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Love-Fear: Uni-Bicentric Theorem as Basis for the Fearlessness Movement

R. Michael Fisher
Technical Paper No. 65

Abstract  This is the latest articulation and upgraded version of the Love vs. Fear theory/discourse found universally across historical time. The author traces a summary of his own working with these “forces” under the label of archetypal metamotivations. His own articulation of the Fear Problem is only part of a more encompassing Uni-Bicentric Theorem he discovered and has promoted for 28 years, all as part of the Fearlessness Movement/Tradition. He claims that the language/theory of Love-Fear, rather than Love vs. Fear, is more healthy and effective for liberation than the language/theory of Good vs. Evil (dualism) underneath the discourse of Love vs. Fear. His unique Uni-Bicentric Theorem offers the foundational thinking to make this shift in our dominant current guiding kosmologies that tend to default to Good vs. Evil when under pressure and less than ideal conditions. He also critiques his own work, while drawing upon (mainly but not only) the theories of Ken Wilber and Abraham H. Maslow. He suggests viral ‘Fear’ complex is a different ‘beast’ than fear or Fear, and so the entire Love and Fear discourses/theories all need revision, via a confrontation with the Shadow (e.g., ‘Fear’ Matrix, and/or “culture of fear” meta-context) and a thorough ontopsychosocial therapy (or terapia).

Introduction: The Great Tradition/Movement

The history of humanity has been the history of a brokenness.¹

If we don’t adopt the language/theory of Love-Fear, we’ll end up by default with the destructive language/theory of Good vs. Evil.

The brief intellectual history of the classical Love vs. Fear theology, theory, paradigm (now, written as Love-Fear to demark a latest upgrade shift in my theorizing) has its origins in my own synthesis beginning in the late-1980s with more prominent summaries finally coming out in print in Fisher (e.g., 2012, 2015).

I began building on the Love-Fear theoretical framework specifically in my first major book (Fisher 2010). In this latter book, I named 15 Bi-centric Paradigms of the Fearlessness Tradition (Movement) utilizing the fundamental Love vs. Fear discourse as found in many wisdom traditions—while, other paradigms equivalent or at least analogous listed included: “Good vs. Evil” (very common) and “Sunrise Vision vs. Sunset Vision” (a

“The Great Fearlessness Tradition” (Fisher, 2010, p. 166) was a significant historical and philosophical/theological label for a phenomena that I am convinced is real and has been characteristically ignored as a whole. Its time has come, and the co-founding of the In Search of Fearlessness Project (1989-) (i.e., by Fisher-Sannuto2 in Calgary, AB, Canada) is the critical turning point of actualizing what, at the time, I had not understood historically as a “movement” (i.e., Great Tradition), other than I was aware it involved liberation.

The nutshell definition of Fearlessness Movement is: the instinctual and accumulative forces that move from grounds of Fear to Fearlessness—and/or more simply said: from Fear to Love. See below “Understanding Fear.” The basic dictum: “When fear arises, so then does fearlessness” (see, for e.g., Fisher, 2010, p. xv). For the first written history of the Fearlessness Movement see Fisher (2007); and, more recently see my Fearlessness Movement ning.3 We are thus talking here about metamotivation(s)4 (cf. Maslow’s theory) and its principles and values that are ever-present in living systems, working to move from a defensive/regressive state (and/or structure) to a growthful state (and/or structure) (cf. Wilber, 2017; and/or for e.g., also “dual-motivation theory”).

---

2 ISOF Project was an original (mystical) co-vision between Robert M. Fisher and Catherine Sannuto. In 1991 Barbara Bickel joined Robert (now Michael) on this journey as co-founders and committed enduring teachers.

3 See a formal historical overview in a Wikipedia format on the FM ning by going to the first and second posted blog Forum(s); see http://fearlessnessmovement.ning.com/

4 I specifically use “metamotivation” as a term/construct that originated (as far as I can tell) with Abraham H. Maslow’s research work (1950-60s) on what he called “being” (B-cognition, B-values) as the highest human potential. This work by the eminent American humanistic and transpersonal psychologist the late-Maslow (1908-70), could just as easily have been called “Love” and L-cognition, L-values—which, he actually called “self-actualization” cognition, values; which, he claimed can be accessed (more or less by all) via what he called “peak-experiences” and/or slower growth-based developmental (healthy) processes (e.g., Maslow, 1964). Most everyone forgets about this depth work of Maslow’s, rather they focus on his famous and popularized “hierarchy of needs” model/theory. The latter, actually is quite a watered-down (distortion?) of the strongest findings of Maslow’s thorough empirical work on “peak-experience” (i.e., mystical state and/or alternative state experiences).

5 See the synthesis by the social psychologists Pyszczynski, Greenberg and Arndt (2011).
For example, various powerful questions may arise: Are you and your community or organization being led by Love or by Fear?; Can you recognize when this happening?; Can you transform it? Would you want to even if you knew how? Such are the ‘Big’ perceptual, educational and ethical questions of liberation work that I often focus on. Thus, the Love vs. Fear paradigm is a theory to talk about this seemingly universal reality of metamotivations. Love and Fear, among other things, are powerful archetypal6 motivators—and concomitantly so, is Fearlessness. I’ll return later in this technical paper to explicate a little more detail of this triadic relationship at the core of my critical philosophy, theory and praxis—as well, at the core of my promotion of a healthy quality fear management/education for the 21st century (e.g., see Fisher, 2010; Fisher and Subba, 2016).

Suffice it for this basic Introduction to show the core of my work for 28 years calls us to understand (at least cognitively) the relationship of Love-Fear that have been part of a larger Uni-Bicentric Theorem—the latter, which I derived nearly a quarter a century ago. While, to be clear the Love and Fear problematic itself is ancient in source (and discourse7).

Figure 1 demonstrates the basic form/pattern of the Uni-Bicentric Theorem (a la Fisher). In sum: the abstract Kosmic figuration indicates dynamic moving forces (represented by arrows) that I claim are universal to living systems (and, perhaps non-living systems as well).

---

6 One not to only interpret this notion of “archetypal” as in the Jungian sense, though there is some overlap to what Wilber (2017) means by “archetypes” when understood from the “Causal” higher (rarified) level of transpersonal consciousness. I have not investigated the Wilberian link via the Causal (View) and the Love-Fear connection as filtered and expressed in the forms of Uni-Bicentric Theory—but suffice it to say, “This Awareness-itself [apprehended and constituted as a lens of subtle awareness upon awareness] begins to objectify the most subtle (that is, causal) forms of existence—namely, the archetypes—which include the very basic matrix of space-time. This activity is a type of ‘cleaning house,’ making into objects virtually all possible subjects [e.g., archetypal Love and Fear dynamics], and thus clearing a space for [the next level] Emptiness itself to arise” (Wilber, 2017, p. 449). Note, this high-level and subtle awareness re: objectifying capacity of everything is part-n-parcel of Maslow’s (1964) description of B-cognition (p. 71), which I’ll quote later in this paper.

