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36" x 132" acrylic on canvas

This large canvas is a meditation on child abuse. I worked alone in the studio during a hot, sweaty summer with the music of Leonard Cohen and Natural Born Killers blaring from the speakers. I wanted to enter a mental and emotional space of fear, confusion, pain, and abandonment and convey those emotions on the canvas. I applied a meditative layer of blue paint and added darker hues to the blue to mark deep bruising of the skin. Black belt marks rip the skin; blood oozes from the wounds. The white paint on the top layer was applied in violent slashing motions with a cat o’ nine tail whipping an imagined defenseless child. The violence of the strokes is not immediately apparent when viewing the canvas, just as the bruises and festering wounds of an abused child can be hidden by clothing or ignored by adults who should protect the child. I have always been committed to addressing issues of child abuse. As a high school teacher and elementary school principal in my early career, I occasionally had to meet with Child Protective Services and testify at court hearings. Today, I am a member of TeamFX, a marathon training team at Lady Bird Lake in downtown Austin. I ran the Austin Marathon and Half-Marathon for many years, and I raised money for abused and abandoned children at the Austin Children’s Shelter. The team motto is “Creating a world without child abuse and neglect... one step at a time.”
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Dr. Patrick Slattery is Professor and Associate Department Head for Graduate Studies in the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University where he teaches courses in Philosophy of Education, Curriculum Theory, Social Foundations of Education, and Arts-Based Research. His books include: "Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era" (Third Edition, Routledge, 2013); the co-authored text with Dana Rapp "Ethics and the Foundations of Education: Teaching Convictions in a Postmodern World" (Allyn and Bacon, 2003); the co-authored text with William Pinar "Understanding Curriculum" (Peter Lang Publishers, 1995) amongst others. He central theme of his work is the promotion of a just, compassionate, and ecologically sustainable global culture through holistic and reconceptualized approaches to curriculum, constructive postmodern understandings of education, queer studies in gender and sexuality, and Process philosophical visions of creativity and change. In his research he contends that spiritual, ethical, and social transformation is intimately linked to visual culture, public pedagogy, and aesthetics, and that wisdom can emerge in the artistic process. He is a long-time visual artist and uses art-making as part of his research inquiries. Contact: pslattery@tamu.edu To see more of Patrick’s art go to: http://psartworks.com
(Senior) Editorial: Getting Personal with Fear

- R. Michael Fisher
  Canada

We had a delightful burst of new authors submitting for this issue, and several articles had to be turned down. I’m glad to see interest growing and this issue, which has a rich diversity of works from seasoned scholars (e.g., Peter N. Stearns) to nascent ones (e.g., Christine Legree). Overall, this is quite a ‘personal’ issue of pieces, including the poems that touch the heart (e.g., B. S. Adhikari). I am most grateful for Dr. Patrick Slattery’s engaging and mature art pieces that bring a visual excitement as well, that I know comes from him every time he goes into his art studio.

On the statistical side of things, I am pleased to see the rate of people around the world downloading the issue in whole or part:

IJFS 1(1) -2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
<th>Page Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, R. Michael</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaku, Osinsakachi Akuma</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnesmoore, Luke</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eales, Mark</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Simon</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a near 3-fold increase in views/downloads combined from the first issue to the second there is obviously some spreading of the world happening. I also received a nice letter from Dr. Bartholomew, librarian at University of Calgary and he was intrigued with the journal and will likely write a short article on it for the next issue. Dr. Jonas Lysgaard, author of Dark Pedagogy and professor at a Denmark university wrote, “The journal and the whole issue of fear is extremely interesting, especially in the light of the ongoing climate crisis and our very human reactions
towards the consequences.” On that note, Dr. Rayson Alex had to postpone for another six months to put out a Call for submissions for a special issue on Eco-Fear as he had some family matters to deal with and yet he still wants to Guest edit an issue of IJFS in 2021, so stay-tuned for that.

I received another wonderful and in depth response by Rafiq [aka Robert Sean Lewis, see his book review pp. 71-75 in IJFS 1(2)] as he responded to my Editorial in the last issue. I quote it at length here because he talks about love and fear, a topic of which this issue IJFS 2(1) addresses once more with Dr. Michael B. Eneyo’s rejoinder and my response to that re: the Love and Fear Problem. Rafiq wrote, “I’ve been thinking about your lament that the field of Fear Studies has not been widely embraced, as reflected in the [initial] lack of submissions to the journal. I expect that a field of Love Studies would likewise not be well-received. Yet, there are enormous amounts of academic work going on that pertain both to love and fear. For example, after editing an anthology about Indigenous plant knowledge and ways of being [recently], which is full of beautiful examples of reciprocity and right relations with the earth, it seemed to me that what the book most strongly demonstrates is love for the earth, but the word “love” never occurs....My point is that the meta-lenses of love and fear are rarely foregrounded [by most other’s works]. Your task, then, seems to be to convince scholars who are already doing related work to dare to frame their ideas in such a way as to emphasize and grapple with the meta-lens of fear.”

I agree Rafiq, it is a task alright. A meta-lens of fear (also transdisciplinary lens) I have been calling for is a foundational relationality of an “ecology of fear” at the lower most substantial foundations of human meta-motivation (Fisher, 2012, 2015, 2016).

**Summary of Contents** in this issue of *IJFS*:

Thanks again to all contributors and peer reviewers of works in this issue. Simon Bell offers mindful teaching stories as a new methodology (and theory) to work with fear/terror, sure to make one contemplate in new ways and find more creative ways to manage/transform fear. B. S. Adhikari, out of Nepal, is both a scholar and poet and is finding his voice in writing through the topic of fear as a meta-lens to make sense of his experience and others. I welcome Dr. Ramji Timalsina, who also has applied a meta-lens of fear to diasporic poetry from Bhutan Nepali literary artists and how they come to use arts as an antidote to oppression from the State. This ought to be a good contribution to the literary branch of philosophy of fearism that Desh Subba began back in the late 1990s.

We are very fortunate that Peter Stearns passes on his decades of wisdom as a university teacher of the history of emotions (and fear), giving us some insights to what a historian’s methodology on the topic involves. Indeed, it is noteworthy that he thinks “fear” history is by far more difficult than other emotions’ histories. That doesn’t surprise me. I have always argued that *fear* (and ‘fear’) are unique amongst the emotions and require special methodological rigor for any adequate understanding of the phenomenon. The *IJFS* is founded upon that very premise, but we still require studies and speculative arguments to make that case for our emphasis.

This includes more and more literature, albeit still rare, that points to ‘fear is more than an emotion’ nowadays because of mediated culture and the way that impacts the nature of fear itself (e.g., Furedi, 2006). Madelainne K. Joss’ article herein is a good snooping out of just how quickly
technologies—fear boundaries are being crossed and she raises questions about our addictions and commission with practices that have dubious ethical merit, unless we self-reflect on the ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of this new phenomenon of technology rescuing us from our anxiety (supposedly). Again, what is fear (‘fear’) becoming in this postmodern condition and interfacing with culture and technology as the precarious future unfolds. Any writers still seeking to fix and simplify the definition of fear (or love, for that matter), I believe are going to be left in the backwater of the advances in fear research and knowledge.

Struggles, and hopefully productive ones, do have to be had here.IJFS as diverse as it is in its publishing menu of works, also has to catered to the philosophical and theoretical conflicts within Fear Studies. The rejoinder here by Michael B. Eneyo to my earlier critique of his critique of philosophy of fearism and fearlessness (see IJFS 1(2)) is provocative, I think, and my response is limited due to my other projects, but I invite you to dive in, even if it is a bit ‘heavy’ for most readers. He and I are attempting to stay open to each other, even with our obvious disagreements about really fundamental issues. Next, I am delighted to have someone in Canada from Ontario taking up a serious look at fear and fearlessness and applying theory into practice. Thanks Christine Legree for your sincere commitment to learning in this area. And it is heartwarming to see it has proved already to be expanding your appreciation of fear research (especially, by Four Arrows’ CAT-FAWN model) and is helping the planet too because you have joined more activism groups. It is a good model for anyone entering Fear Studies to read about her initial experiences.

REFERENCES
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Teaching about the History of Fear

Peter N. Stearns

(USA)

Abstract
This article discusses existing approaches to teaching about a history of fear and their limitations. First, the possibility of basic changes in fear over the past three centuries deserves serious attention; there are relevant data and explanations. A second approach, focused on fear episodes, also has merit, including the opportunity to assess the reasons widespread fears recede. Without pretending a definitive model, historical perspectives contribute to our understanding of fear, just as fear deserves a more robust place in the growing field of emotions history.

For several years now I have been teaching an undergraduate course on the modern history of emotion, with a key section devoted to fear. Among the several specific emotions covered, I consistently find fear to be the most challenging, and I thought that some ruminations on the problem might be of wider interest, not only to teachers but to others eager to apply a historical perspective to this crucial emotional area.

The course is predicated on the belief, widely shared in the growing field of emotions history, that analyzing emotions in the past yields deeper understanding both of historical circumstances and of the process through which contemporary patterns in emotional standards and experience emerged. Emotions historians argue that emotional standards and experiences in the past were somewhat different from those prevailing today, and that exploring the differences, and the patterns of change that gradually reshaped them, opens new understanding of emotional life. There is every reason to consider fear within this framework – but it is a demanding exercise.

There is no avoiding the challenge. Any definition of distinct emotions quite properly includes fear. Recent historical experience does the same: while the idea of emotions history predates the terrorist attacks, many younger practitioners, and not just in the United States, cite the trauma as 9/11 as the event that drew them into the field. I myself was spurred by what I thought were some debatable manifestations of fear into exploration of the emotion in the American historical context. So: fear should not monopolize the exploration of emotions historically, but it has a central place. – which brings us back to the complexities involved.

---

My thanks to R. Michael Fisher and anonymous readers for suggestions on an earlier draft.


No emotion’s history is easy, among other things because of the obvious difficulty in appreciating past cultures and unearthing evidence, particularly about actual emotional experience. But the modern history of love, at least in Western cultures, arguably has an identifiable trajectory: emphasis on romantic love began to swell in the 18th century, and the subsequent evolution can be traced at least to some extent. Shame was even more clearly redefined and in this case condemned in the 18th century, and ensuing developments, though complex – it is impossible to get rid of shame – at least have a definable focus. Even anger offers some clear periodization, particularly amid the growing efforts to control workplace anger in the 20th century: there is among other things the clear recent push toward anger “management”. Anger also benefits from some fascinating anthropological work, which makes it clear that anger cultures can vary regionally as well as chronologically.¹

But fear is harder to tackle, or so I have found it. There is some excellent historical work, but as I will shortly indicate it is inconclusive in some crucial respects, at least to date. I’m also not sure that anthropologists help as much with this emotion as with others, though they certainly identify how certain cultures highlight particular fears and sometimes explore the fears of “primitive” societies.² And of course, as a “basic” or primal emotion, fear may be open to less systematic variation or change as some more composite cases, though I am not convinced that this is the case. After all, other widely-recognized “basics”, like happiness as well as anger, have definite historical trajectories.

To date, historians have explored several options, all of them interesting and in some cases related but, again, cumulatively somewhat unfinished in terms of basic patterns of change. One approach, with several variants, tries to identify relatively systematic change, at least in moving from premodern to modern patterns. A second approach frames the history of fear more in terms of episodes or case studies. The central tension between the cumulative and episodic approaches revolves around the issue of whether any dominant modern trend or trends can be identified or whether instead the history of fear needs to be chopped up into discrete episodes, revealing but cumulatively relatively elusive. Both major approaches dispute any “basic emotions” claim that fear is simply a historical constant; both illustrate the importance of historical perspectives on the emotion. But the implications of the two are significantly different, and so is their message to students of fear from other disciplines.

The Cumulative Approach: Modern Fear as Different

There is first of all the sweeping statement, most clearly associated with Jean Delumeau but open to some further embellishment. Focusing mainly on Catholic Europe from the Middle Ages through the 18th century, Delumeau basically argues that a strong and pervasive emphasis on fear, both as warning and as major part of emotional life, was substantially undone by the impact of the Enlightenment. Religious insistence on the perils of hell and damnation declined. A variety of superstitious fears were gradually displaced by fuller scientific understanding, increasingly popularized. While fear was hardly eliminated, many people found it possible to reduce their experience of the emotion in normal daily life.³

² See for example, Robbins Burley, Renssangri
The argument can be further extended. By the late 19th or early 20th centuries, threats of epidemics and famine receded in the Western world—two potent traditional sources of fear. More attention might also be paid to the advent of more abundant lighting, public and private alike, in reducing fears of the night. We have good historical evidence of how these amenities displaced strong traditional fears in southern Africa by the beginning of the 20th century, allowing workers, for example, to accept jobs that required their presence after dark.¹ It is also true that some religions, like mainstream Protestantism, extended the moratorium on fear by reducing references to hell and damnation at least in Western society, and promoting visions of a more accessible and user-friendly heaven instead. On yet another front, changes in both the treatment of and attitudes toward animals have tended to reduce fear in interactions, in favor of more positive emotions most obviously with the growing array of pets.²

It is not completely far-fetched, in other words, to argue that despite all the undeniable issues with fear in contemporary industrial societies today, the emotion has become less vivid, less intrusive and more manageable than was the case in at least some societies in the past. Most current historians are skeptical of too much emphasis on progress, particularly in a domain as complex as emotional life, but there may be a claim when it comes to fear.

However, “progress” aside, an approach that relies on contrasting modern fear patterns with premodern already should raise real warning flags, despite Delumeau’s careful documentation. We know from other emotional histories, including anger, that facile comparisons of modern to premodern patterns are fraught with difficulty, because of the danger of glib overgeneralizations about the premodern; and fear has not been a heavy focus of the otherwise blossoming premodern emotions-historical literature.³ Delumeau himself may take theology too literally, in terms of popular emotional experience.

We also need to give attention to the role of beliefs and rituals around magic, in alleviating certain fears (despite stereotypes, white magic was more important than black) as well as in provoking them, and how the decline of magic may have removed an important resource against fear that scientific knowledge, at least for some, may not have entirely replaced.⁴ On another front, proponents of the idea of “Cartesian anxiety,” as skepticism undermined earlier religious certainties, turn the progress argument on its head by emphasizing how Enlightenment rationalism left a legacy of ontological fears in modern thought.⁵

More specifically: any approach emphasizing the decline of premodern fears must also allow for the possibility that new targets of fear moved in to replace the old.⁶ Here, the modern history of fear might still emphasize changes away from premodern patterns, but toward new sources of the emotion rather than any moderating trend.

Delumeau himself, though without elaborating, talks about the rise of compelling new fears by the later 19th century, as concerns about degenerative disease, and the unseen deterioration of one’s own

---

body, began to replace the more traditional focus on contagion. There is a substantial scholarly literature on the emergence of new fears of death, as death became less visible, more often located in hospitals, increasingly removed – by doctors and funeral professionals – from family oversight. The whole argument about death as a new modern taboo is much debated, and recent analysis – though focused more on the past fifty years than the earlier 20th century – tends to downplay an extreme approach, arguing that moderns have developed a number of rituals, including more cheerful funerals, to cope adequately with the grim reaper. Still, modern society and death may not easily mix.¹

Certainly, again by the 20th century, the emergence of new media, capable of quickly transmitting irrational prompts to fear, deserves consideration as against some simple pattern of modern fear reduction or improved management. To be sure, more traditional societies were frequently stirred to fear by the sheer force of rumor – see for example the Great Fear early in the French Revolution, so one does not need to overdo the novelty of radio, television and so on. But the famous British and American fictional radio shows that provoked mass panics in the 1920s and 1930s, certainly introduced new mass dynamics into the fear equation.² By the 1970s, the combination of fictional crime dramas on television and increasingly sensationalist, on-the-scene reporting by the local newscasts, began to generate statistically irrational fears of crime rates, particularly in the United States – sometimes goaded further by politicians.³ All of this certainly muddies any claims about fear moderation in modern societies, though it is compatible with some real contrasts concerning the nature and sources of fear in recent history compared to earlier periods.

All of this unquestionably complicates any big claims about fear’s evolution over long periods of time, though I would argue that the interplay between claim and complexity can still generate informative debate. Furthermore, a few other pieces can be added to a cumulative argument, though they apply to more specific aspects of fear.