7 See for e.g., Fisher (2012).
Figure 1: Fisher’s Uni-Bicentric Theorem

This diagram/map is “scientific” as well as “artistic” (i.e., aesthetic) and “moralistic” (“religious”) in the sense of my attempting to draw knowledge, knowing and ultimately understanding from all these three major dimensions (Wilber’s “Big Three”) of Reality and integrate them in an understanding of metamotivation (theory and practice). I have also called the simple form of this diagram the design of the “holon” (cf. Wilber, 1995) and it is created from a cosmocentric perspective or worldview (or “kosmocentric” to use Wilber’s terminology). It’s an out-

---

8. This hierarchical (holarchic) sequence is based on the Hawaiian (Indigenous-based) epistemology as clarified by the eminent scholar Manulani Aluli Meyer (see Youtube videos on her work). See Wilber (1995), for e.g., on holarchy as the fundamental and evolutionary framework to understand holonic systems. Wilber makes, I think, a good distinction between “natural hierarchy” (i.e., holarchies) and “pathological hierarchy,” a distinction most people do not make and thus great confusion (and distortion?) is created.

9. The figuration (Figure 1) is a premise behind the ontological, epistemological and axiological foundations of my work since the early 1990s. It is not the place of this technical paper to go further into this “Reality” conception.

10. Many ancient and contemporary philosophers, theologians and contemplatives, artists, poets and mystics (and “new physics” scientists) have articulated similar cosmocentric perspectives, including the 20th century French existential philosopher Gabriele Marcel (apparently).
standing Big Picture view of how everything works in this dynamic ‘ecology’ of exchanging energies and forces. In that sense, you can see I have adopted a controversial ‘Theory of Everything’ approach overall.\textsuperscript{12}

Understanding Love

So why is it so important to understand Love (with a capital letter)? Earlier I posed the ethical question: Are you and your community or organization being led by Love or by Fear? Another way to put it, using the Uni-Bicentric (Figure 1) map: Are you or your community or organization developing (evolving, growing) Love-ward or Fear-ward? Do you know your most important (ethical) “directions” (telos) when living on Earth—as Earthlings?\textsuperscript{13}

Without going into all the detail of Figure 1 (it would take a small book to explain it properly), suffice it to say you are looking at the Source-1 phenomena, which could be called many things but let’s call it “Earth” and Source-2, likewise, could be called many things but let’s call it “Sun.” Try to think both concretely and metaphorically while reading about and seeing (imagining) Figure 1 as representing some “reality.”

The arising force of “Life” that is differentiating from Source-1 (Unity) sphere is relatively smaller in scale and force and is part-of-the-Whole of Earth. It seems generally Life-forces (as spirit of Eros) move as imperative “law” Sunward in arising, as if the Sun is like a gravity-center (which it is physically as well). Yet what arises as part-of-Earth (beings) must at some point in its Growth (i.e., Path of Progress) make a ‘turn’ or ‘departure’ from that arising-quest and follow imperatively the full-cycle of Life, that

\textsuperscript{11} I utilize Wilber’s important integral distinction between cosmos (typically, today it is physical and external-focused) and kosmos (includes the former as well), which is equally interior-focused (a la Wilber’s work); see, for e.g., Wilber (1995).

\textsuperscript{12} There are many formations of the general theorizing (synthesis) trends that have now been called “Theories of Everything” and most postmodern and poststructuralist theorists (especially in the academy) cannot much stand these T.O.E.’s as they are called. Ken Wilber is one integral philosopher who has written a good deal about the positive aspects of T.O.E.’s (including his own Integral Theory) and also on the down side of them too. I myself like to integrate (as much as possible) structuralist and poststructuralist approaches to Reality—that is, I don’t see them as completely incompatible although they certainly are (rightfully) in conflict.

\textsuperscript{13} I am referring to “Earthlings” in particular, via what Terry Biddington labeled a “risk-shaped theology.” Go to https://terrybiddington.wordpress.com/
is, Earthward,¹⁴ in what marks the other-side of Growth (i.e., Path of Return¹⁵). The dynamics of Earth-gravity and Sun-gravity are interwoven in every fabric of Life.

You can see the relatively smaller growth (pattern), from this kosmocentric perspective, is basically a sphere of life (e.g., could be an individual, could be you) in part traveling in/with the Great Forces of the Kosmos—at least, this is the case from the perspective of a living organism (consciousness) on Earth. We are “Earthlings,” all Beings on/in/with Earth—is one way to rather over-simply say it. We grow-up and we grow-down. The Kosmos (apparently) can be described that way. Thus, Figure 1 represents a healthy, sane, sustainable set of relationships (i.e., system dynamics) that are “Designed” for a ‘balanced’ and ‘system-regulative’ well-being (i.e., Life, which includes decay and Death). I call it a Love-based System (and, metamotoval holonic pattern). Over-simplifying: the Kosmos is metamotovally derived—and, Love is the primary imperative, driver, or what philosophers have called a telic-imperative. There is a (Basic Moral Intuition¹⁶)”direction” (telos) that is Good, Beautiful and True, say the ancient wisdom teachings.¹⁷

---

¹⁴ I take these orienting generalizations and conceptualized terms “Sunward” and “Earthward” from the genius work of R. Buckminster Fuller from the 1960s-70s, when he was attempting to articulate a kosmocentric perspective for human beings so that we transform our orientation frame while living on planet Earth to a more dynamic (“ecological”) way—so as not to make absolute the terms “up” and “down,” which we tend to use habitually, and have done for a very long time in history.

¹⁵ Wilber, from his earliest work back into the 1980s, for e.g., articulated these two “paths” (but really one) as universal (metaphysical) telic imperatives—for a healthy Kosmos; a more complicated metaphysical discussion of the two paths can be interpreted in Wilber’s framing of a Kosmos of both “involution” and “evolution”—albeit, he is less inclined to utilize such theorizing as central to his work after 1996 or so.

¹⁶ “Basic Moral Intuition” is related to what I am speaking to, with some variations in my own theorizing; see Wilber (1995), pp. 613-15).