Two other data points warrant particular attention toward a nuanced argument about fear levels over time. First, it was in the late 18th and early 19th century, in Western society, that the practice of deliberately and voluntarily frightening oneself by fictional exposures to horror began to take new forms. There is a straight line from the rise of the Gothic novel, and masterpieces like Frankenstein, to the horror films of our own time. And while the phenomenon has been much studied – what kinds of people like to scare themselves, and why? – it deserves to be more closely linked to the larger modern story.⁴ Conceivably, as certain real fears declined – for example, fears of the night – some people simply needed to replace the thrill through new outlets, though ones that constrained real fear through the realization that the emotion would end as soon as one put the book down or, later, left the theater. The chronology, at the least, suggests this is a real possibility, and one that sheds light on several aspects of the modern fear experience.⁵

³ Unfortunately a growing and excellent literature on relationships between new technologies and emotion has largely left fear by the wayside, in favor of anger, boredom and the like. There is room for more work here.; Luke Fernandez and Susan J. Matt, Bored, Lonely, Angry, Stupid.
⁵ It is also true that modern arts have enabled some individuals to “re-dramatize” and work through certain fears, providing opportunities for healing that are quite different from the entertainment role of fictionalized terror.
Second: in many Western countries a very real change in the use of fear in childrearing began to be urged by the early 19th century. Responsible parents were explicitly told, in virtually every childrearing manual, that fear should be carefully avoided in discipline. Old-fashioned bogeymen did far more harm than good, and now there were new ways, if only through more adult supervision, to keep children safe. Of course we do not know how many parents took this advice to heart, or how quickly, though it is revealing that, by the 20th century, childrearing manuals dropped the injunction not because fear tactics became fashionable again but because, by now, parents could be counted on to know the drill: don’t scare kids unnecessarily. To be sure, this formula became complicated with the entry of psychologists like G. Stanley Hall in the later 19th century, who insisted that even with the most conscientious parents, kids would find plenty to be scared about anyway. This spurred new parental concerns about further protecting or reassuring children, and relying less on stiff upper lips in favor of prevention or coddling; but this merely intensified the hope to avoid fear in discipline. As parents became more conscious of the need to shield children from fears – like fears of the dark – they would have even more reason to avoid trying to scare their offspring into obedience.¹

All of this may point to a plausible modern periodization for discussions of fear, at least in Western societies, and at least in terms of changes in sources of fear and assumptions about the role of the emotion in socialization. Pending further work, however, it remains a sketchy framework, particularly requiring more careful juxtapositions of modern and premodern experience. It does not really answer the question about changes in the level of fear – and perhaps, in truth, this is simply not a good question. It also does not deal clearly with perennial sources of fear that cut across convenient chronological boundaries, like the fears that have been associated with race in the United States for several centuries. Nor, finally, does it offer any careful comparisons. While we certainly have a sense that some societies have different fear targets from others, even in modern times, there have been no efforts to my knowledge to compare regional fear levels and cultures as part of a larger historical evaluation of modern trends.² Thus an impressive critique of irrational American fears at the end of the 20th century said nothing about whether the phenomenon was at that point unusual, compared to kindred societies in other places.³ There is much still to think about.

A Second Approach: Key Episodes of Fear and Fear Management

The doubts and complexities that must attach to any cumulative argument about fear leads to the need to explore the second historical approach to the emotion, that is frankly agnostic on the subject of long-term changes or comparisons. It is quite clear that there is a verifiable fear history of key episodes in the experience of most societies, and the result, while not as ambitious or dramatic as a more sweeping claim,

² Interesting work has emerged on some characteristic, or possibly characteristic, German patterns of fear, from the early modern period on up to post-World War II. The analysis is first rate, but it has not yet ventured explicit comparisons with other national patterns. Again, there are further opportunities to explore in this domain. See Frank Beiss, *German Angst? Fear and Democracy in the Federal Republic Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Thomas Kehoe and Michael Pickering, eds., *Fear in the German Speaking World, 1600-2000* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2020).
³ Peter N. Stearns, *American Fear*
can be quite revealing. Joanna Bourke’s fine book on British and American fears offers a classic example of the episodic approach, but there are others – and certainly many additional opportunities.¹

One intriguing instance, of a fear episode bounded in time, centers on the widespread anxieties about burial alive, which began to develop in Britain and the United States (and possibly beyond), from the later 18th century, and extended vigorously into the first decades of the 20th. There were a host of symptoms, along with a great deal of public discussion including, around 1900, a batch of sensationalist press coverage that further stirred the emotional pot. Individuals tried to protect themselves, as in George Washington’s order that he not be buried until at least two days after his apparent death. Devices were introduced, like coffins with bells so that a victim could signal to the outside world upon waking and realizing that there had been a terrible mistake. This was a vivid fear, whose origins can be traced and, up to a point at least, explained in terms of new understandings of resuscitation, active fears of medical error, lack of trust in public regulation as new hospital and burial practices were introduced.²

A more recent example: the nationwide fears of poisoned candy and applies with razor blades that circulated widely in the United States in 1982. This prompted active anxiety about neighborhood evil, a host of new regulations of trick-or-treating, and a novel parental obligation to accompany kids on their mendicant rounds. This is a fascinating fear because it was not grounded in fact, but on a quickly-accepted urban legend after a quite different and more limited episode of Tylenol poisoning (with largely adult victims) in the Chicago region. The fear’s acceptance has actually never been completely undone, with the result that Halloween activities, for children, remain largely circumscribed. (Related and equally exaggerated fears of kidnapping began to crest in the same period, offering another episode to explore.)³

Some fear instances involve policy considerations. The fears that surfaced after the explosion of the atomic bomb, and particularly after the Soviet Union acquired weaponry, have been examined, along with the decision, by concerned scientists, not to play up fear tactics in urging armaments control lest wild public response prove counterproductive. And while actual fears remained vivid for a while, arguably quite understandably, they actually receded more rapidly than might have been imagined, as many people simply got used to the threat and/or assumed that responsible behaviors would prevail. (The complex role of fear, including the possibility of negative reactions, in the current environmental crisis might be discussed with this episode in mind. Case studies encourage efforts to identify partial analogies to current emotional issues.)

Reactions to the 9/11 terrorist attack offer another opportunity for episode analysis, here with some possible comparisons to responses in other countries such as Britain, Spain and Israel (granting that terrorist acts vary widely in scope and impact, complicating the analysis). Arguably, the national response, with fear components well documented even geographically far distant from actual terrorist sites, were exacerbated not only by the magnitude of the attack and the role of media in endlessly recycling the horrifying images. The decision to evacuate the President, instead of offering immediate public

¹ It is worth that Bourke’s ambitious canvass does include one argument about more systematic change, around the claim that the reduction of physical activity in modern military combat has increased the fear experience in battle from the early 20th century onward; Joanna Bourke, Fear: A Cultural History.
appearances aimed at reassurance, and the recommendations that Americans stay indoors rather than risking public demonstrations of grief, resolve and anger, were arguably counterproductive.¹

For while the fear-episode approach has some obvious constraints analytically, it can support efforts at wider generalization. Attention to the role of modern media, based on the multiplication of fear involvements, is one obvious focus. More broadly, I am particularly struck by the desirability, as part of fear studies, of doing more systematic analysis, based on an accumulation of relevant episodes, on when a particular kind fear stops. Thanks to careful historical work over several generations, we can now answer this question with regard with witchcraft, by the later 17th/19th centuries. But there are many other opportunities. How and why did the widespread fears of smallpox vaccinations finally recede (and might there be lessons applicable to current vaccination fears)? Evaluations of why burial alive simply ceased provoking fear, after literally more than a century of impact, are actually even more interesting than why the phenomenon started in the first place. New patterns of trust, more systematic government requirements of certifications of death presumably finally took hold – and the media had to find other threats, real or imagined, to play on public emotion. Even racial fears or other group-based phobias can moderate, despite their deep roots, and again the factors involved are worth more attention. Here is an opportunity to combine focused generalization derived from historical case studies to a broader interest in fear management.²

**Summary Remarks**

Two basic questions about the history of fear remain, insofar as I can judge, unanswered. Both are highly relevant to an understanding of fear today. Both, in my view, support the earlier claim that (perhaps unsurprisingly) fear is an unusually complex emotion to handle historically.

The first is the fundamental issue of whether fear, at a societal level, changes over time, or whether it merely shifts targets (itself important, where historical work on episodes does provide important information). Perhaps the question will remain open, though work on other, broadly similar emotions like anger continues to suggest that we might be able to do better, whether in terms of arguments about “progress” (with occasional regression) or some other approach.³

The second brings us back to the comparative challenge, which should receive more attention. Are some societies, at certain periods of time and around common issues like health threats or terrorism, more prone to fear than others, and if so why, and what can we learn from any differences?

In the meantime, beyond insisting on the need for more data and more refined analysis, we can take some real satisfaction in the achievements already available, both along lines of debating the possibility of long-term changes and around the exploration of key episodes (including the cases of ultimate improvements in fear management). I am not sure that historians of emotion are ever likely to adopt the label of fearology – we can be a bit stuffy; but there is every reason to promote greater communication between historical insights, current and forthcoming, and the larger field.⁴ Certainly, a discussion of fear

---

² Peter N. Stearns, *American Fear*
³ Theodore Zeldin, *Intimate History*
and its complexities as part of teaching about the history of emotion measurably helps students think about the emotion and its contemporary risks and peculiarities; and that can be a step toward more constructive management. Lessons from history do not always require certainty.
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FEAR IS AN IDEA...

The classic Robin book presented “fear as an idea” with its genealogical political history. It was a breakthrough work in 2004
An Experiential Opportunity:  
*Using Mindful Stories in the Mindful Consideration of Fear*

Simon Bell  
(UK)

Abstract

In this article the issue of fear management practice is discussed in terms of the discourse around mindfulness and an experiential engagement is provided. The article describes two heuristics and then brings them together in a process which the author invites you to engage with. First, in terms of fear analysis, the heuristic for fear diagnosis called the Paradigm of Fear is introduced. PoF relates to concepts of Weapon, Target, Emotion, State. These are described in overview. Secondly, a heuristic relating to mindful assessments is reviewed, concepts of Meaning, Relevance, Value, Insight and Action are introduced. Following this, readers are invited to engage with a Mindful Story, a story which already contains the fear heuristic. Following reading the Mindful Story, the reader is asked to further engage with it using MRVIA and make their own personal assessment of their fear analysis and any reflections or actions which might arise. A discussion of the likely and useful outcomes of such assessment follows and finally, the paper closes with conclusions on the potential value of Mindful Stories in engaging with fearful situations.

Introduction and Background

This paper is intended to provide an experiential engagement with a form of mindfulness as a means to engage with situations of fear and terror. In what follows I will briefly introduce two heuristics developed separately to consider:

a. A pattern for fear weaponization: The Paradigm of Fear or PoF
b. A method to using and assessing stories in order to enhance capacity for action: MRVIA

The intention is for this paper to be primarily an experiential learning opportunity and not a theoretical description. For this reason, the preamble to the experiential element is minimal.

The Formations of Terror

In previous papers and articles (Bell, 2017, 2018 and 2019), Bell has described the emergence of the heuristic involved in the assessment of fear. The heuristic (referred to as the Paradigm of Fear, PoF) emerged from a comparative study of fear emergence in the climate

From a comparison of the direct experience of fear in the climate change arena and the literature addressing the fear phenomena a suggested heuristic, the Paradigm of Fear: PoF, emerged as a means to problem structure the fear phenomena. PoF as set in the wider Terror System is set out in Figure 1.

(Above) Figure 1. The Paradigm of Fear in the Formations of Terror System (Bell, 2017, page 233).

The PoF heuristic was intended as a means to assess a fear context by means of a series of diagnostic questions: If you are feeling fear,

a. What (if anything) is being weaponised consciously or unconsciously?
b. Is there an identifiable target for the weaponised fear?
c. What, if any, emotion is being produced or resulting from this targeting?
d. Is the emotion becoming normalised as a state of fear?

The Formation of Terror method proceeded to look at means to attenuate or amplify fear but that is not the basis of this paper. Key to the current work is the concept of the PoF heuristic, it is this which is explored in the mindfulness exercise.

Assessing Mindful Stories

If fear is prevalent in 21st Century living, then one important contemporary means to push back on this has been the advent of deeper senses of mental self-control. Core to this has been the literature on Mindfulness. Jon Kabat Zinn (Zinn, 2013) arguably set the high-water mark for self-help and Mindfulness is now well established as a powerful process to achieve personal and group clarity. Sam Harris (Harris, 2014) has shown in his book ‘Waking Up’, that ‘no frills’ Mindfulness without allusion to religious legacy is possible and powerful. Although there is now more push-back against the thoughtless acceptance of mindfulness as a self-evident good and, some claim it provides a basis for passive and accepting attitudes (a particularly spikey example is given in: McMindfulness: How Mindfulness Became the New Capitalist Spirituality by Ronald Purser, (Purser, 2019) the experiential evidence of value is hard to deny. The at times contentious interest in the subject continues to animate wide diversities of exponents and a correspondingly intense interest and application by the general public.

Mindfulness is connected to a range of extremely interesting and related approaches which the use of mindful stories described in this paper draws upon. Nancy Marguiles (Marguiles, 2008) provided a means for groups and individuals to capture personal narratives by means of pictures and art. Nick Owen has written two superb books making use of metaphor and story as a means to help individuals get unstuck and move forward (Owen, 2001, Owen, 2009). The mindfulness practice included in this paper builds on both of these types of approaches, braiding them with the more narrowly conceived mindfulness literature.

Mindfulness is famously about removing the self. The approach to mindfulness adopted in the Mindful Stories (MiSt) approach set out in this paper takes a step back from this. The core of MiSt is to establish a ‘safe place’ for personal reflection by making use of fiction as a basis for progress. Mindful Stories are more about preparation for exploration rather than engaging in more formal types of mindfulness (such as that advocated by Zinn, Harris, etc.) or detailed change making. It can be noted that the area of priming individuals and groups as preparation for deeper analysis is covered in a range of books (e.g. those by Owen) but few make effective and nuanced use of fictions.

The subject of self analysis via the use of metaphor has been widely discussed over many years (See for example: Horney, 1942, Gray and Brown, 2010, Bolton and Delderfield, 2018, Bawick and Weegmann, 2018, Matousek, 2017). Some authors and practitioners use visual metaphors, others make use of the written word, but none use stories as sequential means to
explore complex realities across our various fields of experience. In the MiSt approach these fields are generalised as self, personal world, group world and group. Nor do these authors apply a graduated method in exploring the stories. This is very much the mission and province of the mindful stories.

The specific heuristic applied in the MiSt approach and which is introduced later in the paper is the five-fold method for reviewing the stories content. This five-fold method is:

a. Meaning, identifying the key personal meaning in a fiction
b. Relevance, consciously noting the relevance of this meaning. Why is it important?
c. Value, recognising the value of the meaning. What might this important idea relate to?
d. Insight, assessing the insight gained
e. Action, identifying the practical, real-world actions which may follow from the insight.

This five-fold cycle is set out in Figure 2. The figure demonstrates the cyclic nature of the analysis, indicating the option to review meaning following an action phase. An important point to note is that the five stages of MRVIA may occur out of sequence and may be highly porous. Meaning may flow without boundary into identification of relevance. Similarly, relevance can be almost synonymous with value and insight. The stages are included to ensure that some conscious activity happens to leverage an idea from the fiction from identification (in meaning) to any potential action.

(Above) Figure 2. The MRVIA cycle for story assessment
An Opportunity to Practice With a Fear-based Mindful Story

In the next section you will find a mindful story themed on fear. I suggest the following process for your engagement with the fiction.

Find a quiet space. A place in time and space when you are clear enough and undisturbed enough to be able to engage with a story. Spend a little time in reflection.

*****

Consider your present circumstances. Consider where the pressure is in your life right now. Separate out what are the most pressing issues. Identify but try not to associate to closely with, any items which are making you feel anxious or fearful. Just identify them, don’t pursue, analyse or try to fix them.

*****

Take a couple of minutes over this.

*****

You will need about 20 minutes in order to engage in the Mindful Stories process. Try to set aside 20 minutes. You have all the rest of the day to do all the other things that your busy life involves. Dedicate this 20 minutes to being mindful and nothing else.