¹⁷ Call this Creation-in-progress (by “Design”), if you will. Some may ask: Who is the Creator/Designer? That’s a complex ontological question far beyond the scope of this technical paper. For now, in a sense, Love is the Creator/Designer as I am articulating this Uni-Bicentric Theorem. I have also at times over the decades referred to Love as Quality. This is kosmocentric and/or in psychological terms a “transpersonal” (and/or transhuman) perspective and/or worldview (e.g., see Wilber’s integral/transpersonal theorizing for deeper and subtle articulation of all this—see also Maslow’s B-cognition perspective that I quote later).
Understanding Fear

With “The Great Fearlessness Tradition” I have articulated for 28 years—it is more or less founded upon this kosmology (Figure 1). The Uni-Bicentric Theorem (kosmology) is named after the Unity or Oneness of All—as you can see the dynamic “ecological” connection of all three major spheres (e.g., Earth-Human-Sun). All in ‘balance’ and ‘harmony’ as many Indigenous teachings speak about. The two big solid spheres are Source(s) and are a Unity (i.e., Uni-) yet with Bicentric (i.e., two) centers joined by the dash-lined vertical axis. The Theorem can’t be proved in the normal sense of hard or soft “sciences” but it can be ‘probed’ and investigated scientifically (another argument for another time). It can be also investigated aesthetically, and morally—and the investigations of all the ‘Big Three’ (value-spheres as Wilber calls them: Art, Science, Religion (Morals)) gives us as complete as possible a Big Picture (for generalizations and guidance as a map) of the territory we call “Life” and/or Existence/Reality—at least, theoretically. The Fearlessness Movement now can be translated in/with/through this kosmology and so can Love and Fear as metamotivations.

I have traced Love. I have suggested an Ideal—an unbrokenness to the Kosmos and human possibilities. Yet, we have to turn the page in our Kosmic Story to what Wilber called “the history of brokenness.” So, let’s look at Fear (with capital letter). It takes time for me to describe and draw out my thinking over the years, based on a good deal of integral research. You can now see an abstract map (Figure 1) of the great kosmic movements, metamotivations, yet I have not completely labeled them in the language I wish to for purposes of this paper.

Love, at this kosmocentric perspective, is represented by the arrows in bold curving dynamics, which in their own way symbolize a near geometrical and mathematically precise (“perfect”) set of Kosmic relations (as if based on “gravity”), ‘negotiating’ the course of the “individual” (for e.g.) on Earth and yet occupying the ‘space’ between the Earth and Sun forces. The two big black solid Source dots are “Love” Centers (you may call them).

---

18 For e.g., the “human” growing in this kosmology is Uni-Bicentric(ally) connected to Sun and Earth at all the alignment of “centers” (or Sources).
19 There is an awful lot of thought and theorizing behind why I have settled on Fear (with the capital)—see also Four Arrows’ work (aka Dr. Don Trent Jacobs). I won’t be able to go into this here—you can read any of my prior publications on fear (Fear) and fearlessness (Fearlessness), or simply, send your queries email me: r.michaelfisher52@gmail.com for guidance.
They determine and nurture All—that is, if the Path of Progress and Path of Return are kept in the form as shown in Figure 1. Healthy, sane and sustainable systems are metamotivated by Love. That’s the thesis here.

We can map Love kosmocentrically to start with and it gives us an integral Big Story of what is going on and what it is we as “individuals” (and/or communities, organizations) ought to be attuned in/with for Growth to be non-pathological. What about pathological Growth? What would that look like in Figure 1? The kosmic metapathology, if you will, can be seen in Figure 1 in the smallest arrows circling close to the Sun and deviating from the course imperative of the Path of Return make a “Neurotic Loop” as I call it, or ‘Fear’-based Loop. It is shown with a non-solid black center—meaning, it is “empty” or better said, it is a “vacuum” (of lack = neurotic needs or as Maslow, 1964 called them, “deficit-needs” or “D-cognition” and “D-values” in important distinction and contrast (opposition) to “Being-needs” or “B-cognition” and “B-values”).

Some insightful (spiritual) authors/teachers have defined “Fear” as an absence of Love or variation thereupon. Figure 1 shows Fear as an errant rebel-path taken, deviating from the path of Love. Thus a pathology or what Wilber (2017) prefers to call a developmental (evolutionary) “dysfunction.” So, when you may have heard about Love vs. Fear (as conflicting polar oppositions: could be described as “Good vs. Evil”) there are a lot of good reasons for that language/rhetoric/discourse, theology, theory and/or paradigm. The rest of this technical paper will sort through some evidence for this conflictual Love vs. Fear (polarity, dichotomy, binary), yet the larger proportion of this paper is dedicated to my latest upgrade of Love-Fear (not Love vs. Fear) as the better metamotivation theory to use for the 21st century. To sum: Fear is ‘off-center’ from the Source(s) in Figure 1. This creates havoc (pathologies) in the Kosmos. Is Fear itself a metapathology? I’ll attempt a “short” answer to that, and indicate a “long” answer.

**Current Working Through the Love-Fear Complexity**

To be sure the Love and Fear problematique is vast, deep, and ancient, as I have said. There is no only one analysis or solution that is offered throughout human recorded history that all would agree upon. There are often contradictions in the interpretations and teachings around this phenomenal dy-

---

20 For e.g., see Saratoga and Telstar (aka Baugher, Kirin) (1995).

21 Wilber (1995), for e.g., might call it an "arrogant holon."
namic of metamotivations. One ought to study this history to be better prepared to handle the Fear Problem\textsuperscript{22} we have on the planet today—which, in all likelihood is going to get a whole lot worse (devastating) before it will (perhaps) get better.

Before diving deeper, let’s get one basic developmental distinction in terminology clear: that is, what Wilber called “differentiation” from “dissociation.” Over-simplifying: differentiation is the process of a Unity growing/becoming “two” (looks like, ‘separate’ but really is not, it remains connected, even though that is not always easy to see or perceive). In Figure 1 the relatively smaller sphere in between Earth and Sun is originating from the Earth sphere as a differentiation (still intimately connected)—whereby, evolution has “designed” such a movement/process in order to create diversity, uniqueness (the Many from the One, as the ancient philosophers would say\textsuperscript{23}). So far, so good... but ‘shit happens’...

Pathological (patternning) does not enter this picture of growth/becoming until enters a very unique errant patterning (i.e., what I have called ‘Fear’-patternning; like a ‘fear’ virus (dis-ease), for e.g., see Fisher, 1995, 1997). In Figure 1 this pathological pattern is like a “split” (i.e., dissociation) where the relatively very small “neurotic loop” goes its own way (sort of)—via its rebel-path\textsuperscript{24} deviation from the Love Path(s). I think any notion of “sin” (theologically) or “evil” would nicely fit this neurotic-rebel patterning (path). It is like there is a transgression of the Law of Life (e.g., evil is live spelled backwards). The Whole (Kosmos), more or less, gets out-of-order once a ‘Fear’ patterning is set in place. Fear then seems to, more or less, “rule” over Love. Fear-ward is the apparent ‘chosen’ predominant direction of a human’s activities, including its community and organizations. Though, this can (theoretically) be ‘corrected’ (healed and/or transformed). I won’t repeat what I said earlier in describing the errant path and its off-centered/vacuum-center in Figure 1.

\textsuperscript{22} The “Fear Problem” is a conceptualization I have labeled for a network of problems; see for e.g., Fisher (2010, p. 91), Fisher and Subba (2016, p. xxi). Note: in a more complicated discussion, beyond this paper’s scope, you would want to investigate also what I have labeled the ‘Fear’ Project(ion) and ‘Fear’ Matrix.

\textsuperscript{23} Contemporary postmodern theorists may explore the phenomena under a different set of premises than Wilber, Maslow or I utilize, but the impulse is the ‘same’ basically—that is, to understand issues/problematics (i.e., relations) of Singularities and Pluralities in “reality.”

\textsuperscript{24} I teach a very unique and complicated Rebel Theory in evolution, history, development, which I argue is unique (albeit, related to the Hero archetype)—see my early video on this Rebel Theory (with 3 kinds of “rebels”) in the DVD “Recovering the Inner Rebel” (1995).
So, let’s take some space to show a sequence of my publications of diagrams (i.e., subset variations, simplifications of Figure 1) that I am using for pedagogical purposes to articulate the Love vs. Fear Problem (while, converting it into a Love-Fear problematic). This is historical, in terms of my own work; yet, really useful if you want to understand where I have been of late in my writing/teaching.

One of the earliest, and yet still powerful studies I made was of Ken Wilber’s (at that time) “transpersonal” theory of what I called ‘Fear’ (Fisher, 1997). This was one of my first initiatives applying fearanalysis to another author’s life’s work. I used a similar variation of Figure 1 to show how Wilber’s transpersonal theory by the mid-1990s had given us empirical and speculative grounds for a high quality, full-spectrum of consciousness, view of how Fear and ‘Fear’ operate as a grand metamotivational force determining most all our current motivations. So, in that publication I emphasized Wilber’s Love vs. Fear discourse pattern, which he wrote specifically on (in Wilber, 1995) as Eros-Agape (forces of Love driving evolution) vs. Phobos-Thanatos (forces of Fear driving de-evolution).

To skip a number of years, in 2014 I came across a most interesting philosopher-poet-fiction writer from Hong Kong (born and raised in Nepal), Desh Subba. He had coined a new philosophy for our times—philosophy of fearism. His argumentation, based on a lot of study and experience, was that living systems are shaped and motivated by fear (Subba, 2014). Fear for him was however not against love but they worked in tandem. He and I

25 Fearanalysis (analogous but after psychoanalysis) is my “soft” technology for evaluating and transforming our ways of knowing fear (Fear) and ‘fear’ (‘Fear’). See Fisher (2012a) and a new book in progress A General Introduction to Fearanalysis: Putting the Culture of Fear and Terror on the Couch.

26 I won’t suggest Wilber is comfortable philosophically or theoretically with a notion like “de-evolution” (as some critics like to use it, for e.g., Four Arrows’ “point of departure theory,” based on his critical Indigenous-based postcolonial critique of the Dominant (Western) society and its history). He wrote, “The evolution of holons is not all sweetness and light, as some proponents of ‘evolutionary progress’ seem to maintain.... Nonetheless, the opposite conclusion, that most evolution is really devolution, is not warranted either” (Wilber, 1995, pp. 101, 103). However, Wilber (1995) makes his philosophical work aligned with a premise (in part) like partial truths of de-evolution theories. He wrote, “It’s a strange world” as he summarized the evolution of something from nothing, to something “a mere few hundred years ago, on a small and indifferent planet around an insignificant star, evolution became conscious of itself. And at precisely the same time, the very mechanisms that allowed evolution to become conscious of itself were simultaneously working to engineer its own extinction. And that was the strangest of all” (p. 3). He’s talking about “pathology” in the largest sense of the term, which I’ll bring forward in more detail later in this paper.
co-authored a book dialoguing on our mutually-supportive theories about fear (Fear) and he found we were saying a lot of the same things even though we had not ever read each other’s work prior. I created a combination Figure 2 (below) for our book (Fisher and Subba, 2016):

![Integral Dialectical Journey of Consciousness](image)

Figure 2 Integral Dialectical Journey of Consciousness

Without going into all the details behind this image (see Fisher and Subba, 2016, pp. 34-5), suffice it to say that over evolutionary and developmental time we both hypothesize a growth of consciousness (an expanding spiral, like in Figure 1), which is metamotivated by Love and Fear. However, for Subba, Fear is primary over Love as the actualized operational universe of human (and life) experiencing. He nor I set up a kosmology in the philosophy of fearism that makes Love and Fear binary static opposites (i.e., Love vs. Fear). Yes, we acknowledge they are opposites too, of a sort as great “forces.” They do however, come from the same Source (i.e., until ‘Fear’ shows up27). We saw them as in a dialectical process together (a simplified

27 ‘Fear’ is very complex to explain, and I cannot enter that discussion fully here. It is a term/conceptualization I use to show that fear (Fear) requires intense deconstruction (a la Derrida) and reconstruction in the postmodern and post-postmodern (integral) philosophical sense (a la Wilber, Fisher). The purpose of labeling Fear with (‘)—as ‘Fear,’ is an admission we don’t actually know well what fear is (e.g., you cannot rely on the dictionary or the psychiatrist for ultimate authority on meanings, analysis and cures). We have to keep it open, dynamic, and realize it is constantly morphing—while, at the same time never to forget we are also doing so with it—we have to study the self-fear-other relationship “ecology,” as I like to put it. Wilber argues that any phenomena has to be studied from at least three major meta-perspectives, “self,” “society” and “nature,” respectively known as the universal perspectives of first-person ‘I,’ second-person ‘We,’ and third-person ‘It.’ Wilber’s later Integral Theory work has gone into identifying eight or more perspectives beyond the simple basic three.
Uni-Bicentric Theorem, as I would call it)—that is, a dynamic “ecology” of metamotivational forces. That said, we did agree that excess Fear (what I call ‘Fear’ patterning) does cause pathological conditions in living systems that cannot regulate or ‘balance’ the Fear and Love forces. ‘Fear’ is a whole other “beast” than Fear (see Fisher, 2010).