I suggest that you place the story in a peaceful setting. So, settle down in a comfortable place and take a few seconds to control your breathing, focusing on the in-breath and the out-breath. Give this a couple of minutes.

*****

When you feel ready, let your mind wander over the issues of your day, the thoughts of the moment and your main concerns. Try not to hang onto any of these elements, just try to let your mind wander, like a bird flying over a great landscape of trees and mountains. All of it is important but it is all below you. Stretching out. No single element is necessarily more important than any other part.

Now read the story.

The Mindful Story: Fear

(as published on https://literallystories2014.com)

“Standing in the necromantic pit, in the depths of the crypt of his tower the Dark Lord could feel the Wyrd Work of the King. He could sense the deceitful and untrustworthy akashic
forces leaving him and coming under the King’s command – inexpertly at first but with growing confidence the young monarch wove the patterns.

As the light of the fires of Hell flickered uncertainly around the walls of the chamber and the floor moved suddenly under his clawed feet the Dark One could not help a sallow smile from crossing his thin, cruel lips.”

“What is a necromantic pit Daddy?”, the small voice issued from the snug confines of the midnight blue sheeted bed by which he sat.

Still be-suited, hair tousled from the daily-slog experience of commuter heat and sweat rather than fashionable cool, he put the book down.

“I think that is probably enough for tonight” he said. He had been late in (again), rushed into reading prior to supper and not known the book. What was this stuff? He was concerned that this really was not an appropriate night-time read for Ben. For goodness sake how had he got hold of this book?

He had had a long and cruel day and he really did not need to be reading about Dark Lords and necromantic pits, nor did he need the intense job of trying to explain what it was all about to an innocently curious, wide awake ten-year-old.

The bed-time read curtailed he slipped into his study prior to the descent to kitchen, supper and cross-examination. Some days it really was not ‘good to talk’.

In the comparative safety of his study, behind the Ikea desk and the Mac desktop, he felt a little command and control coming back to him. He seemed to have been running scared, out of control for most of the day.

An evil process seemed to be at work. Sitting back on his ‘venom’ games/office chair (“Good for work and play” he had explained to his disbelieving partner when Amazon had delivered it. It was a half decent office chair but great for games and maybe she guessed more than she let on about his main occupation in his study). He rubbed his eyes tiredly and pondered the sequence of events which he summarised as; being targeted, weapons being used, emotional consequences and ensuing state of mind.

Target.
To say he had been targeted was an understatement. He and his crew had all been simultaneously victimised by what they had experienced as a wicked internal office process. From seemingly innocuous beginnings they had gradually found their work streams closed down, undergoing evaluation and then gone. Just gone. The H drive did not lie and nor did the Dropbox folders. Weeks of work was as if they were not and never had been. No explanation and no responses from line management, they had sat about in incredulous disbelief as they had seen their computers taken away, their hot-office space closed (‘for cleaning and hygiene’) and had been nudged more than thrown out of their usual office space. Huddled together they found that their ID badges no longer functioned. They had to ask for help from a Security Officer to get the lifts to accept them as legitimate denizens of the eighth floor and grant them a ride down. At ground floor, more Security Officials questioned them about their status, took their badges and, finally harried them out of the thick glass doors.

*Weapon*

Uncomprehending and panicking they had stood like idiots, clustered on the pavement in front of the twenty-story office block, a group moved from power, competence, coherence and purpose to lost sheep in the space of 30 minutes. Even now, standing in the wind of the street they did not fully understand that they had been targeted and that a potent weapon had been deployed against them. All that they knew was the entry conditions of fear, that things had happened and that the world which they had known an hour ago was no more. From being secure, well paid professionals, they were now reduced to an uncomprehending rabble, anxious, angry and confused. Their task in their former role had been as a shock, SWAT team of software engineers, tasked to manage an aberration in the company’s digital record. They had been making progress and had identified what seemed to be a huge anomaly in the digital build of some parts of the legacy architecture. Some of this stuff was beyond them in that it had been put in place years before they were born. Assembler code and FORTRAN skills needed to be understood. They had identified that the digital equivalent of a mega city had gradually arisen upon the ancient foundations, they were also beginning to think that the foundations were not only faulty, it could well be that there was stuff going on in the crypt-like depths of the code which was suspicious and potentially corrupted, or in the process of being corrupted. Unknown
agencies seemed to have been at work. They were zeroing in on what seemed to be a hot spot of current illicit activity when the world had gone crazy. They and their mission had been revoked.

Emotion

When the numb shock had passed, they began to jabber. His team-lead role was the natural starting point for questions to begin:

“What is going on Steve”, “Did you know about this?”, “Has Chantel been in contact?”,

“Why are they doing this?”. “What did we do?”.

“What did we do”, Steve repeated to himself.

The team were no longer a team and panic was eating them from the inside out. Some of the younger members were in tears and an over-whelming need for information, frustrated in act, was working its way out in a range of emotions, anger, rage, fear, horror, panic and; increasingly dumb despair.

What was becoming obvious was; there was no cavalry coming to the rescue, history would not rewind, and they were sacked. Tears, rage and confusion amplified in the absence of no information, no leadership and no shared group point of focus. Not yet anyway.

State

They had repaired to the local Costa, ordered coffees and clustered around two tables hastily joined. Steve had tried to impose his authority (which he no longer had as he no longer had a job) and seek an answer to the question: “what did we do?”. But in question and answer it became increasingly obvious that no one had done any thing which could have been construed as treasonous or illicit. Far from it. The whole team had been super-cautious as it found the crypt (that is what they called the anomalous area of code), wary of their lack of knowledge of the antique code and anxious not to make matters worse or give away their investigation. Add to tears, rage and confusion conspiracy, distrust and a yearning for it all to end.

One by one they had dispersed. They could not go back to the office; the only options were endless cups of coffee or going home. Steve and two of his more senior team members stayed, made futile efforts to enter the office block, call their Line Manager Chantel and find
new and revealing parts of the story so far untold. Failure met them on all fronts and, at 6pm they had decided to leave it for the day. With no plan they dispersed to their various residences.

So, he found himself back at the house, so he found himself numbly reading a child’s story and so, at last he found himself in his study looking with incredulity at the messages appearing on his computer screen. The words came together slowly to form a meaning he already knew and indeed had read but did not understand. Now, perhaps he did understand the fear that had gnawed him all day and the likely cause, unbelievable but irrefutable. He could not look away. He was the target. The code was the weapon. Confused panic had been the emotion but the state, the state was nothing, but fear and this fear had no end in sight. Indeed, this seemed to be amplifying on a logarithmic scale. He read his computer screen again and again. The message could only be from one system:

“As the light of the fires of Hell flickered uncertainly around the walls of the chamber and the floor moved suddenly under his clawed feet the Dark One could not help a sallow smile from crossing his thin, cruel lips.”

**Analysis of the Mindful Story**

Now, read the story again. Two reads is preferable, new ideas and thoughts will emerge in the space provided by the second read.

Read carefully and try not to judge the content too quickly. Let the story seep into your mind. Then, take a moment to breath and reflect and with the story still fresh in your mind, consider your responses to each of the following questions:

*Question 1*. What do you feel is the main meaning of the story?

What message or core or essential meaning does the story hold for you? There may be many meanings which occur to you but for now try to prioritise just one. The various forms of fear described in the story may resonate with you or you may find them alien. Be clear on how you relate to the fear. When you feel clear on this, read the next question:

*Question 2*. How is this meaning of relevance to you?

How does the story impact on your life and your challenges right now? Why is it important to you at this point in your life? What element emerges as being most relevant? Do you recognise the sense of a target, weapon, emotion or state?
Again, give yourself time to think of your response and when you feel prepared try the next question:

*Question 3.* Think about what is the main value that you can draw from this relevance of the story. What does this value bring to the concern you identified earlier?

Don’t rush your response. Take time to think about the value. The word ‘value’ is an interesting word. What do we value and what of value is here? When you are set try this:

*Question 4.* What insight does the identified value provide for you? Is there something here that you had not thought of before. Finally:

*Question 5.* What action might you engage with as a consequence? Might you now do something differently? What? Why?

*****

When you have considered what you might do next, spend a couple of minutes just breathing and thinking about nothing at all.

*****

See what changes this day as a result of thinking about the story. You may like to swing through these five questions two or three times. Each time you may get to a deeper level of meaning and this could result in deepening senses of relevance, value, insight and action. How might you react to being targeted? What weapons are used against you and how would you react to them? What emotions are drawn from you by fear? How is your current state of mind influenced by fear processes?

**Discussion**

The mindful stories are intended for face to face use and the results of engaging with them vary considerably. It is almost impossible to generalise responses but here are a four which I have witnessed as common, relating to four levels of story interpretation: literal, metaphor, cause and personal.

- The story is the story. It is interesting to varying degrees, but it remains a fiction with little real purchase on the individual experience of fear. It is an interesting thing but conveys no conscious message.

- The story is a metaphor and corresponds to some generic sense of fear which the reader has felt or is at present feeling. The formations of the story are in some way recognisable and relatable. This can lead to an uncanny reaction or a sense of unease.
Progressing with and dealing with this unease can be considered at arm’s length, as building on the fiction.

- The story is suggestive of deeper causes which lie at the root of the metaphors and these causes are active or potent in the readers experience. There may follow an urgent sense of need to address deep causes of unease in the readers current lived experience.

- The story is recognisable in a highly personal way. Some elements chime personally and graphically. Wider lessons may be involved, and time may need to be spent unpicking the correspondences between fiction and reality.

The author would be delighted to receive your thoughts and comments on your experiential engagement with the fear/ mindful stories opportunity. All comments and thoughts can be sent to simon.bell@bayswaterinst.org

Conclusion

The experiential exercise contained in this paper is an opportunity to consider personal responses to fear. The exercise has an embedded fear heuristic (PoF) and makes use of a mindfulness heuristic (MRVIA). One of the major issues for fear management is the capacity to look meaningfully at that which alarms or frightens us. By use of fiction we can place the context of fear at arm’s length and consider fear by means of metaphor. By this means it may be able to engage, gain agency and some control in situations where fear is a cause of debilitation or feeling frozen or ‘stuck’. The author is at the time of writing finalising a book on this subject which contains 100 stories for use in fearful contexts as well as many other.
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Yi-Fu Tuan’s classic human geography study of fear (1979) now has a new cover much more provocative than its first edition.
Fear

Fear! The master of the masters
Guiding force of all to both humans and non-humans
Draws the attention to all
Derives peace and order
Cultivates the sense of duty and responsibility
Maintains law and order even in chaos
Activates discipline even to the beasts
Discourages criminals to commit crime
Keeps in morality, ethics, sinless, harmonious and prosperous
Draws nervousness, depression and insanity if it is too much
Harmful if too extreme, but meaningful if it functions in limits
Comes from the inner part of heart and appears in the appearance
Outcome of consciousness and knowledge
Beautiful and creative in its positive form
Harmful, worthless in the negative appearance
Law of the laws functioning in creative perspective
Law of violence, horror, terror, sin, crime, and murder in destructive form
Beautiful and creative if properly dealt with
Mother of creation of all the 21th century
Stone age in the absence of its function
Source of world war in extreme form
Solution of all the obstacles in its medium use
Boon to life in medium exercise
Curse of all in the exercise of extreme
Welcome to positive-medium use of fear
Farewell to negative extreme form of fear

****

Bhawani Shankar Adhikari
English lecturer, Balmeki Campus, Kathmandu
Nepal Sanskrit University, Nepal
Fear Politics

Politics as a social science leads the nation
Lurks the fear in politics in invisible for
Fear of rivals in the heart of all politicians
Fear with respect to one another praiseworthy
Fear with hatred as compared to uncultured and disgusting
Uncultured fear in politics begets violence
Cultured one as peace and harmony, progress and prosperity with joy
Fear politics in limitation as essential to the world as the heart of humans
Cultured, fearless politics resides with Biswa Prakash Sharma of Nepal
Fear Politics detrimental and ups and down in the social peace
Fearlessness derives boom with the sense of security
Fearless politics requires to the world to avoid war
Politics as a science of all sciences dwells at the top of all discoveries
Fear in politics resulted the annihilation of resources and humans in the 1st and 2nd world war
Politics with fear contaminates everything of the globe
Bombs and missiles of little boy and fat man of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the consequence of fear politics
Humanity and cosmopolitans vanishes in fear politics
The human world turns into inhuman with the fear
Dreams of political philosophers of ideal states die only in dream
The planet, earth, suffers and feels agony with chemical weapons in fear politics
Fear as a root of all evils pollutes the minds of world politicians
What do polluted and unhealthy minds offer to the world?
Nothing but mutilation of beauty of nature and harmonious life cycle of all the living creatures of the planet
If so, why not to impose the principle of positive fear in their minds to create fearless world?
Cannot the fear politics be converted into fearlessness in the entire globe?
Of course- but the world politicians need to change the minds to be unselfish, with mutual faith to one another and positive thought of fearlessness
Let the fearlessness be friend of the world politicians
Let the seeds of fearlessness politics be sawn in the entire globe
Let the negative principle of fear vanish in the minds of all politicians forever
Let them regard negative fear as the enemy of the humanity
Let never the negative fear lurk in the world politics
Let positive and creative fear circulate in the blood of all human
Let the fearlessness rule the world
Let this planet, Earth, be like a heaven with the doctrine of fearlessness
Let never be the word humanity only in the dictionary
Let the world be like one nation with the rule of fearlessness
Let the feelings of brotherhood and sisterhood prevail in the absence of fear
Let the world be united to establish the rule of fearlessness
Let the voice of fearlessness and trust come from all the mole hills, hills, and peaks of mountains in the entire globe
Let fearless be the soul of all individuals of the world
Let fearless work to ban the fearful chemical weapons and missiles
Long live fearlessness! Long live the planet Earth and all other living creatures who share the earth with us

- Bhawani Shankar Adhikari
  English lecturer, Balmeeki Campus, Kathmandu
  Nepal Sanskrit University, Nepal
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FEAR AS METAPHOR:

The latter half of the 20th century witnessed crime rates soar in many urban centres. Further, the fear of crime, which received scant attention until the 1980s, is now recognised as a more widespread problem than crime itself (Hale, 1996)....What is the nature of fear? Is fear a product of the criminogenic conditions which appear to have flourished in urban environments? Or, is fear more broadly allied to city-dwelling, a metaphor for the quality of urban life?

- (excerpt from Bannister & Fyfe, 2001, p. 807)

From browsing social media to watching videos, chatting with friends and calling-up apps for services and information on-line, studies suggest some humans invest about 8 hours a day in their devices—not including surfing-hours when unable to sleep. If you’ve come to depend-on and crave more immediacy, convenience and comfort, here’s a catch-22 that just might help you curb your enthusiasm.

A wearable device called Nettox—as per the term dettox, is being developed by an inventor at the U of Indonesia. When worn on the wrist, this product—containing a pulse oximeter sensor—measures the hemoglobin, oxygen levels and your heart rate (HRV). Why? Scientists have found that prolonged mobile phone usage has a specific lowering effect on the human system, so when HRV levels fall within a concerning range, Nettox emits a sound reminding the wearer to stop using their phone.

……and if you catch yourself thinking you should be drinking more water? Then you may be interested in what today’s tech-world has on the market. Simply log-in your water intake on an Apple Watch app called ‘WaterMinder’—a product designed to help create new and healthy habits that might just motivate you to stay hydrated.
A host of other companies are in on this information explosion as well—like Bell for example—exploring how to offer you a better ride by creating road-condition-monitoring technology on your smart-phone. This app will measure speed, location, vibration and weather—so you don’t have to. And how about ‘Livestock Labs’ currently manufacturing a fit-bit for cows. This device monitors body temperature and heart rate to detect early signs of disease. It’s hoped this product will soon be available to diagnose human health concerns.

Tamara Banbury, a PhD candidate studying voluntary cyborgs(users of experimental technology to augment and enhance life) thinks “life will become even more exciting when we stop creating applications for mobile phones and start creating apps for our bodies. All it will take is to implant a couple of microchips somewhere in your body and important information and knowledge originating from the senses will be unlocked.”

I’m not all this tech savvy, however a curious part in me is often impressed with what my brother and sister humans are accomplishing with an amazing variety of new devices at their beck and call. I also admit to having a significant amount of distress around how the new techno-tools seem to be taking over people’s lives and stealing what little free attention many have left. Sure, advancement in technology and social media makes carrying-on business, studies, travel, shopping and communication easier than ever before—but at what cost?