Next, a few years later as I was working on an intellectual biography of the Indigenous scholar, Four Arrows, I invented another diagram in which I could place his original CAT-FAWN Connection theory (which I label as Fearlessness, at one level of abstraction) within the Uni-Bicentric Theorem (at least, a very simplified version)—see Figure 3:

![Figure 3 Four Arrows-Fisher Theory](image)

This diagram/map, like Figure 2 shows Love-Fear in a mutual dialectical “ecology.” Love is associated with biophilia (i.e., love of life) and Fear is associated with biophobia (i.e., fear of life). I cannot describe here Four Arrows’ CAT-FAWN theory28 (e.g., see Four Arrows, 2016). What I am attempting to show is that biophilia is a good thing and biophobia is a bad thing, to put it bluntly. And, there’s an especially deadly condition (which Erich Fromm noticed in the 20th century especially) where biophobia overtakes biophilia and we move into a cultural pathology because biophobia

---

28 CAT = Concentration Activated Transformation, FAWN = Fear, Authority, Word(s), Nature. For the most intimate, in depth, and experiential description of the origin of his theory go to Jacobs (1998). See also my new book (soon to be out): Fisher (with Four Arrows) (2018).
becomes the norm. Four Arrows (and other critics) argue this “point of departure” from a natural way of being as biophilia to a cultural way of being characterized by biophobia is some 9-10,000 years old (see Four Arrows, 2016, pp. 5-8). We have to find a powerful metamotivational ‘corrective’ to turn this situation around or suffering, toxicity and extinctions will be massive crises in the early 21st century (as in many cases, they already are).

The ‘corrective’ posited by the Four Arrows-Fisher Theory is “Fearlessness” as a zone or band in Figure 3 that is in between Love and Fear forces. In Fisher (2010, pp. xxix, 143) I argued fearlessness was a meta-virtue. It is what I would call a “system-regulation” zone. Recall earlier I spoke of my basic dictum: When fear arises, so then does fearlessness. Fearlessness regulates excessive Fear productions somewhat but its greatest gift is in reducing and minimizing toxic ‘Fear’ productions. That simple idea, and reality, is a means of theorizing how we can work to ensure that Fear (and the susceptibility to cultural pathology that comes with it) does not get off doing its own thing (i.e., the errant off-centered path, in Figure 1). If it does get off-track fine, but we are quickly able to detect it and “pull” it back on-track (e.g., Four Arrows-Fisher Theory and praxis). All this is a simple teaching I have found consistent with the wisdom literatures around the world through time (albeit, they don’t usually say it explicitly) is that Fear changes and moves via the path of Fearlessness toward Love—that is, with conscious attention “helping it” along. Love is the Source (see Figure 1) but things evolving from that Source can get off-track. I am speaking in third-person language, from an “It” perspective though it is important to remember that this third-person perspective is not by any ontological necessity disconnected from first- and second-person realities and/or accounts of Reality. It/I/We are holonically connected and co-arising, as Wilber’s Integral Theory suggests.

To change/transform the deep cultural pathology, we have to both understand it well and classify it as a global “wicked problem” (and Wilber provides a great analysis) developmentally. We have to offer the “soft” technologies to ‘correct’ the Fear Problem. A whole lot of authors/teachers

---

29 Theological scholarship has uncovered the “gift of fearlessness” (‘corrective’) tradition as a deep (near universal but rather hidden) pattern of cultural philosophy and practices in the East (i.e., Jainism, Hinduism, Buddhism)—see for e.g., Hibbets (1999). The West ought to ‘import’ and integrate the best of this gift tradition as soon as possible. Note, in the West today there is an analogous discourse on “gift of fear” (I call the “fear-positivism movement”), of which I am highly critical of (e.g., see Fisher and Subba, 2016, pp. 47, 95).

30 I highly recommend the integral approach to defining and solving “wicked problems” as presented by Watkins and Wilber (2015).
and discourses) exist that promote “Love” (or compassion) is the only solution. In all my writing (and Wilber, Maslow, Subba, and Four Arrows agree)—Love is not enough. Astute experts on the psychology of fear (e.g., Overstreet, 1951/71, p. 11) have demarked the common problem of defining “love” in the first place because it typically (in modern North America, at least) is so infiltrated with “fear,” due to fear taking on diverse and clever “disguises” to even hide itself in forms of love, hope, courage, etc. My work is all about these “compound” and/or “complex” notions of Fear (i.e., ‘Fear’), not a simple or thin fear concept or fears as is typically what most authors/teachers utilize. Fear management/education today demands a whole lot more than what our past history has offered us. The critical analysis and subtle solutions require great nuance and sophistication—including a critical literacy up-grade of Love-Fear. I’ll argue that further in a moment.

Let’s first listen to Wilber (1995), who gives us an insightful heads-up on the generic problematics of complexity in general systems, specifically cultural evolution and the susceptibility to cultural pathology (e.g., biophobia, or what some today are calling the “culture of fear” and/or “risk society” as the basic postmodern background/texture in which we are raising our children for an unsustainably toxic, insane and terrifying future). No intention here to overly scare anyone because we actually have good solutions to all this mess. Yet, we can’t be shy. We have to name-it and face-it without denial (i.e., ‘Fear’ itself)—and, sure, it can feel pretty scary at first to do so (“waking up” to full-existential-reality is not something our Western society has fostered particularly well for centuries).

31 For a nuanced fear analysis of Marianne Williamson’s leadership/teaching re: Love vs. Fear (and, Love is the solution, according the esoteric book A Course in Miracles), see Fisher and Subba (2016, pp. xxxi-xlvi).

32 The culture of fear problematic is critical to all my work from the beginning in 1989. See any of my publications, and/or search on the Internet (e.g., Wikipedia) to understand more of what this term (theory) “culture of fear” is about. Any fear management/education (and/or curriculum) has to look seriously at this meta-context or else coping with fear models and techniques will be nearly useless to ‘turn-around’ the Fear Problem.

33 Wilber (2017) has become particularly adept in his Integral theory with using terms like “Waking Up” and “Growing Up” and “Showing Up,” which I highly recommend to provide a critical literacy on development/evolution and our tasks for “Cleaning Up” the messes we’ve created as a modern species (especially). He also warns of “transcendence” approaches (e.g., meditation, mindfulness practices, yoga, etc.) via what some are calling “spiritual bypassing” (pathologies) in the transpersonal realms and/or theosphere (e.g., p. 480).
Wilber (1995) wrote dialectically of pathology in developmental (evolutionary) terms with the real and metaphorical notion of “cancers” (aka dysfunctions and/or pathologies) in the biosphere (bad enough) but then in the more complex systems of the noosphere (really bad news):

[T]he fact that evolution always produces great [growth] transcendence \( [Eros = \text{Unity-drive} = \text{Sun}] \) and greater differentiation means that a factor [probability] of possible [growth] pathology is built into every evolutionary step, because transcendence can go too far and become repression \( [Phobos = \text{"neurotic loop" in Fig. 1}] \) — the higher [level-structure] does not negate and preserve the lower [via healthy differentiation], it [rather] tries only to negate (or repress or deny) the lower [junior], which works about as well as denying our feet. Likewise, differentiation [Agape] can go too far and become dissociation [Thanatos] — a failure to adequately integrate the newly emergent differences into a coherent whole that is both internally cohesive and externally in harmony with other correlative holons and with all junior components [levels]. Whenever a new differentiation is not matched by a new and equal integration, whenever there is negation without preservation [i.e., disconnect], the result is pathology of one sort or another, a pathology that, if severe enough, evolution sets about to erase in earnest. This becomes particularly [troublesome and] acute in the noosphere, in cultural evolution, simply because the human holon contains so many levels of depth — physiosphere and biosphere and noosphere — and something can go wrong at every level [p. 103].... Instead of transcendence, repression; instead of differentiation, dissociation; instead of depth, disease.... the history of cultural evolution is the history of new achievement, the history of new disease [i.e., a dialectic of progress]. (p. 104)

And Wilber (1995) reminded us that it is a history of “new hopes and new fears” (p. 104) (at each level) as well; and, equally a history of new fear management methods/systems to handle them — and, ongoing dialectic of progress, with its up-sides and down-sides. The dialectic of Love-Fear in this sense then is driven as a ‘corrective’ (‘balance’) by Fearlessness — as itself a meta-Fear Management System (Fisher, 2010, p. 151). But that all would not be so bad in particular, if it weren’t for the growth of the ‘cancer’ called ‘Fear.’ So, my point is that even if the classical discourse on Love vs. Fear had become outmoded (somewhat) — as is my critique here — and, a better up-grade is to move to a Subbaian, Wilberian, Four Arrowsian view of Love-Fear as a dialectic of progress — yet, we are still confronted with the insidious virulence of unprecedented proportion in
complex cultural systems—that is, ongoing accumulative cultural ‘Fear’ production systems (e.g., “culture of fear,” “organized fear trade”\textsuperscript{34} and ‘Fear’ Matrix\textsuperscript{35} complexes). This latter virulent phenomenon, arguably, is something our species has been not well equipped to manage or transform so easily, not by Love, not by “soft” management technologies, etc. My colleagues’ theories fall short at this juncture. We require an absolute radical re-visioning, in order to include something more—call it the 	extit{Shadow of Love-Fear}. I’ll get to that in a moment.

So, let’s first look at my most recent and final Love-Fear diagram for this paper, published in an international critical pedagogy journal (Fisher, 2017), Figure 4:

![Figure 4 Towards a Trialectic Theory of Love-Fearlessness-Fear](image)

This Figure 4 is the last of a logical sequence of four diagrams re: Love vs. Fear (first two based on linear binary formation Love > Fear, and Fear > Love) and a shift to a third dialectic Love and Fear model, and finally Figure 4 as trialectic. I am not going to give you the details here, as this paper is available free online. It is a critique I created 	extit{via} critical fearanalysis of how critical pedagogues were using Paulo Freire’s notion of “radical love” and how they all (in a special issue of the journal) tended to fall into the trap of understanding Love > Fear (i.e., Love is greater than Fear). This latter discourse formation is by far the most common not only in the criti-

\textsuperscript{34} A concept coined by Massumi (1993), p. viii.
\textsuperscript{35} See my dissertation, for e.g., Fisher (2003).
ca pedagogy literature but much of the Human Potential/New Age movements as well. It’s very popular and simple. I basically argued we need dialectic and trialectic models/theories to understand the Love-Fear relationship accurately in the 21st century. The trialectic involves adding Fearlessness into (between) the Love-Fear dynamic. Note, however, I did not go into the finer detail in the critical pedagogy critique—that is, I did not discuss ‘Fear’ (as in the “neurotic loop” of Figure 1).

Fear without the (’) marks is, according to Subba and Four Arrows, not the problem, but how we manage that Fear is what causes our problems. And, I can respect the basic wisdom of their models. Yet, that guidance alone is insufficient, if not distortive, as it tends to reductionism by locating all the dimensions of Fear into the individual’s perceptions and mind (i.e., psychology of fear). Wilber’s AQAL Matrix (i.e., Integral Theory) prevents that kind of reductionism, as does my own fearanalysis (a la integral). Wilber’s Phobos-Thanatos (Fear) developmental dynamics relative to Eros-Agape (Love) is not taken into account either in the simplified more common fear management/education discourses and theories (especially, in the Western world). Remember, Love-Fear is viewed in this paper from a kosmocentric perspective, not an individual psychological (somatocentric, egocentric or sociocentric perspective). We require, as in the trialectic theory (Figure 4) at least worldcentric perspective and preferrably also kosmocentric. Simply, we are required to bring a higher consciousness to how we research, understand and apply fear management/education in general.

36 There is a plethora of discourses on fear management/education in the self-help public sphere (less so in the academic sphere) that repeats this notion as if some ‘wisdom’ or ‘mantra’ is being uttered—that, it will help us all get through this mess and resolve “your fears”—however, thank goodness Subba nor Four Arrows are nearly so naive in their discourse and in their philosophies. The larger Fear Problem is more complex. Point being, there is a common default and simplification that is viral out there in the world that wants to simplify the complex and “wicked” problem that Fear (now ‘Fear’) has become. Psychology in general as a discipline and as popular culture genre of literature has played right into this fallacy, of which I critique constantly and recommend you do as well.

37 Granted, to be fair, Four Arrows’ is also particularly concerned about “worldview” as the operative and most important determinant of how individuals behave and think. However, his predominant change-focus and interventions are still the individual and their psychology. This is not surprising as he is a trained health psychologist.