It’s becoming more challenging to watch our world undergo significant changes brought on by the AI revolution. 2019 studies show a 410% percent spike in chronic mental health issues, depression, burnout and anxiety compared to 2018. With less stigmatization around seeking health resources via AI, many take
action to improve their lives for the better—but what about the shocking number of millennials, Gen Z and others who’ve quit their jobs for mental health reasons, same story as above…..

In their first East-West Dialogue: *The Philosophy of Fearism* co-authored by R. Michael Fisher and Desh Subba—stress and mental health conditioning is linked with their specialties—Fearology and Feariatry—another trend running parallel to the AI generation of analysis and solutions. Fisher suggests:

[W]e can no longer afford to fear what we don’t know about what fear actually is, nor how harmful it is to our health and well-being. Fear is like racism, sexism and classism—a disease caused by trauma and unhealed painful memories…..and continues ‘some say my critical fear analysis is too dark, negative, even somewhat nihilistic and pessimistic. It depends on what they mean and what reference they judge my work compared to others they find more optimistic. I won’t go into that debate here except to say that I’m a critical thinker. I am not looking to make people feel happy and hopeful as a primary goal. [p. 111]

‘No worries’ Dr. Fisher….I mean just how happy and hopeful can a human be, when every system in their body is saturated in unhealed painful memories—and their symptoms garner more attention than the root causes?

*I think we must concern ourselves with how acts of self-reflection, self-care and self-regulation are faring amidst the tonnes of technodistraction humans face each moment of their day.*
Enter Ken Wilber—an American teacher-writer known for his work in transpersonal psychology and integral philosophy. In his four quadrant model of human development, he suggests humans thrive when we merge the inner with the outer aspects of our lives. Sorry to say, I’ve met few who’ve actually pondered what this might mean for their life, have entertained a proposal of this sort—or given sufficient thought to embarking on such an adventure. In fact, had my employment with a large corporation not been terminated in the late 80’s, I may not have either!

A major tipping-point in my individuation(healing-learning-changing-growing) process was discovering I’d been gifted with a community of ‘inner residents’ (psychic parts/identities, thoughts, feelings and behaviours). Some were fearful of engagement while others simply disappeared now and then. Even though the lights were on, many of my ‘inner rezzies’ were not home!

No doubt you’ve heard the term FOMO—fear of missing out. It was in a conscious community building process at the In Search of Fearlessness’ collective in Calgary where I was introduced to Scott Peck’s work— *A Different Drum: Community Making and Peace* (1987). Here, some of my more curious inner rezzies began showing-up—seemingly ready to explore the eclectic menu of ‘fear vaccines’ being offered. Together we invested many delightful and painstaking hours—individually and collectively—sharing stories of how we’d been hurt and survived. From this place of vulnerability, I was able to get to know and create a more respectful, trusting and fearless ‘inner community’ of relationships and ended up manifesting a healthy, more meaningful outer one as well.

In fact it didn’t take long for a second FOMO—fear of moving on—to catch my attention when I became more aware of the shit-
load of baggage I’d yet to unpack from earlier excursions in my life. And so it was that my interest in social media was eclipsed by what I consider a healthier compulsion— to explore my own ‘devices’.

Cue: ‘ A Better Mood’. While writing this piece, I came across this ad in People magazine: “Check-in with how you’re feeling with short, mindful activities and tune into to your emotions. Download, stop, breath and think— for free”. Wait…..what—you can download this kind of thing from the Apple App store or get it on Google Play? You mean I just blew 40+ years devoting significant time and energy learning to navigate life with what I consider the most exquisite of GPS’s—the one behind my eyes?

Thankfully, there seems to be a growing interest in developing what may be considered “soft skills.” These include various kinds of communication, empathy, mindfulness, creativity, collaboration and leadership. Many workplace experts predict these abilities will assist employees to differentiate themselves from their peers and provide a ‘leg-up’ for those applying for work.

No matter where we find ourselves—health-conscious blue or white collar, scholar, practitioner, educator, politician, therapist or artist—its highly desirable we ask if every experience in life needs to be captured, publicly displayed and documented on social media —or used in algorithms to manipulate our attention, then stored as meta-data for who knows who in the future?

The next time you notice yourself putting-off self-care or neglecting to fulfill tasks and goals you’ve set for yourself in lieu of cyber-loafing, give this little personal, research project a shot............
Close your eyes. Withdraw inwardly to yourself. Slip-on your natural ‘seatbelt’........your breath. Notice coolness at your nostrils as you inhale and the warmth of your breath on exhalation. Hang-in here for a bit, sensing where and how each breath meets the next similar to the railcars of a train rumbling along, one connected to another.

Seize this moment for a felt-sense of your body temperature. You may be heating-up and/or sweating…… or feel the need to shiver, shake or tremble. Might there be a yawn or 2 ready to roll-out? Continue to check-in with yourself here. A part of you might even be thinking this is nuts—or at least amusing—and with that notice a chuckle or two yearning to bubble-up and out…… even a whimper or boohoo may show-up as a variety of accumulations find their way through the system.

Fear missing out or moving forward? Don’t take my word for it. Just continue attending to your ‘inner rezzies’ as they come calling. With these simple acts of refreshment, you’ll eventually contradict any compulsion to count-on a device for inner awareness and head to the tap/water cooler on your own!

Initially it may seem near-impossible to live w/o AI equipment. As with anything, baby-steps in new directions can be catalysts to discovering inner information and resources you never knew you had. Relying on your inner ‘data’ and natural ability to be in-sync with it— is your birth-right........I mean who’d you rather trust—a giant tech company who’s created a facial recognition system for your phone that can’t tell the difference between a live human and a photograph--or the evidence of your senses? May the Force be with you.
BIO
Madelainne K. Joss is a yogi, bodymind therapist and petcare provider living in Calgary, AB  madelainnekjoss.wordpress.com
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From Fear to Action Research, to Enhanced Activism Using R. Michael Fisher's "Fearlessness" Research

Christine Legree
(Canada)

This secrecy affects my honesty in communicating with myself and others.

An exploration of fear and fearlessness is a new adventure for me in my retirement. Throughout some events in my life, I've felt fear. Fear feels like paralysis due to a perceived threat or negative consequences from actions. It often stops me from taking action.

Telling myself I've lost interest in an issue is a lie because had there been no fear, then I would have taken an action that would have moved my life in a different path. Fear also affects my transparency to myself and others. Telling myself and others, the lie that I've lost interest is also participating in the phenomenon of secrecy. This secrecy affects my honesty in communicating with myself and others.

It was when reading R. Michael Fisher's book, Fearless Engagement of Four Arrows: The True Story of an Indigenous-Based Social Transformer (2018), that I realized fear is a most important phenomenon affecting a person's life. I took a challenge offered in the "Study Questions and Practice" section of the book on page, 117, #3. I asked several people "(a) How do you define fear?" Answers were as follows: "Being afraid of repercussions, of certain actions, statements and discussions"; "Fear is something you are afraid to face"; "Fear is a lack of self-confidence. Fear is a lack of faith that God is working with you"; "Getting stuck. Ignoring or avoiding the truth and not wanting to change"; "Fear is a feeling of being threatened by possible negative consequences if an action is taken or even if there is an upcoming conversation, or an answer given to a question. Fear can also be present during discussions if one's ideas are very different from those listening to these views."

Upon reflection and in agreement with Dr. Fisher, fear is an emotion most of us know very little about. Perhaps, we know more about driving a car than a phenomenon deeply entrenched within us -- Fear. It is an intimate, powerful part of the self.
In the past, using intuition along with rational thought guided my actions. This strategy worked for many years especially after learning about intuition and completing my Master of Education thesis on the subject. It was after I retired and pursued environmentally-based interests as an advocate/activist that I felt my intuition alone was inadequate.

I live in the Lake Simcoe Watershed area, Ontario. For years, environmentalists in this area have worked very hard to speak up in favor of keeping our lake in good quality condition and our natural forests intact. For years also, there have been stresses on the lake; waste from farming, from urban centers, and from phosphorous pollution. Forests, including wetlands and fields have been threatened with over development consisting of buildings and infrastructure which I call "cement centers." Environmental advocates have been successful on occasion. We recently won a legal victory in favor of saving a significant portion of the North Gwillimbury Forest from development. Over ninety percent of this forest will remain intact.

I continue to volunteer with them but there is something else I'd like to learn.

I am not against development. I wish developers and those using Nature's gifts or resources would listen more and follow the advice of those supporting our natural heritage. To achieve this, it would be helpful to have environmental groups and residents involved in the planning process, within the planning department of municipalities. Also, municipal planning departments could hire recent graduates with experience and degrees/diplomas in sustainable urban planning, who also have degrees/diplomas in environmental protection or conservation. In my municipality, there are hopeful signs recently established which I will explain later in this article.

It is crucial to emphasize that the advocacy and activism of environmental groups here already have been recognized by our municipal decision-makers. They are having a positive effect on local decisions. Probably the media and public attention to climate change is having an impact on the attitudes of our municipal officials.

As a volunteer, I've learned a great deal helping environmentalists, who have environmental degrees and years of conservation experience. I continue to volunteer with them but there is something else I'd like to learn. I would like to be able to motivate others to join us. This is a challenge as I don't have the skills to attract more conservation advocates. There is also the fear that I won't be able to motivate others despite my efforts. Other fears are that an action I take or something I say may jeopardize the successful work others with more experience have accomplished.

As someone who highly prizes personal intuition to guide one's life, I was stopped by these fears. Months ago, I sought guidance from my intuition to lead me towards the best way to learn how to conquer these fears. My questions for intuitive guidance was, "How can I learn to conquer my fear of recruiting environmental advocates to protect the Lake
Simcoe Watershed areas in ways that honor the hardworking environmentalists already here?"

*It is the fear that initiates the process and progresses towards fearlessness.*


Despite the success of intuition, which led me to Michael Fisher's work, fear continued to stop me. It showed me the dark shadow surrounding a monolith of formidable skyscrapers, i.e. the destruction of our beautiful natural heritage, replaced by big, polluted cement centers along with a toxic lake. According to Fisher's work, fear, courage and fearlessness are related because it is the fear that initiates the process and progresses towards fearlessness. A comparison between intuition and the Fear/Fearlessness partnership shows that fear will overcome intuition for a while. The person experiencing fear can no longer proceed using his or her traditional intuitive guidance system. In my case, the issue was fear of failure in not attracting more people to join environmental advocacy and regret, resulting from making statements or taking actions that contradict the work of very experienced and highly educated environmentalists in my area.

According to Mona Lisa Schulz, M.D., PhD and psychiatrists who wrote the book *Awakening Intuition: Using Your Mind-Body Network for Insight and Healing* (1998), physiologically, intuition facing fear will react this way:

> [A]nxiety, panic, and horror are shades of fear. Throughout our lives and at various stages, depending on what is happening with us, we all feel these emotions. Emotions, and the memories that embody them, speak to us as elements of the intuition network, intuitive guidance signals that tell us whether we're heading in the right direction or the wrong direction for our happiness and health....When an emotion feels good, we know we're on the right course. Feelings like joy and love are your internal cheering sections. They tell you you're succeeding at something, you're on the happy track, and you should keep going the way you're going....Emotions that feel bad are telling us we're off course. The same is true for fear, which is a strong intuitive guiding signal telling you you're in a new and potentially treacherous situation, to watch yourself, be careful. (Schulz, pp.219-20).

What about a situation when fear is present but the individual still has an urge to proceed with the motivation to pursue an interest or cause?
People who are not aware of how intuition works will miss the answer...

In the book, *Practical intuition: How to Harness the Power of Your Instinct and Make it work for You*, author Laura Day states, "intuition must be "set in motion" by a question. The question focuses your intuition and tells you what you need to notice in the world around you" (Day, 1996, p. 87). In the mind of the person, she explains, intuitive information is "delivered in a melange of symbol, sound, and feeling that then has to be interpreted and integrated by the rational conscious mind" (p. 118). In my experiences, using Day's research, it is important that after the question is asked, the observer needs:

...to notice that answers can come in pieces over time. The answers can come in the form of images of people, things, animals, places, insights in the form of short sentences, dreams, colors, shapes, feelings and symbols that occur in the mind and relate back to the question posed. (Legree, 2009, pp. 3-4).

Other ways of experiencing intuition related to a question are by "receiving things, information, and by closely observing the context or events happening around the observer" (Legree, p.4). Furthermore,

The person asking the question does not know how the answer will be given, but if the person is aware of how intuition works, this person will see that an answer to a question has been given. People who are not aware of how intuition works will miss the answer because they don't know they are being given an answer. (Legree, 2009, p.4)

Intuition has stopped me due to fear. There did not seem to be another path for me to follow. This time, however, instead of disengaging from the situation that brought the fear, I chose to seek answers about fear and courage. That’s where I particularly found Fisher's book relevant.

In *Fearless Engagement of Four Arrows*, Fisher invites us to learn how to deal with fear by applying the teachings of Indigenous-based social transformer and education and leadership professor Four Arrows (aka Dr. Don Trent Jacobs). Four Arrows is also a life-time environmental activist. While he was kayaking in treacherous waters in remote Mexico decades ago, Four Arrows narrowly escaped death and in the process had a near-death experience. He studied this experience under mentoring of 104 yr-old Indigenous shaman-leader Augustin Ramos.

Four Arrows, very athletic, who served as a fire-fighter and U.S. Marine was accustomed to taking risks, even dangerous athletic risks. But his near-death experience gave him new transformative insights about fear, courage and fearlessness, knowledge he could share with others. After the near-death experience, Four Arrows in a trance state saw the acronym CAT-FAWN. The dream-vision showed a large feline (puma) and a fawn (deer). What captured his curiosity even more strongly was that in his waking life, he had seen that particular feline and that fawn days before.
CAT-FAWN became the acronym for this unique method of teaching others how to deal with fear, overcome it, and move, more or less, into a state of fearlessness. For those who wish to be able to deal effectively with fear, this was a watershed event of deep understanding, because for many of us, especially in the modern W. world, we know little about fear and therefore ways to overcome it.

Meditation is a powerful guide in using intuition.

In his research, Four Arrows explains, the benefits of CAT-FAWN and trance-based learning (TBL). "Fear and courage concepts are essential to understand as they drive learning and development in a "good way" or "bad way" (quoted in Fisher, 2018, p.2). The "bad way" for me would have been to succumb to fear and abandon my wish to overcome it. The "good way," the path I chose, is to learn about fear, courage and fearlessness.

In CAT-FAWN, CAT refers to "Concentration Activated Transformation-- meaning there is an altered state of consciousness (and/or TBL potential) emerging, often caused by Fear (including alertness and/or shock). However, there are many other forms of concentration practices such as intense arts, sports, exercising, yoga, ritual and meditation that can bring this state-change of consciousness, focus and alertness." (Fisher, p.6). Four Arrows further adds, "In CAT, our senses and creative imagination (e.g., right-brain hemisphere) are activated" (quoted in Fisher, p.6).

For me, it was meditation on a statement in another part of Fisher's book in which Augustin Ramos advises Four Arrows, "Tell them to concentrate quietly in a place where the energy is not sick. Then they will be awed at how they are related to all that they see and feel." (quoted in Fisher, p. 140).

For me, meditation is a powerful guide in using intuition. Part of my practices then involved entering this quiet place and time. I felt a trust that I will be able to overcome my fear and capture the spirit of adventure. I felt confident that I could proceed with my wishes. As Four Arrows further explains, I could see/imagine myself in "fearless pursuit" in regard to describing the magical and successful synchronicities and happenings" (quoted in Fisher, p. 90). Synchronicities and happenings are hallmarks of the intuition network. In reflecting back on my question, I realized I was being given the answer. I had the tools within CAT-FAWN. I needed to understand how to use this tool. There were more synchronicities and happenings that would soon occur.