38 Sorry to load you with this Integral Theory vocabulary re: AQAL Matrix and the worldview labels of egocentric, sociocentric and so forth, but there is not space in this paper to delineate those terms and methodology of Wilber (read his original works for details).
The ‘Cancer’ Called ‘Fear’: Facing the Shadow

It ought to be clear by this point that I have integrated the best of my colleagues work on Fear and the best of the plethora of literature on fear management and especially on the Love and Fear problematique. At least, I am presuming that after decades of systematic study of this literature, I have gathered the “best” in it, while more or less tossing the less useful and distortive aspects.

My assessment is that the Fear Problem (more accurately, the ‘Fear’ Project and ‘Fear’ Matrix) confronts us like no other “wicked” problem. So, easily, I see the analogous (and homologous) link with the historical and insidious problem of “evil” (that is, the classical Good-Evil problematique). If Fear and Love are metamotivations as much of the wisdom literature suggests around the world and through time, then what happens if ‘Fear’ (with the ‘ marks) is also a metamotivation and not only that, it has the capacity as a ‘Fear’ virus meta-pattern to deconstruct and reconstruct the very ‘balance’ of the Love-Fear dialectic? Wilber (1995) did a marvelous job to disclose such a capability of transformation of Love to Fear (see below—and his therapia). So, we end up with a whole other ‘beast’ (i.e., something like ‘Evil’) on our hands, so to speak.

This is where my work takes the road less traveled, is unique—and, true enough, is rather, speculative (theoretical) when referring to the ‘cancer’ called ‘Fear.’ I will say only in mention, without detailed explanation, that ‘fear’ and/or ‘Fear’ is a result of a modern, postmodern and post-postmodern approach to the subject/object I took on in 1989 as study—that is, fear itself. Things got complex as I integrated the diverse knowledges

---

39 The original inspiration, if you could call it that, for founding the In Search of Fearlessness Project was (in part) the naming of the ‘Fear’ Project. I published my first academic article on “The Fear Project” in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology 20 years ago and no one has picked up on that conception since. I claimed that Ken Wilber’s work was most powerful because he was articulating the “Atman project” and “Dualism-Repression-Projection” as two core ontological complexes/realities beneath his theories of knowledge—I merely called them “The Fear Project” if you come right down to it (Fisher, 1997a, p. 65).

40 In Fisher & Subba (2016), the notion of Carl Jung’s concern about the “problem of evil” is linked with the Shadow and what we ought not to forget what we are dealing with in addressing the global Fear Problem (p. xxii). Note: Wilber’s later works have offered very particular ways to do shadow-work, and I greatly appreciate that initiative; however, I think it remains far too Upper-Left Quadrant (i.e., quadrantitis) if you look at his Shadow 3–2–1 method. That’s another long critique I have of Integral Theory and its ‘heady’ spiritualizing in general, and the Integral Movement overall likewise—that is, it really doesn’t do shadow-work very well (see Masters, 2010 excellent critique re: “spiritual bypassing”).
available and “tested” my own experiences and others’ as well as reflected on the cognitive aspects of my theorizing. This is an ongoing evolution. I don’t expect there will ever be an end when I (or anyone) finally says, “Okay, enough research, we now understand what fear is!”

Take a moment to review my description earlier of Figure 1 and the “neurotic loop” patterning, or ‘Fear’ pattern (i.e., rebel path/vacuum center). Take a moment to re-read Wilber (1995) that I quoted at length earlier. This split-loop dynamic can occur, theoretically at any position on the full-spiral form of Path of Progress and Path of Return. There is a longer explanation that I offer on why the pull-out and abandonment of this cancerous loop. The nutshell is that it is because we are hurt in life (speaking primarily about humans) and if we don’t heal the hurt(s) they accumulate and do so because of both suppression and repression dynamics—thus, creating an unconscious Shadow on the Path of Return side of the Love cycle (Figure 1). When we arrive at the junction of “turning” from Path of Progress (always going up up up), then we face aspects of that long-repressed woundedness (Shadow)—of which psychoanalysis had a good sense of this problem—and we continue to deny, diss, abandon (i.e., dissociate from) the natural path of going down down down into that Shadow “mess” we (mostly) created in the first place due to suppression-repression dynamics. Our oppressive society in general (referring to the West) encourages little if any depth work on the Path of Return. That’s part of the cultural pathology I am addressing with the formation of ‘Fear.’

The neurotic (vacuum-centered) loop can “drain” energy from the Unibi-centric (Source) construction. We have to pump a lot of energy into that loop to keep it “up” from Returning naturally to the Source-1. Using all that energy creates excess pollution (wastes). That’s a basic ontological summary of Western modern scientific technological society. We use excess energy to “stay up” erect and tall and “keep going up” (phallic-projection) and hate to “go down” with anything. We’re workaholics mostly and are currently driven by Phobos ascendant forces more than Eros (at least, theoretically). Each point of such a ‘Fear’-based neurotic patterning is like a “cancer” growing inside your body, but this time it is growing in the body of the Kosmos as a mega-system and no matter where it is it affects all Life, more or less. No one escapes the negative impact. Now, Wilber’s view has focused mainly (but not exclusively) on the developmental problematic of complex systems and how the ‘Fear’ patterns get set up (my words) when processes of differentiation become dissociation (to keep things simple). Healthy growth can become unhealthy growth (i.e., a ‘cancerous’ pattern). The cancer pattern converts the normal healthy cell,
for instance, in the biosphere dimension, into itself (a replica). Diversity is reduced to homogeneity (the classic fast growing “lump” of all the same cells). ‘Fear’ does the same thing to diversity, and to Love.

Wilber however describes the ‘Fear’ Project(ion) better in some of his earlier publications, beyond the scope of this paper (see Fisher, 1997a, pp. 65-66). To be clear, neither Wilber nor I are talking about fear as only an emotion/feeling; far from it. However, Wilber still tends to remain so brightly focused on a kosmocentric perspective (via an evolutionary/developmental structuralist view) that he negates often to adequately talk about real “trauma” (hurting) as feeding the very dissociation—which is ultimately a self-reinforcing pattern of unhealed trauma in living systems which creates more trauma. We have to deal with that Shadow as Jung and many others in depth psychology have told us for decades. The problem Wilber does not mention is the construction in cultural evolution, and accumulating unhealed painful traumatic memories of a System of Coping (or coping paradigm, for short). This coping paradigm (as default, in a coping culture) eventually forgets even what healing is, though the natural instinct is always there following the Kosmic dictum: When hurts appear, so then does healing. You can see the parallel of the earlier dictum: When fear appears, so then does fearlessness. No wonder several people, like myself, are calling for us to transform the coping culture into a healing culture (synonymous with turning a culture of fear into a culture of fearlessness).