It is very helpful to read Fisher's book in its entirety but one can see the outline of CAT-FAWN in the Appendix (p.299). In the CAT-FAWN partnership, the FAWN, F means Fear, A means Authority, W means Word, N means Nature. Using CAT-FAWN, in a good way, means Fear activates the attention and motivation to learn. Authority is designated by the observer, and in my case it is CAT-FAWN induced intuition and synchronicities that are meaningful to me. I am the authority over myself. I may reflect on other authorities in my life and how they either helped or disabled me. The Words used in past or in the present are the teaching tools I choose to use. They Worlds have power, so use them
wisely. Nature - I am taking these actions in support of Nature and those who support Nature. Using FAWN, the observer proceeds to initiate thoughts that follow the virtues of reason, mindfulness, patience, courageousness, truth and love. Notice the emphasis on education and learning. The actions are based on courage, self-realization and freedom to pursue a new path or adventure. When used in a bad way, CAT-FAWN, like unconscious hypnosis leads to the opposite of the virtues and negative actions—ultimately, fear-based reality. In this way, the observer pursues fear, not even aware they’ve activated a very pessimistic transformation. They succumb to irrationality, mindlessness, cowardice, self-estrangement, which leads to hate, deceit, injustice and oppression engendered by their fears (Fisher, p. 299).

As I was reading Fisher’s book, two significant and related synchronicities occurred. One was an email I received from an on-line magazine called "Kindling I Good News for Humankind". This magazine reports good news globally about ways in which people are taking action to improve social justice and helping our natural environment through compassionate works and ideas. Since recently, the North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance won a legal issue, this was great news. I asked the editor of Kindling magazine if he would consider printing this good news. After email discussions, I sent him a link to this report which was printed in a local newspaper called Georgina Post. I was elated when I read our good news about the North Gwillimbury Forest in the Kindling on-line magazine.

On another occasion, I received an email from an organization called the Pachamama Alliance. This is an alliance of Indigenous leaders and their supporters who offer information about forests in South America. They also offer free on-line courses on ways in which to become agents of change for Indigenous people and forests. The wonderful teachings about the Indigenous worldview, invite us to imagine a world abundant in beautiful, natural landscapes, clean water, happy humans and wildlife. I joined this group and I’m taking their courses. This alliance offers ways to connect with others around the world for discussions on the course materials, and ideas for taking actions in support of Indigenous people, forests in South America, and in our own areas. This has become a way for me to learn how to attract others to join in conservation efforts in my area. Among the lessons, there are teachings about the Indigenous worldview through videos and transcripts by Indigenous leader from Peru named Arkan Lushwala. Some of his presentations can be viewed on Youtube by using his name. Arkan Lushwala offers us the wisdom of Indigenous teachings - a worldview intimately connected with Pachamama, or Earth Mother. He has books available as well.

The adventure in fearlessness has started in a basic manner for me. Since I have the book by Michael Fisher I can refer to it perpetually when needed. In my local area, I've participated in meditation sessions with a meditation coach. Since completing these sessions most days, my meditation practices are strong, but some days they are weak. The lack of motivation is expressed in not being able to complete a meditation, in having too many scattered thoughts and a lack of self-confidence. At times, recalling news about a dire situation in the world will cause a feeling of hopelessness and I'm overwhelmed. On good days, I'm successful in following my process to achieve self-confidence, focus and optimism. The routine is to find a quiet place in my home. Once the spring/ summer
weather here, I will go outside. For now, in my home, I sit or lie quietly and imagine myself in a peaceful, beautiful natural area.

I’m walking over a hill. On the other side is a pond surrounded by lovely trees, wildflowers, and reeds in the pond. I notice the sky is blue with some clouds, and it is warm.

My meditative imagination spontaneously turns into transformation.

I change into a leaf, feather, or retain my present form. I feel the breeze on the pond and the waters rippling into waves. There are raindrops on me. Then I sink into the water and notice fish near me. I gently sink deeper into the pond and notice the water and view above me of that same area through the water. I notice the stillness, darkness and the absence of fish I saw moments before when I was at a higher level in the pond. Finally, I sink to the bottom of the pond. It’s dark, still and peaceful. Here there are no intruding thoughts about the day’s tasks any more. In this condition, other images emerge that are not related to my daily life. Sometimes I see the beautiful, mysterious head of a very large black feline, a panther and I focus on those awesome eyes. Other times, there are images of other nature based images. When this meditation is successful, I reach a feeling, attitude or even an awareness that is focused, self-confident and optimistic! My emotions are stable. While in the pond with these positive emotions, an image presents itself as a bird flying to gain altitude. At a specific altitude, this bird glides easily, freely in a wide circular fashion, riding the wind.

This is a signal to me that I’ve reached the desired "space" in my meditation. At some point I open my eyes and enjoy this confident, energized feeling. I’m able to pursue at least one environmentally related goal for this day. This meditation is personal. Others likely will have a different experience that works for them. For me, when all the images and events culminate in a feeling of self-confidence, stable emotions and joy, I know I’ve reached a condition in which I can focus well on an environmentally related task. Both, the meditation sessions and the courses within the Pachamama Alliance are helpful.

An important part of my advocacy includes being involved in Survival International, an organization devoted to helping Indigenous peoples worldwide to stop the mining, logging, and palm oil companies from theft and destruction of Indigenous lands. The Indigenous families are often abused, subject to terrible violence, the burning of their villages and other atrocities. The movie by Leonardo Dicaprio called "Before the Flood" is about palm-oil and Indigenous people, natural forests and the suffering of animals as well. My goal is to raise awareness and next month I am giving a presentation about palm-oil, the dire effects on Indigenous people living in those areas along with the suffering of animals and destruction of natural spaces there. Survival International provides videos of Indigenous people telling their stories and a translation into English. Products on the market containing palm-oil have an alternative with no palm-oil. This will be part of my presentation.
Locally, we've had very positive developments from our municipal government. Our mayor and a senior planner have invited local groups and residents to participate in the present and future planning of our environment during this period of anticipated population growth in our area. There are processes in place to invite groups and residents to participate in planning meetings. I've been invited by our mayor to participate in this process and local environmental groups have asked me to attract people to attend these meetings.

At the outset of this article, I described my fears and my desires to motivate others to join local environmental groups with outreach efforts to participate in keeping our natural heritage spaces intact and the lake in good quality condition. The efforts to overcome my fears through using the therapy work and the research of Michael Fisher are succeeding. My knowledge of intuition has been enhanced through the fear/fearlessness partnership and CAT-FAWN. I invite the reader to take this adventure from fear to courage to fearlessness. For me this exciting adventure continues.
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A Rejoinder to R. Michael Fisher’s Critique:
“The Love & Fear Problem: A Response to Michael Bassey Eneyo”

Michael B. Eneyo
(Nigeria)

Abstract
In recent times the concept “fear” has received much academic attention from a group of researchers known as Fearism (Subba) and Fearlessness Movement (Fisher). The main purpose of this new area of research is to know insightfully the role of fear and its relationship with all living beings. This article comes as a response to an invitation from R. Michael Fisher to me, to give clarifications to some of my claims in my two books; Philosophy of Fear and Philosophy of Unity, in which I advanced my theory on fear and love among others. In these books, I maintain the opinion that, though fear and love are primary motivational concepts, love is the grand motivational word and phenomenon. Clearly, the force of love is greater than the force of fear in any decision making venture. I stated in those books that Fisher and Subba hold a somewhat contrary opinion. They argue that fear is greater. Fisher had written an article (published in 2019 International Journal of Fear Studies, 1(2)) in reaction to my view and then asked for my response. The response herein is intended to give us all an opportunity to clear the misconceptions and lacuna characterizing our ways of presenting our views and the concepts we use. It will also help us to understand each other’s views on love and fear more clearly and to expand our studies of fear and the new constructs introduced by different fear scholars and how they are used in different contexts.

****
NOTE: I look forward to reading more reactions from Fisher and any other person that might be interested in this open-ended dialogue. When Fisher first wrote this critique in mid-2019, he too invited several colleagues in the fearism field to respond but no one did with any substantive remarks. Both of us are still inviting for more dialogue from those who are interested.

****

Introduction: Power of Love vs. Fear

This article is necessitated by R. Michael Fisher’s (2019) call for my response to some of the contents in his IJFS’s article entitled: “THE LOVE & FEAR PROBLEM: A RESPONSE TO MICHAEL BASSEY ENEYO.” In the article, Fisher, founder of the Fearlessness Movement, who is also a member of the Fearism Movement founded by Desh Subba (Nepalese author), had critically engaged some of my positions on the issues of Love and Fear.
Much as the philosophical schools of Fearism and Fearlessness—hereafter combined “the school”—are in a relatively early-formation theoretically and re: methodological structuring. The school has received some intellectual boosts from some notable fearists/fearologists across the globe. To date there are no systematic critiques offered by those inside or outside the school, though that will be welcomed. Being an emerging school of thought, there are some ideological and term applications that conflict amongst some members. Albeit, this does not contradict the general presumption and belief among members that, fear is fundamental to all beings.

This article is part of the efforts to make the contemporary researchers in this new area, and those that will come later, to look at the concept of fear through a unique macro-fearist lens, or at least to have the understanding of how different scholars perceive fear in-operation. The members of the school have carried out many researches on the concept fear, and how it could be well understood in the contemporary world as one of the primary motivational concepts. It is believed that, if fear is well understood, it can be used effectively as a tool for human liberation from one’s tensions and fears; therefore, assisting one to grow in fearlessness and/or become fear positive. Such an enlightenment process can help human beings in realising their authentic self, thus enabling them to overcome most of the ambivalences and struggles of their existence.

Notable founding members of the school are Fisher and Subba; others include: Osinakachi Kalu (Africa), Maria Kumar (India), Rana Kafle (India) and Michael Eneyo (Africa). Fisher and Subba have been initiating thought figures of this new area of studies, founding various organizations; that is why observations from any of them are taken seriously by me. In this article, I intend to analytically discuss the concept “love”, which to me, is where Fisher seems not to fully grasp how I idealize it in my works, and most importantly, to respond to the call by him to defend my stance for attributing the statement “fear is greater than love” to him in my book Philosophy of Fear.

In Fisher’s critique he has questioned my source for the above claim, as he denied ownership of the claim. In Philosophy of Fear, I wrote: “the book elevates love to the position of an ultimate motivator of all actions of fearful/fearless decisions. This in a way contradicts the Subbaian and Fisherian notions of love. For them, it is fear that is the greatest motivator within the framework of fearism” (Eneyo, 2019b, p.xxxiv). The above assertion is predicated on Fisher’s epistemic evolutionally declaration in their book: Philosophy of Fearism: A East West Dialogue. Fisher in this book has made a categorical remark: “I could make a strong case, evolutionally and developmentally that fear is stronger than love—yes, fear conquers love. I know that goes against a lot of philosophies, religions or spiritualities that say and/or believe as faith, more or less, that love will conquer fear” (Fisher & Subba, 2016, pp. xxxvi).

It is on the strength of this declaration of Fisher by allocating much power to fear over love that I was bold to make the assertion against the duo in my book. Now, a position I am out to defend. This discourse for now is still open, since it is possible that Fisher will still react to some of my clarifications. I think the ideas that will generate from this dialogue and the ones that shall come later from us and others that will take part in this intellectual exercise, will greatly contribute to deepening our knowledge of the workings of love and fear in the world.
The Heavy Load in Fisher’s Abstract

In as much as I know that Fisher is a respected seasoned scholar and a researcher, who has spent three decades researching on the notions of fear, fearlessness and love, though with more interest on fear, I know how valuable his critical call is to the field of fearism. With his years of experience, and judging from his educational pedigree, I will not hesitate to recognize, appreciate and take seriously any of his opinions on intellectual discourses especially in the areas of fear and love, the degree of the factuality or fallibility of his claims notwithstanding. This does not in any way suggest that all of such opinions or views would be epistemologically justified or logically validated. However, I will be humble enough to admit and accept to denounce any of my early opinion(s) on the issue at stake, if they are found to be misleading.

I would like to start my response to Fisher’s call by critically, analytically and logically taking a look at Fisher’s Abstract and concomitantly pointing out what I think are the weaknesses embedded in his claims. In the abstract, he says: “Fisher makes the case that Eneyo has not fully owned his own disciplinarity as a philosopher of fear, and his own Christianity privileging of a faith in love,…”. This statement is bias or ‘fear-based’ (using Fisher’s terminology). The sharp shift from my theory on love and fear to my religion has already shown that Fisher may likely be interpreting my works based on how he perceives Christianity or his knowledge of Christians’ doctrine on love. Such a distractive move is not really on what I have written on love. This is the first challenge of Fisher.

His overall claim here is ambiguous to me. What does he mean: “...Eneyo has not fully owned his own disciplinarity”? What does it entail to own one’s disciplinarity, which seems to be lacking specificity re: my actual theorization on the notion of love? Linking such to my religious background to me is not scholarly. I think Fisher ought to have explained further the above assertion, since the real essence of this discourse is to expand our knowledge of fear and its management. The poser: Is Fisher saying that because of my Christian background I cannot understand fear from his own perspective, or is he assuming there’s only one approach to knowing reality? If religion can influence one to reason in a given way, non-religion or a secular humanistic attitude can do likewise. Or, is Fisher saying that since he and Subba are not committed to religious beliefs as this suggests, that those who are, will not be able to understand fear from their own perspectives or even to understand it insightfully as a new body of knowledge? Or, can this be further interpreted to mean that belonging to a sort of religious group necessarily hinders one’s understanding in his field of expertise?

Lastly, is Fisher saying that fearism or fearology is a non-religious intellectual movement? If any of the above should be the case, judging from Fisher’s reference to my religious background which ought to have nothing to do with my fear-love studies. I think Fisher is also aware that he belongs to a non-religious group, which also has the potentials of influencing or distorting one’s understanding as well? This is a “Tu que que fallacy.” Accusing someone of the same thing the person is doing. I had expected my senior and respected scholar to substantiate his reason for making such assertion, but this is lacking in his article.
Probing my claims further, Fisher questioned why I should rely only on his writing to draw conclusion on his position on fear-love theorizing. Hear him (Fisher): “so far, he (Eneyo) relies on a distant abstract text reading only and this makes his analysis susceptible to several misinterpretations” (p. 80). My reason of relying on the testimony of Fisher’s writing is that, writing is an expression of self. It appears that Fisher has not adequately considered my careful research, while interrogating my view of his work. The point is, any published idea represents the writer’s thought, by extension, his belief. Also, Fisher’s writing on fear and love ought to adequately represent Fisher’s belief and position on the notion of love and fear. For Fisher to have demanded me to have had direct contact with him or know how he practically expresses love before writing about his work will mean that one needs to know or meet with all authors, exponents, theorists, etc. before one could write about them. I wonder why Fisher should expect me to engage him directly in person before I could understand his position on any knowledge claims he has put in print.

I know for sure that Fisher is aware that the present good students of Socrates, Aristotle, Kant, Hobbes, Rousseau, Hume, etc., didn’t see any of these persons, yet, are experts in their philosophies. I need not to travel to USA or Canada to interact with Fisher before I could know his philosophical positions or his fear doctrine. His writings ought to have spoken volumes of him, just as it implies that the good students of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Thales, etc. ought to have known these intellectual icons physically before they could write about them or know their philosophies or ideas. This seems to be absurd!

I need not to see how Fisher practises or applies his ideas and theories he presents in his writing before I could understand him. For Fisher to have said that I rely on “a distant abstract text reading only” (referring to my reading of his works) is worrysome. However, it is possible I misunderstood some of his theories as it is possible he does to my work too, but that doesn’t need our physical interaction to understand ourselves or our theories. His initiation of this dialogue is a good medium to understanding each other better.

**Fisher’s Sub-topic of: A Grand Problematique Re: Fear Over Love (?)**

The main reason of the call by Fisher for my response to his critique is contained in the statement I attribute to him in my book (*Philosophy of Fear*) of which I claimed him to have said: “fear is greater than love”; an assertion which Fisher cannot completely deny, but only in part. While I will not want to raise argument on that, I prefer making reference to his expressions in his dialogue with Subba in their book *Philosophy of Fearism: A East West Dialogue*, when he said: “I could make a strong case, evolutionally and developmentally that fear is stronger than love—yes, fear conquers love. I know that goes against a lot of philosophies, religions or spiritualities that say and/or believe as faith, more or less, that love will conquer fear” (Fisher & Subba, p. xxxvi). The above assertion, no doubt, can be interpreted in different ways without losing the central message intended. If fear conquers love, it means it is greater than love, and if fear is
stronger than love, according to Fisher, I don’t see anything wrong for one to use “greater” to pass the same message. I don’t think that such a categorical statement needs detailed explanation or further interpretations, which should have warranted the call for clarification from Fisher as suggested in his critique except for clarification of my applications. All the analyses and explanation of Fisher on love-fear relationships in his article point to the fact that fear is a grand motivational concept.

On p. 84 of his article, Fisher summarized my call for his explanation why he thinks love is not sufficient to solving the Fear Problem in what he called Eneyo’s challenge of the fearist: re: the analysis of the Fear Problem and Development of fear management/education as an intervention and solution to human misery into:

(a) Love as insufficient and,

(b) Downplaying love’s role in general human/moral development.

In an attempt to offer a scholarly response to the above, Fisher in page 85 of his critique made reference to one of his published works of over 25 years back when he said: “defining ‘fear’ is like trying to define ‘love,’ except the former is likely to be a thousand times more useful to human liberation.” This reference indeed validates once again my claim that Fisher sees fear as greater and it is more useful to human liberation than love within the framework of fearism. This is the position I differ from other fearists, like Fisher. I will make my reasons known as we proceed. Going further to prove his point, Fisher quarried my theory on negative and positive love, thus asked what proportion of negative and positive love would be at any point in time. He further asked how such proportion can be assessed and how such situation can be improved. These indeed are scholarly questions.

My response to the above is that the proportion of negative and positive love at any point in time depends on what takes greater influence on an individual, in particular, in a given situation. If one chooses robbing as a mean of becoming rich, then, the proportion of negative love for wealth would be greater than the love of not stealing to make a living. This is because the consequence of robbing (negative love) is more negative than that of not having wealth through illegal means (positive love).

The proportion of positive/negative love to be assessed depends on the individuals. The sense of right and wrong and the acceptance of right over the wrong is personal. This is not to say such assessment cannot be carried out on the group of persons or on the community of people. A charitable organization can be said to be an organization that is influenced by positive love, while a gang of armed robbers are those influenced by negative love.

To improve on positive love, we must ensure that we are guided by the moral codes or the ethics of the society. Better still, one need to follow the right way of doing things. But if we keep breaking the law, then, we are likely to increase the proportion of negative love; the love to break
the law. Thus, good ethical counselling, education and awareness can reduce negative love and increase positive love at the same
time.

Even though Fisher had had premonition of my response to this query, for saying that I will likely speak in line with Pfister’s and Kierkegaard’s critique that “things would improve when fear of punishment due to doctrinism/dogmatism in Christianity ends”. But I do not advocate for an end to fear; fear is part of us as well as ‘fear’. In a more categorical way, fear is activated by thought or consciousness, but ‘fear’ can be reduced through awareness. One can argue that the home of fear is the mind, not just human minds, but the minds of beings. Wherever the minds or its thoughts go, fear goes with them. It becomes more active by the consciousness of knowledge and ignorance. Fear in potency is fear that has not yet been activated by consciousness. Fear does not begin with consciousness as Subba opines. Every consciousness must necessarily be consciousness of something, in this case, the consciousness of fear. Therefore consciousness doesn’t create fear, but activates it.

But the point we should note about this position of fear is that, fear is sometimes not to be feared! For those who study deeply the notion of fear, will come to know that fear is not always fearful (in negative sense). Apart from its negative impacts on humans, it can be positive at times. Positive fear can give peace of mind, while negative fear is a threat to life, and this is the kind of fear we should fight to overcome, if possible; to eliminate. This is why I emphasize fear education awareness; whereby, negative fear can be overcome through fear education, while positive fear can enhance human good relations and development. When I say, “fear lives in the mind,” the point I’m making is that without a living mind, there wouldn’t be consciousness of fear. After being conscious of fear, it develops through thought, idea, action and then to consequence. You can read the process of fear in chapter 4 of my book, *Philosophy of Fear*. Thus, to end fear, is to end thinking or to eliminate the mind. My efforts in the fearism studies are to contribute ideas on measures to be used to overcome their negative aspect of fear through fear education and awareness; again, to guide one on how to use positive fear in actualizing human potentials. That is why I argue that it is not possible to put an end to fear, but we can subdue the negative and elevate the positive fear for the overall good of mankind.

In furtherance, Fisher in his Fear and Love discourses sees fear and love as contraries, while in another sense, complementary. He says: “For me, both Fear and Love “need” each other as part of the learning process... and thus I often refer to them in a dialectical relationship, although in certain ways, paradoxically, they are also “opposites”” (p. 86). The assertion that fear and love need each other is position to be reckon with, but to say that they are opposites contradicts my own notion of fear and love relationship. While I recognize them as motivational concepts, I do not share the idea that the two concepts are in anyway opposite. How can fear becomes opposite of love? I need to learn more from Fisher here.

Fisher also alleged that I, among others, do not know the distinction between his concept of ‘fear’ and fear. But I think Fisher is making a mistake by holding such opinion because I know clearly how he uses the two words in advancing his fear studies. Fear as it is used by Fisher is natural as we know it, thus one cannot eliminate it, while ‘fear’ is his technical usage to
differentiate the natural fear and the one caused by certain culture, belief, or attitude of human beings that promote fear. Fisher’s concept of ‘fear’ is what I called in my book accident of fear. Unlike fear, Fisher’s ‘fear’ can be eliminated or overcome through fear education or awareness. This is the idea I share. Even if I may not know all about is studies on fear and ‘fear’, at least I know the tenet or the axiom he uses in differentiating them.

Again, I have observed the problematic outcome of Fisher in making love an opposite of fear. Since love according to Fisher is opposite of fear, and that since Christians in a way have interpreted God to mean love, thus, God is love-based, and Satan is fear-based. Now Fisher is saying that since God is love according to Christians, then Satan must necessarily be fear. The question that Fisher must answer is, if such reductionistic conclusion is actually Christianity’s position or his’? Is it a Christian dogma that love is opposite of fear? I don’t think so. Hence, it is unfair for Fisher to impose his view on the generality of Christians. I want to reemphasize that love is not the opposite of fear, as such making God opposite of Satan is a bad philosophy. God does not have opposite, because such proposition and reductionism would mean that Satan is at the same horizon with God. Or that God and Satan have equal existential power. I don’t think Fisher’s claim of God as opposite of Satan is a Christian belief, dogma or doctrine.

Fisher again asked: “What justification is there for this superiority of love over Fear-and, more importantly, what does it leave behind in its exuberant leap and claim of truth-in terms of the nature and role and value of Fear”? What does such a Love-bias leave as left-over also for the value of a philosophy of fear(ism) or fearology? One could not, it seems, be a fearist and fully accept this ontological and theological devaluation of Fear…” (IJFS, Vol. 1, Issue 2).

When Fisher in the article, as observed previously. interrogated my concept of positive love and negative love, he questioned what proportion at any point in time is negative love to positive love, and how we can improve the situation(?) These questions may suggest that Fisher did not take time to read my work or, that he didn’t understand insightfully understand how I apply them. We need not to be religious to have the sense of right and wrong actions. Morality or ethics goes beyond religion. I also believe that the majority of people have the sense of right and wrong even though they are not religious. Such people know when something is said to be negative or positive. The love for money that leads to stealing cannot be called positive love. If one loves sex and then goes about sleeping with people’s wives, do we call such positive love? Or, would we say that the love for doing what is acceptable in the society as ethically right action is negative? These are elementary things that we all know. However, these questions and many other forms of critiques raised by Fisher, are meant to expand our knowledge of fear. Let me respond to some of these queries so as to explain why I maintain these positions as good paradigms of fear education.

My Response

First, I will start by giving a justification for the superiority of love over fear. Love is a grand motivational factor of all human actions. When a decision is to be made, there’s always tension between positive or negative fear—the right and wrong. During this enduring conflict, courage
which is a more close opposite of fear is needed in order to surmount the interest of one of these opposites (positive and negative fear). At the instance of the intervention of courage, we are no longer controlled by fear, but by love. How will this happen? Our love for one thing over another influences us into choosing from the two fearing alternatives. At this point also, we no longer operate in the realm of fear, but love. In a more logical and critical standpoint, no decision has ever been taken as a result of fear. Though fear may appear to have overshadowed our decisions, but this is not true in practical terms. When we’re gripped with fear and we want to decide on what to do, we will first of all consider the cash value of our intending actions. For example, the options of telling lies and be free from being jailed and saying the truth and go to jail. In such scenario, we’re no longer acting based on fear, but on what we value most (love). If one loves or values being a moral being, s/he will say the truth and go to jail, but if s/he values freedom over being a moral being, s/he will lie. It is with this sense of our ever commitment to the influence of love that I maintain the view that love is greater than fear.

Fisher also want to know the role and value of fear should the above position be maintained. I have to draw our attention to this undeniable fact about one of the roles of fear that fear brings us face to face with the reality of life; it presents us with the dilemma of decision making. Fear ushers us into the domain of love. It brings us closer to love; not as its opposite, but as a sub-motivational ingredient for decision making. Fear raises love consciousness and helps one to be critical about his/her action. While presenting us to the domain of love, courage must work with love to assist us choose from two fearing alternatives. One can argue here that fear introduces us to the reality of life. It can raise us and bring us down. It brings us to the domain of decision making, but the actual decision is always made by love. There is an overlap between love and fear, such that it becomes difficult to know when one stops and when another begins. This thin line between love and fear is not so clear for people to see.

The last part of Fisher’s query is what would such a love-based notion to fearism or its value in fear study be? I don’t think that the purpose of fearism is to promote fear. It is to create awareness on the need for fear education: that is, to know its meaning, effect and how best it can be managed for the overall good of human beings. It is to expose the benefits of fear in decision making and not to make fear unnecessarily superior to anything else. How will Fisher pay this much attention to the study of fear without the love to know? It is not the fear to know, but the love to know that is the driving force of all researches. It is with the above understanding that I found love as a grand motivational concept to be used in explaining how fear functions in every decision venture.

On the contrary, Fisher’s query seems to mean that as a fearist, we must work so as to elevate the role of fear over love in human experiences. But this in itself, is a fear-based submission. I think, as a researcher, we shouldn’t be interested on what our findings stand to promote, but on how true and useful are such findings to human beings.

In page 87 of his article, Fisher said that the division of love and fear into positive and negative is really of no value to fear studies. Hear him: Be it Love-positivists or Fear-positivists, I get critical. I don’t even think dividing Love or Fear into “positive” and “negative” is particularly useful or
transformative (i.e., it won’t solve the Fear problem).” Fisher has a lot of questions to answer here. First, is the word, Love a purely positive concept or can be negative as well? Is Fear always negative? Remember, Fisher had said that love and fear is both opposites and dialectical. Should this mean that Love is positive and Fear is negative? Is the love for stealing positive? And is the fear of God or constituted authority negative? If Fisher should insist that love is always good, and then he must tell us how good the love for stealing is. And if fear is always negative, Fisher must convince us that the fear of God or constituted authority is negative or bad.

The division of Love and Fear into positive and negative is to me, the foundation to fear study. As fearologists/fearists, we ought to educate people on the kind of things to be afraid of and the ones they should not. How would we succinctly talk about fear as a research worthy when we don’t look at it as positive or negative, good or bad, etc.? The beginning to the solution to the problem of fear is to look at the status of fear. This is contra Fisher’s view.

Fisher on Fear Conquers Love: An Equal Positionality: My view

My concern here is on what Fisher tagged, his “haunting question.” He asked: Why does a religion of love become religion of fear? (p. 86). Or, why does a choice to love yield and become a choice to fear” Or, why is a loving parent eventually a fearing parent? Or, why is your lover suddenly your enemy (a fearer)? Answer to any of the above questions is an answer to almost all of the questions (in a subtle manner). In my book of philosophy of fear, I recognized love and fear as the two motivational concepts that are capable of influencing humans’ actions. Every religion preaches love, just like humanists insist on love to all mankind. Philosophically speaking, love itself has the potential to promote fear. One of the reasons that the religion of love has now become the religion of fear is because most religions followers want to make heaven or be in paradise at all cost; they love what is told about heaven or paradise, so they want to go there. They want to live forever. People don’t really want to die, they want to live. Since it’s told that heaven or paradise is where people live forever, people want to go there. They will do anything that their leaders tell them can make them go there. They do that "in fear and trembling" and as such, they become children of fear. "Children of fear" in that, even when such demands are beyond their logic or reasoning, they don’t question for fear that they might loose heaven if they fail to do. This makes Christianity to become or look like a religion of fear outwardly, while inwardly it’s still religion of love—love of heaven. The seeming children of fear in the present world are not really controlled by fear, but by the love for the rewards of being obedient to God.

The Challenge(s) in Understanding Fisher: Recommendations

Fisher in his own words: “My work over 30 years on the topic of fear is vast, and typically I find most people take many years to sort it out carefully for understanding correctly, if they ever do.” This statement of Fisher may somewhat suggests that there’s difficulty in understanding Fisher’s writing style, of which he is aware. If that’s the case, then Fisher has the responsibility of elucidating his ideas for better understanding as this is what is expected of a seasoned educator and a researcher of his rank. I think having discovered this challenge, he should work hard to change his writing style for ease of understanding for his readers and students. I think this is the
right way to go rather than blaming those who interpret him, based on his way of presentation (p. 79). For Fisher’s insistence that I don’t know how he interprets love, and then fail to tell us how he interprets it, seems to me, unhealthy. I call on Fisher to educate us the more in this regard.

Again, Fisher’s constant reference to Christianity and his linking it to my writing is what I do not understand. Though a Christian, I haven’t in anyway addressed myself as a Christian philosopher. In my book (*Unity of Love*), I have critically discussed the Five Stages of Love in Hinduism but Fisher has not addressed me as a Hindu philosopher. This assumption clearly negates basic scholastic principles. Fisher instead of engaging me on the issues raised in my books alone, he rather expresses his experiences he had about Christianity and some of the followers of Christianity.

Besides, my approach to the study of love is not rooted in Christian doctrine of love. My research on love has revealed to me that love is both positive and negative, this clearly negates Christians’ notion of love; the latter, which is generally believed as something that is always good. For me, love is not always good; it can be bad as well. This is the point of my departure from Christians’ concept of love and that of Fisher.

Finally, I want to thank R. Michael Fisher for giving me the opportunity to explain some of the contents of my books on fear and love. I see this discourse as a healthy method to engage ourselves on some of our diverse positions and views in this new field of study. Fisher is a mentor, a teacher and educationist of high repute, and I am not ignorant of this. I look forward to reading more reactions from Fisher and any other person that might be interested in this open-ended dialogue.
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Fisher’s Response to Michael Eneyo’s Rejoinder

R. Michael Fisher
(Canada)

Finding base *common ground* in the midst of conflicts (of any kind), is a basic mature way to proceed. On that, I **totally support** the basic foundation of Eneyo’s work in regard to what he just published in his Rejoinder (above)—in his words:

> It is believed that, if fear is well understood, it can be used effectively as a tool for human liberation from one’s tensions and fears; therefore, assisting one to grow in *fearlessness* and/or become *fear positive*. Such an enlightenment process can help human beings in realising their authentic self, thus enabling them to overcome most of the ambivalences and struggles of their existence. (p. 47)

I agree with Eneyo, in his words: “...these questions and many other forms of critiques raised by Fisher, are meant to expand our knowledge of fear.” That is indeed my purpose overall. Fear Studies itself ought to be based on this. “Knowledge of fear” is my emphasis for Fear Studies and fear management/education in the 21st century, and I know that many people read that in my work but then go on to want to focus on behaviors like coping with fear(s), of which I am less focused on at this time of my career and work. The lack of concrete examples in my pedagogy and writing, of people handling fear, be it good fear or bad fear (as Eneyo and other use those terms), is because of my epistemological emphasis—that is, to “expand our knowledge of fear”—and not just by making quantitative gains in that area, but by qualitative paradigmatic changes, if not quantum leaps in new imaginaries that ‘see’ fear very differently than “fear is an emotion.” In this latest 2020 issue of *IJFS* I have pulled out in a few places, in between articles, with images or quotes, that *fear is an idea, fear is a metaphor, fear is a landscape-mindscape*—that is my invoking of us going beyond “fear” as commonly accepted and as I see is primarily used by Eneyo and most fearism writers—that is, “fear is an emotion.” Underneath this problematic is to distinguish when we are looking for a *definition* of fear in contrast to when we are looking for *meanings* of fear in our discourses. Few, make that distinction, unfortunately. I tend to focus on meanings, constructed and collectively imprisoned in monolithic culture, or religion, or science, and thus, just assumed they are the best because they are the ‘norm’ and assumed they are accurate. They are lacking, as I see it because of the narrow approaches, which are not holistic-integral. I won’t repeat my teaching on that. It’s a topic for another time and I encourage all to share more on this. Use various outlets, e.g., the Fearlessness Movement ning community etc.

I agree with Eneyo, in his words: “These questions may suggest that Fisher did not take time to read my work or, that he didn’t understand insightfully understand how I apply them.” Indeed, I
am in a really busy space and have not read Eneyo thoroughly. Although, he was a student in the Fearology Institute under my tutelage and I wrote a Foreword for his first book etc., I do have a good sense of how he thinks, interprets and writes. So, no doubt, he will be disappointed I have not given his work enough time. I may be mis-interpreting him on some things. His Rejoinder did clarify his view he is not utilizing Christian theology in his philosophy of fear and love (i.e., unity). Okay, I can take his word at his word. However, there is an intuition and there is a theoretical problem I have with that artificial rational distancing from his own cultural and religious background in his views on love and fear and thus, on fear management education. Any postmodern analysis, holistic and/or critical analysis of a sociopolitical and cultural kind would not let him off the hook with his distancing that his Christianity (or his gender, his Nigerian and African background, his age, etc.) is not informing his current philosophy. Anyways, that will be likely an ongoing area of disagreement we’ll have.

Again, I cannot take time on more nuance to respond in detail to his Rejoinder but I thank him for putting his views and questions, his concerns about my ability to teach the material well, and so on. Maybe, in the future more dialogues and/or disagreements will be published on various venues. I don’t have time to do this as priority right now.

**Brief Background Context: My Latest Response**

To quickly give some background context: When I first started reading Michael Eneyo’s work on a combination of philosophical propositions and critiques, first with *Philosophy of Fear* (2018), then with *Philosophy of Unity (aka Love)* (2019), I had no idea one day I would write a ridiculously passionate and ‘way too long’ critique of his philosophy and critiques (e.g., IJFS, 1(2))—which I focused on the theme of “Love and Fear Problem.” More so, I had no idea that after I wrote that piece an idea for a book would arise and I would on this very day be completely steeped in an intellectual biography of “Marianne Williamson.” Who she? Why is she relevant to my second article addressing Eneyo? Let me explain.

Oumano (1992), the first (and only) biographer of Marianne Williamson (MW), of which now MW, at age 67, is becoming world famous because of her leadership campaign run for Democratic party leader and potential President of the U.S. in 2020, wrote,

> At forty years old, Marianne Williamson is being touted as the high priestess of the New Age, the most visible spokesperson [teacher] of *A Course in Miracles*. A 1200-page, three volume self-study program in “spiritual psychotherapy” [to use MW’s words], the course teaches how to relinquish a thought system based on fear and separation and replace it with one grounded in unity and love. (p. 1)

You might quickly see why I would be deeply interested in MW and *A Course in Miracles* because of the dual-modal philosophical teaching about human therapy and healing, if not redemption: (a) *path of Fear* and, (b) *path of Love*. Therein, is the basic distinction, Love and Fear Problem, which respectively, occupies my work and Eneyo’s work. MW and *A Course in Miracles* (not written by MW) are both potent educational influences internationally and
especially in North America—both I had long ago dubbed as branches of the historical Fearlessness Movement. If you search the Fearlessness Movement ning, for example, you will find several posts I have put up there over the years. I was looking to find engagements with others, for example in the fearism movement, but no one took me up on such. Now, I have devoted the past several months to research and completing this new book on *The Marianne Williamson Presidential Phenomenon* [1]. Foundationally, this new book is all about the Love and Fear Problem, once again, occupying my attention as a philosopher, therapist and educator. Btw, it is occupying me so much, with a short-time line to be handed in to the publisher, that this response to Eneyo’s rejoinder is going to be cut very short and will not address adequately our current tensions and conflicts.

In a nutshell, my new book is about myself as a teacher of fear and fearlessness (minimally known) critically analyzing another teacher (great leader and celebrity) who teaches about fear and love. I am continually working as an intellectual biographer to be fair to MW, not let my own distresses get in the way of doing a respectable job of writing about her and her work. I am mostly writing about her work, but also her personality, her religious background, and all that she stands for are part of the fearanalysis. One cannot separate these things, not from a systems holistic-integral perspective, that is. So, to summarize her core teaching, relevant to the conflict I sometimes have with Eneyo and his work, is a simple as this (written by Oumano, 1992):

> In a time of widespread unemployment, poverty, escalating civil unrest, drug use, violent crime, and imminent ecological calamity, Williamson offers the only true miracle, *a shift in our perception* of ourselves, each other, and the world, *from fear to love.* (p. 8) [italics added for emphasis]

Indeed, that is the first symptomatic and axiomatic psychological thing to deal with philosophically and theologically: How to make a *shift* from fear-based existence to love-based existence. MW, Eneyo, myself (and others) are also very interested in this shift. Not merely as theory but as practice. Yet, Eneyo and I are philosopher-types and he even has a strong theological education background. Although MW and Eneyo have some distinctions in their work (e.g., MW uses “Love” as all positive; Eneyo has “positive love” and “negative love”), the critical issue I am raising in my book on MW is no different than the one I am raising with Eneyo in our tensions and conflicts—is the dual-modal *shift* conceptualized correctly in the first place? I tend to disagree with MW and Eneyo’s conceptualization—and, thus, *Fearlessness* becomes an alternative conceptualization that I have argued for 3 decades, more or less, is *better* as a way to bring about an effective and truly transformative learning, healing and ultimately *shift* developmentally and evolutionarily, “from fear to love.”

Clearly, it is not that I disagree with the end goal of MW or Eneyo but I disagree with the best means of achieving that end. That said, I am well aware of the provocative nature of my using terms like better and best. That is just language expressing my strongest passion and critical thought—but it by no means is a pre-given reality that my means offered (via Fearlessness path) is actually better or best. I am too much of a philosopher to be so arrogant. It will require
better arguments in the future (like the current one with Eneyo and myself) and further research—so that, ultimately, a community of thinkers will arrive at some consensus on some premises that are durable and tested for what is the best and better way(s) to go—re: the dual-modal shift many of us see as ethically an imperative corrective to the current directions contemporary society (the world) is heading.
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Abstract

Fear is a major emotion in diasporic society and its literary creations. This article explores how Bhutanese Nepali diasporic poetry exhibits fear of different types that the society of the creators is compelled to live with. The concept of fear in literature as discussed by Wayne A. Davis, Lisa Hinrichsen, Joyce Carol Oates, and Kate Schick has been used as the basic theoretical perspective for the analysis of selected poems. The Bhutanese Nepali poets who have been living in the diaspora and their poems published in English have been used as the primary source of this research work. Using the interpretive approach this study has found out that these poems were composed with the mentality of terror and so they exhibit different types of fears the society has been experiencing in last three decades, after their forceful expulsion from Bhutan to the present day life in the West. The study shows that those who are hopeful to be free from fear have more balanced view on life than those who worried about such a release. Their literary creations play a significant role in this connection.

Keywords: Fear, diasporic poetry, release, identity, existence.

Fear in the Diaspora

Fear is one of the primal human emotions. Scholars from the East such as Bharat Muni discussed it about two millennia ago. With the development of modern psychology and its theorization, there is ample discussion on its use and misuse in the West, too. Wayne A. Davis, a philosopher on fear, defines fear as the accumulation of “several different, though related, psychological states”; and he explains the idea:

The state of fear takes many forms differentiated in part by the propositional fear that produces the state. Thus fright results from the sudden fear that one is about to be injured or even killed. The subject typically has a disposition to flee, but occasionally
freezes. Terror involves the intense fear that one may be killed or seriously injured at any time, accompanied by a sense of helplessness. Dread is caused by a wider category of often long lasting fears, such as the fear that one will fail an exam. (287)

There are different conditions and types of fear. As I grew in Nepal and lived through the destructive decade-long civil war, I could, personally, experience what being fearful mean. At the same time, I studied diasporic Nepali life and its literature that showed me the fear of uncertainty in diasporic life. In the same process, I started my exploration into the connection between fear and diasporic poetry. The Bhutanese Nepali Diaspora is found to be one such a field where the connection among fear, diaspora and poetry could be explored since their life as refugees in Nepal and the diasporans in the West is the background for the experience and consequent literary creations. Different types of pains the Bhutanese Nepali diasporans have been undergoing and the use of the pain in their literary creations attracted me to study the use of fear in their poetry. Diaspora is mostly the space of uncertainty. And the uncertainty of any type is related to fear and anxiety.

**Connection between Fear and Literature**

Literature deals with human thoughts, existence, emotions and politics. One of the primal human emotions that are frequently used in creative works is fear. H.P. Lovecraft in "Supernatural Horror in Literature” argues: “The oldest and strongest emotion of mankind is fear, and the oldest and strongest kind of fear is fear of the unknown.” (qtd in Oates 176). Once fear is used in literature, it takes the form of aesthetic fear that is “not an authentic fear but an artful simulation of what is crude, inchoate, nerve-driven and ungovernable in life”. Its “evolutionary advantage must be the preparation for the authentic experience, unpredictable and always imminent” (Oates 176). Oates connects aesthetic fear with humanity: “The aesthetic of fear is the aesthetic of our common humanity” (185). This is the reason why the literary creation that uses fear appeals to wide audience.

Poetry uses fear; and gives it an aesthetic state. In the process of using it, “poetry itself approximates the creative play of the boy’s game, substituting word for thing, and overcoming absence by positing presence” (Hinrichsen 47). This way, poetry gives an outlet to pent-up
emotion of fear and helps the person or the community feel fresh: “If there is not a hole or a breach, libidinal energy (the "whatever") is dammed without the possibility of release, resulting in anxiety’s overflow” (51). Here is the connection between social role of poetry and fear.

Many programs that concern with the refugees and their trauma (heightened and engraved fear) use poetry and other forms of art to enable them to release the fear that constantly haunts them. One such program is the Harvard Program on Refugee Trauma that . . . uses the healing power of the arts to help refugees work through trauma. Richard Mollica, director of the programme, maintains that artistic beauty can help people come to terms with pain. . . . He argues that one aspect of the violence perpetrated against refugees has been the destruction of beauty and culture and that part of the process of recovery is reconnecting with that which was lost. (Schick 184)

Schick argues that “such writing exposes both the writer and reader to empathic unsettlement that encourages practical ethical response while remaining open to Utopian ideals and hope” (1851). This discussion shows that once put in poetry and other forms of art, fear works as the means of remedy of trauma of both the creator and the audience.

**Background of Creation: Atmosphere of Fear**

A literary creation with the use of fear also deals with a background that causes the fear. “A fearful subject must perceive some danger” (Davis 300). And the fear causes an anxiety in the experiencer. The background always has some type of loss and the people who suffer it “often search for meaning in the losses they suffer”; and so their literary creation is “an attempt to attenuate the pain and bring comfort” (Schick 1843). The Bhutanese Nepali diasporic poems reflect such a background. Poet Chakra Acharya’s poem entitled “Horror of Living” is one such example.

The poem starts with the imago-symbolic depiction of the atmosphere that is full of terror, uncertainty and destruction. The first line “A passel of greyhounds have concealed in the hovel of termites” shows how the people with destructive mentality (greyhounds) have taken shelter in the space of common people (hovel of termites) and have replaced them. As a result, the beautiful garden of common people has been destroyed: “Ah, the blossom of garden—
broken and wounded with appalling bites” (l. 2). This scene symbolizes the destruction of the beautiful life of the Bhutanese Nepali people with the bad intentions and consequent discriminative deeds of the rulers there. The first line is repeated as the third line to emphasize this theme of planned devastation of Nepali speaking community in Bhutan.

This atmosphere has created hopeless mentality and fear in the affected. Even the green meadow is perceived as the space of “heated wounds” where nothing meaningful is believed to be present (l. 4). It is the iron arrow that is seen to be present all around:

Pinching and piercing into the chest of Her like the ironed arrow—
Fettering, wincing and taking in the deer’s bow.
Where is the windup of arrow’s pain?
Where is the end of grenade’s lane?
Where is the extreme of wild dread and where is the bound of grotty drama? (ll. 5-9)

The result is the extreme pain and trouble in their life. They do not know when this sad fate may come to an end. The path they walk is like the grenade’s lane that does not have any final point: They simply have to bear all these harsh realities of the situation. This “grotty drama” that the rulers have created, they think, is not going to end. This creates uncertainty in the days ahead; and gives rise to both the fear and anxiety.

They want the end of this situation; but are not sure that it would take place:

Where is the end of havoc and where is the end of killings?
Where are the instruments of thought for humanity and heart of feelings?
Where does humanity outflow?
When lightness dark generosity dimly grows . . . ! (ll. 11-14)

They are not sure whether such a cruel act comes to an end or not; whether the Bhutanese rulers can think humanely and feel like human beings or not; and whether the world can deal with the Bhutanese Nepali diasporans with humanity in the true sense or not. These uncertainties and hopes attached with them are the causes of their fear and anxiety.
Rulers’ Role in Creating Fear

Bhutanese Nepali diasporans were compelled to leave their nation due to political reasons. The cultural difference of the Nepali speaking people from those of the Dзонkha speaking Bhutanese rulers was the major cause of their expulsion from Bhutan. The nation that is traditionally established for and believed as the provider of security has changed its face: “Traditional notions of security, which reify the state, have been challenged in recent years by the emergence of the (multifaceted) concept of human security, which places individual rights and development at the centre of security” (Schick 1838). Thus, when the Nepali speaking community began to grow conscious of the discriminations and was aware of their rights, this tragic fate of the community started. Poets such as Jiten Muskan, Devi Subedi, Prakash Dhamala and R. N. Pokharel have portrayed the picture of the atrocity that the Bhutanese rulers put upon the Nepali speaking community.

Jiten Muskan in his poem “Write My Histories with the Blood” digs out the history that the Bhutanese rulers created with the inhuman activities meted out to the Nepali speaking community. Even now they blame many Nepali speaking Bhutanese people living away from Bhutan as terrorists. The poem details out the situation:

You blame me as a terrorist
You name me as a terrorist
You have killed my ox
I was arrested
While I was tilling
the golden sand
You had gun in your hands
You forcefully evicted me
You have written only your histories
making my stories incorrect
-seized my properties
-raped my mum and sister
-snatched my citizenship (ll. 1-14)
Remembering the past with these realities, these diasporans fear the rulers and their own future. Muskan, in his next poem “Oh! Tiger King”, details out such a fear:

You may rap my smile
You may grab my breast
You may stab my chest
You may castrate my rhymes (ll. 1-5)

The past was a terrible time when the rulers romantically rapped their cries

jumping in different parts
delivering minds to minds
penetrating into the world of blind
whistling in the wind (ll. 17-20)

Similar pain that they had to bear in the past is portrayed in Devi Subedi’s poem “Agonies of Being Exiled”. The poem uses the historical incidents of the year when the poet was a four-year child. Back then, the government first seized his grand parents’ citizenship; and then it started to torture the parents. The reason was the Bhutanese government’s policy of “one country, one race” that treated the Nepali speaking community as an outsider one. This resulted into the atrocities such as “kidnapping, raping and killing many young ladies, / thrown in the river many saplings and babies / Our parents’ bank accounts were seized” and consequently made them “penniless and treated as wild beast” (ll. 11-14). Being unable to bear all these insults and tortures, they left their birth place; and they made a camp in Assam and northern India. Indian police did not let them stay there, too. So, they were loaded in trucks and were finally dropped at the border of Nepal. It was followed by series of troubles in the refugee camps in Nepal before many of them chose the third country resettlement. At present the memories of all these troubles work as the source of fear.

Prakash Dhamala’s poem “Standing on the No Man’s Land of Life” also recounts similar experiences and tries to establish that the Bhutanese rulers created fear in the Nepali speaking community. Ultimately, their dreams were disastrously shattered as they were “given a cold shoulder” that let their “passion of mankind [...] let down”; and as a consequent, the
individuals like he speaker were “executed for [their] voice of equality” and they were “banned from dreaming” (ll. 10-14). Despite all these difficulties and atrocities, they are still continuing their life.

R. N. Pokharel’s “I’m Still Alive . . .” also captures this theme. It depicts the scene of the time they left their homestead in Bhutan:

My pa looked toward his hard earned land,
Hard earned orange trees his hand hath planted.
My ma cautiously with a wish
-left the door open and wept,
And we set steps . . . to unknown destination. (ll. 10-14)

All the examples above show how the rulers induced fear in their people. It has been engraved deep down in their psyche. It works as the base of the other types of fear they have been living with.

**Causes of Fear in the Host Land**

Despite the early confusions, most of the Bhutanese Nepali refugees in the camps in Nepal chose to resettle in the West. It changed their status from Bhutanese-diaspora-refugees to the Bhutanese Nepali diasporans. At the time they chose it, they cherished a dream of good future in the new lands. This desire was accompanied by the fear of uncertainty and the resultant anxiety on them. As “[d]esire is essential to fear” (Davis 296), in such a situation, “the subject experiences fear, even intense fear, but cannot specify what he is afraid of” (298). Saroj Budhathoki’s “Fling to the Odd Land” is one of such poems that deal with the causes of the disporans’ fear in the host land. The poem symbolically presents their existential situation:

A dark day rode, tempest erodes, and all wreckage left
Rumpled my blissful past, and dashed into a foreign land.
Land so odd, tongue so unique and culture so unalike
Brownie I look, thick accent I sound, but all we pain
Like them, and hurt so easy when cast-off by kind alike
Did I admit all odds as mine; near my bosom so tight? (ll. 3-8)
This is not the poet’s original land or homeland; it is only a host land where he looks like an outcast. Though people outwardly praise him, and he, too, smiles back at them, he fears a lot: “Fear so real, threat so genuine” (l. 11). He does not find a bright light in life. Merely “a light so dim and distant” (l. 12) cannot make him feel good in the new land. Though he looks at the world “with the worthy virtue of love and / Empathy, the kindness I preach to the world” (ll. 14-15), his own life is not so. He feels: “Alas! The world sinks under my feet so rash / Explodes this world in my eyes, left no or less drive” (ll. 16-17). He has never doubted the love and care of the new land. But the land always scorns him. As a result, he lives with “[a] soul so crass, builds a rift, and abounds a poison” (l. 19). He finds the condition of humanity blurred:

What a shame human I belong, the crook it begets
The world deep in my feet, feel in my drenched hearts
The sorrow I take, abyss I land with such a shameful soul!
Though I accept all theirs as mine; near my bosom so tight? (ll. 20-23)

These lines show not only the predicament of the speaker’s present situation, but also a worry full of fear about the days ahead. The existential condition of the diasporans and their relation with the mainstream society in the host land is not so good. As a result, even the behaviour of the mainstream society in the new land makes them fearful of the future. The following section further highlights the fear related to future.

**Fear of Future Life**

Fear, for the disporans, is primarily a futuristic concept. One experiences it in the thought of future possibilities. “Fear, in other words, entails aversion and uncertainty” (Davies 289). Davies reports what Gordon (1980) has shown, in his research: “fear does require a special kind of uncertainty, which he calls non-deliberative uncertainty”. Thus, Davies concludes: “Fear is possible, though, as long as the uncertainty is not due solely to indecision” (290). Poems by Rup Narayan Pokharel, Ramesh Gautam and Welkin Siskin have presented such a situation and consequent fear.

Wilkin Siskin’s poem “I Give this Life to Thee” presents such a fear of future life with uncertainty and difficulty. The speaker in the poem fears to have his future very dark and
desolate: “Morrow is precarious, and we may not run across each other” (l. 6). He finds the way ahead full of troubles; and it whispers the symphony [really the cacophony] of the groaning skies (ll. 9-10). His chants are also filled with the sense of separation with the lovely people, places and things and the consequent pain on both sides (ll. 10-11). The speaker wants to give life to the separated beloved; but it is not possible because of their situation: “For the night is darkening hurriedly / And times are fleeting / Carrying the weight of our departure” (ll. 3-5). At the moment, he realizes that life is “transient and perishable as the time” (l. 7). He fears that his future life may be full of sorrow; and he may have to listen to “the walls of the room and canopy” that spreads the song of their separation (ll. 14-15). He imagines that even the stars will weep in their separation (l. 16); but it cannot provide any sign of hope ahead. As the time ahead is like the night that “is darkening hurriedly” (l. 3), he is fearful of his future life.

Similarly, Ramesh Gautam’s poem “How the Life Feels Again” paints the picture of desolate present and uncertain future in the new land they have settled. The Bhutanese Nepali diasporans find that the hope they had cherished before resettlement could not be materialized. The result is their fearful present and possibly the similar future. The poem begins:

The days are screaming
And the night waiting,
For the life deserving.
I am scared
I am bewildered
The life we dreamt of
The moments we painted in colours
I believe, are only the sentiments. (ll. 1-8)

After this portrait of present life and the recollection of the past, the speaker expresses his fear for the future:

The way ahead
I see—
Is twisted and scrappy
Is desert-like and is dusty.
I see—
The image you and I cared
Is gloomed by the moment now.
The heart I have
Questions the facts in pains (ll. 9-17)

The speaker has grown so hopeless that he questions himself and asks every one like him to question themselves: “If the earth is for us, / If the heart are ours” (ll. 25-26). This situation, on the one hand, is the result of the fear of present and future that is generated on the basis of the life they had to live in the past; and on the other hand, it causes additional fear about the future.

The next poem that presents the fear of terrible future is “Unstated Triumph” composed by Rup Narayan Pokharel. Here, the speaker imagines and fears his possible pathetic life in future and probably a terrible end. The poem begins with the line:

I may be in a trench
When you hear of me,
Probably;
With half-filled belly,
And unquenched thirst (ll. 1-5)

Along with the fear, the speaker exposes the reasons behind the creation of the fear. If he were satisfied with his own life in whatever condition it had been, his life would not have been in the threat it is now. He dreamt of good future of the next generation so that he had to do many things for their benefit: “Framing a lawn for you all and the like / To rescind you out of muzzy days” (ll. 6-7). As a result, both his present and future are difficult; and the same difficulties cause his fear. He has further described the fear:

I may be staggering
When you know of me
Perhaps;
With swollen heels
And maltreated, pus-filled cracks
Soothing apostles to live at ease
Lending the gun relic from league. (ll. 8-14)

All these fears are not only the fear of the poet and the speaker of the poem, but also that of all Bhutanese Nepali diasporans who have been compelled to live away from both Nepal and Bhutan. These poems indicate the extent to which they suffer and the consequent fear they live with.

**Existential Condition and Fear**

What a man values the most is the personal existence. That is why; they fear the loss of the same. This is also connected with the possibilities of the loss of the meaning of existence. Joyce Carol Oates asserts:

> What we fear most, I suggest, is not death; not even physical anguish, mental decay, disintegration. We fear most the loss of meaning. To lose meaning is to lose one's humanity, and this is more terrifying than death; for death itself, in a coherent cultural context, always has meaning. (185)

In the diaspora, though the diasporans exist physically, what they believe and fear is the existence of their meaningful life. Poems by Dona Acharya and Welkin Siskin display this theme.

Siskin’s poem “Struggling in the Silence” presents the trauma of bizarre existence of the Bhutanese Nepali diasporic community. The persona of the poem depicts his situation in such a way that it reflects the condition of his community as a whole. The poem begins with the line: “My bereft aura that bethinks me of my art is lost” (l. 1). It is followed by the lines that talk of how the cockles of his heart “whispered and sounded off like the bravery of the Jesus’ Cross” (l. 2). He finds himself facing “the horror of the grievous like the roots of the trees stretching its arm holding up the glades” (l. 4). He finds that his life is bereft of childish happiness, voice of silence and present happiness. He finds, around him, cruel human world that is filled up and moved with the age old dogmas. As a result, “the noble and the honest, the virtuous and the
upright lost their souls” (l. 13). This poem is, thus, an expression of hopelessness that is resulted from the life full of fear and troubles.

Siskin’s next poem “My Many Ways” has presented, through bizarre images, the effect of trauma on their life and existence. The speaker finds himself “a bare book, a wallet penniless!” (l. 16). He has reached to this realization about life when he had to undergo many troubles in his life. They have been reflected in the lines that talk of his “long blackout in [the] soul” (l. 2); the breaking of life “befalling beyond remedy” (l. 5) after being dragged to “the gravel-lane” (l. 3); sleeping “under the hatch” and seeing “wolf at the door often / Glutted and its limbs even-tempered” when he finds himself “enkindled in the coffin” (ll. 13-14). All these situations symbolize the existential crisis and the consequent fear in the speaker and his community.

These poems also show how “the human subject comes into being through a series of attractive and repulsive maneuvers with respect to this Janus-faced force.” They further display that “[t]he identity of the "I" is founded upon an economic relationship with jouissance, and it is the endless play of jouissances bivalent difference that constitutes this identity” (Hinrichsen 46). The fear created with the possibility of identity-less-ness has made these poets and their community feel insecure in the host land. It shows that the condition of existence plays a role in the creation of certain human psychological states; and fear is one of them.

Other Fears

The diasporans are nostalgic of their homeland where they were born and grown up. But when they cannot do anything about that land and have to concentrate only on their present day existence in the host land, they sometimes feel that they are betraying their homeland in their race of existence in the new land. This feeling of regret has also got expression in Bhutanese Nepali diasporic poetry. One such example is Yeshey Pelzon’s poem “I am only a Child”. It talks of how being a diasporan one feels the fear of being the betrayer of the homeland:

O mother, did I betray you?
I have offered my cold fingers
Onto the warmth of a new hand,
She promises I will not fall again.
I know she is not you—
But I am only a child! (ll. 7-12)

Here, the speaker accepts that he has got the help in the new land. It has promised him good days ahead. He is trying to adjust there. But he does not feel very good because this new land is not his original mother (motherland). So, time and again, he realizes his inability to work for the land where he was born. He worries whether he is a betrayer or just someone who is compelled to do it. This is a common feeling and fear of every diasporan anywhere in the globe.

Fear of separation is another fear that the Bhutanese Nepali diasporans live with. Primarily, they are fearful of their permanent separation from their land of birth. Similarly, in the third country resettlement they have been scattered to many countries in the West. This has separated them from their relatives and friends. With these experiences on the background, they fear separation from anyone they are together at any time of their life.

“Because You Complete Me” by Devi Pokharel has given expression to such a fear of separation and its consequences. The speaker fears: “I’m too scared to let you go / I am afraid to lose you” (ll. 17-18). He feels it because he thinks that he “wouldn’t have lived till now / If you hadn’t come to me” (ll. 1-2). He is sure that he “would have been lost elsewhere / On the odyssey of misery of life” (ll. 3-4). These are symbolic expressions that mean the presence of fear in the depth of their psyche.

Retaliating Fear

Fear is a problematic psychological state. One needs to be free from it to live a normal everyday life. Scholars have discussed on how it can be done. Relating the fear with trauma Kate Schick observes that it should be acted out for release that “involves a compulsive and repetitive re-living of the trauma”. For this the individuals who act out “have difficulty distinguishing between the past and the present and struggle with notions of future. They are haunted by their experience and trapped in the past that wounded them.” (1842). Some Bhutanese Nepali diasporic poets have dealt with this issue of their life. In the state of trauma,
they even go to the state of retaliating fear itself. Yati Raj Ajnabee’s poem entitled “Fear Fears with Fearlessness” is one such example.

The poem, at first, recounts the wounds and troubles the Bhutanese Nepali diasporans underwent in the past. Then it goes on showing the sufferers as blind people though they have eyes, deaf though they have ears because they “never heard cries / And never rubbed mother’s tears” (ll. 11-12). The poem then inspires them to wake up from this careless slumber, and urges them to understand their proud history and great capability. Finally, the speaker wants them to “[g]o, face, fight with storm” (l. 29). It is now their duty to their motherland, the people there and even for their own existence. For this, they need to make their mind “hard and firm” because “[f]ear fears with fearlessness” (ll. 31-32). This idea of retaliation against fear itself is very crucial in the fight against atrocity and its consequent fear.

**Conclusion**

Life of the diasporans is full of struggles, troubles and fear. Diasporic literature gives expression to the suppressed fear of the creators and their society through different literary genres. The poems discussed in this article have displayed how the poets were and are compelled to live in the atmosphere of terror so that their creations were filled up with fear. The rulers of Bhutan created such an atmosphere with their inhuman policy of ‘one-nation; one race’ that treated the Nepali diasporans in Bhutan as the outsiders; and so they were inhumanely expelled out to become Bhutanese Nepali diasporans. This historical incident made them fearful throughout their existence.

Once they were in the refugee camps in Nepal and even after their resettlement and rediasporization in the third country, the systems there made them fearful. The uncertainty and new ways of life created new types of fears in them. They were mostly fearful about their future. This is connected with their existential situation and the consequent condition of identity. Along with the fear of future, they feel the fear of being a betrayer of their motherland as they could not do anything for its progress and good future. All these types of fear are the result of their separation from the homeland. Some poems also indicate the ways to retaliate to fear. Thus, this study has shown that fear is a major emotion in a diasporic society; and so the
same is expressed in the diasporic creations. Further detailed studies are necessary to explore this issue in detail.

Works Cited

https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

Acharya, Dona. “I Was Born Where I Couldn’t Belong.”

https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

https://www.jstor.org/stable/4319892

Dhamala, Prakash. “Standing on the No Man’s Land of Life.”
https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

https://www.jstor.org/stable/25167553


https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

https://www.jstor.org/stable/40549062

    https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630


    https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

    https://www.jstor.org/stable/23025578

    https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630


    https://bhutaneseliterature.com/archives/630

Bio

Dr. Ramji Timalsina is a researcher of poetry and diaspora, and lecturer of English in Tribhuvan University, Nepal. He has earned his PhD Degree on “Exploration into the Use of Rasa in Nepalese Diasporic Poetry”. He is the chair of CETRAP (Center for English Teachers’ Research and Pedagogy), Nepal. He has conducted number of programs as a facilitator on research and writing. Dr. Timalsina has published five books and more than four dozen research articles in each of the English and Nepali languages. He currently works as an Editor-in-Chief, Executive Editor and Editor of different literary and academic journals. He has been taking part in national and international conferences on language, literature and diaspora. He is currently working on the transnational approach to Nepali Diaspora and its literature. His latest book is Nepalese Diaspora and its Literature: Emotion and Expression published from Lambert Academic Publishing, Latvia, Europe. Contact: ramjikoshi@gmail.com
Corona Virus

As fearful as Ebola virus
More horrible than the atom bomb
Curable even to the poison takers with medicine
Cobra bites less dangerous since it cures
How terrible the corona virus
Travelling all over the globe
Corona virus raises its head as fast as the rays of the sun light
Corona virus regards the humans as the greatest enemies in the world's creatures
It targets the world to be human free
Corona virus tends to be cheerful to see the humans in flee
Proud of being the most powerful in the Earth
In the speed in slaughtering humans unimaginable
Fear of corona virus has no place to hide
Thousand beds' hospital in china within six days
Result of positive fear in the birth place of corona virus
Positive fear consciousness in china solves it
Negative fear consciousness makes everyone nervous
Let the fear of corona be away
Let the humanity be away from corona
Let the positive fear function to address the corona fear
Let the humanity live long.

Bhawani Shankar Adhikari
English lecturer, Balmeeki Campus, Kathmandu
Nepal Sanskrit University, Nepal
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Each Issue of IJFS will include a unique selected bibliography with important references to the field of Fear Studies. This is my pick (as Senior Ed.) but all are encouraged to send in to me your picks for the next issues.


A great and timeless resource offered from a wise woman psychotherapist. “Living Beyond Fear shows you “how to” reconnect in a safe and appropriate way with all of your feelings...It is not the way we have been taught. It is unfamiliar, so it requires courage and commitment.” (Tina B. Tessina, in Foreword, p. xi)


Engelhardt created and runs the TomDispatch website. His critical writing on news and events in America is stunning and honest. The book covers stories of the many wars that the U.S. has got itself into and cannot get out, all breeding more fear everywhere for everyone.

Estrella, Martin Diaz (in progress). The theory of Love and it’s comparison to Fear/Fearism.

[MDW recently wrote:] Introduction. To understand Fear/Fearism one must know that of the Love and it’s attributes. One must know the link between the tow. For if one ONLY sees Fear on shall not know how to observe that of Love or know Love itself.