The speculative theory: is that when Fearlessness is suppressed in a “culture of fear” (or say, ‘Fear’ Matrix) then so is healing suppressed. This oppression of healing and Fearlessness gets internalized psycho-culturally and politically (if not spiritually) and causes and drives the coping paradigm to become dominant. It is a disastrous movement to lose the healing paradigm, which ought to be dominant. The Indigenous cultures still practicing the ‘old ways’ are well aware of this problem. It is a cycle of hurting/violence (i.e., traumatization) that is accumulative in human history through time—more or less—and, here and there, depending on conditions and worldviews in various cultures and regions of the planet. The message: We cannot talk about “fear” without talking about “hurting.” We cannot talk about “evil” without talking about both fear/hurting (i.e., ‘Fear’). How

---

41 Wilber’s training and bent is not as a clinician but a theorist, so this bright focus ought not be taken as a way to write-off his sometimes more abstract theorizing and philosophy. For more practical applications Wilber et al. offer, see “Integral Life Practices” on the Internet.
to turn all this mess around, is the big therapeutic and political challenge. Liberation and freedom, democracy and healthy communities depend on us figuring out solutions to the Shadow. I think that seeing ‘Fear’ as oppressively colonizing in the negative sense, is a good re-frame of the mute popular, biological, psychological and even sociological accounts of fear that dominate current discourses. The acute critiques of the postmodern sociologist, Bauman (2007), for e.g., have brought “fear” into a whole new genre of rhetoric, a new trope and reference point for the 21st century—see his clever metaphor which asserts our major problem is “liquid fear” that infiltrates (i.e., colonizes) everything.

So, with this brief analysis of ‘Fear’ (post-Wilberian), you have my ‘Big Picture’ view of the Love-Fear issue. My own thought has evolved from at first accepting the adequacy and value of the Love vs. Fear discourse(s) in the wisdom traditions and even in current teachings (e.g., A Course in Miracles) to then adopting a more critical dialectical perspective/theory as Love-Fear (e.g., Figure 4). However, with the notion of the ‘cancer’ called ‘Fear’ in the mix, a further evolutionary ‘corrective’ is needed that is more profound than Love-Fear. And, at this point, I’m still working on it but I believe the idea of creating an ontopsychosocial therapy or what Wilber (1995) called therapia will guide us best because it is rooted in philosophical analysis as much as psychological and sociological analysis. And, in order to be fully holistic-integral when working with the Shadow, we have to include the arts and hard sciences and just about every kind of knowledge, knowing and understanding we can. This is the integrative and integral sensibility of inclusion in research and education required for a quality fear management/education for the 21st century.

---

42 Follow the developmental/evolutionary structuralist approach (i.e., “deep structures”), Wilber (1995) argued that at each level of shift in complexity (a new ‘rung’): “each discovery of a new and deeper context and meaning [revealed and developed leads to]... discovery of a new therapia, namely, we must shift our perspectives, deepen our perception, often against a great deal of [Shadow] resistance, to embrace the deeper [higher] and wider context. The self is situated in contexts within contexts within contexts, and each shift in context is an often painful [fearful] process of growth, of a death to a shallow[er] context and rebirth to a deeper one” (p. 73). The implication of a better therapia is one that is not merely human-constructed, at least as Wilber outlines how this works from the kosmocentric perspective. If truly integrated into current theories of psychotherapy or spiritual direction, therapia would improve the therapeutic interventions by a quantum leap—because we’d be working with the Love-Fear ontological and “ecological” dynamic overall. That is, we’d be with the Kosmos not against it.
Abraham Maslow’s Most Forgotten Work

I end here with a bit of reprieve from the highly abstract/speculative writing. I return to Maslow’s research in the psychology of human motivation and potential (especially in 1950s-60s). The short of my study of late, is that it is highly distorting to focus on Maslow’s research/theory of “Hierarchy of Needs” as what is best in his long career as a ‘great’ American psychologist of the 20th century. I much rather find his work on Love and Fear (my words) far more of a gift to humanity. We have much to learn from his revelationary (if not revolutionary) discovery of B-cognition/values and D-cognition/values. I won’t go into all the fine details of the linkages between his work and Wilber’s—but there are many developmental overlaps. And, equally, there is still my critique of Wilber’s rather abstracted developmental-structuralist focus on defining pathologies and dysfunctions (and Fear metamotivational forces)—I would also apply to Maslow’s theories. To be sure, the much younger Wilber had followed at times in the tracks and advances that Maslow was making at the ‘edge’ via the generation of revelations about the highest levels of human potential. I wish to give Maslow’s work its due in terms of the Love-Fear problematique. To be sure, Maslow’s naming of the idea, and study of “metamotivation” is why his work is so important to my own.

To keep this short, Maslow’s work on B- and D- cognition/values (or consciousness, or worldviews) is pertinent because they are dialectically related for him; a finding, he discovered based on empirical evidence for the most part. He recognized a spectrum (as did Wilber) of consciousness levels or structures/stages in human development that are available to all; however, because of being born without time to develop, we all start on the bottom rung of the hierarchy (Wilber calls holarchy) of cognition capabilities. Most good developmental psychologists know this hierarchy is real—even if how we try to research and describe it may be incomplete, partial if not somewhat flawed. Simple systems evolve into complex systems, etc.

Anyways, Maslow found that a series of levels (rungs) on the developmental path are similar even right up into adulthood. They have general-

---

43 Any poststructuralists will cringe with this term “rung” as if on a linear, fixed, genetically-preconditioned “ladder” or “hierarchy.” This is not at all what Maslow, or Wilber or I mean developmentally—for, evolution works in spirals not linear fixity so concretely as a “ladder.” The organic reality beneath the metaphoric language of what is being spoken of is even ‘messy’ (as surface “structures” and dynamics occur) as all good developmentalists know—yet, universal “deeper structures” are quite identifiable, albeit, more “hidden,” and more stable entities/platforms (assemblages), if you will.
ized qualities that are universal, despite the surface differences. So, he systematically plotted those same characteristics and ended up concluding that most all of ‘normal’ human development is Deficit-based cognition/values (D-cognition/values, for short). His discussion of these D-values is based on “need” (or “lack”) that centralizes around somatic (body) and ego (mind) aspects of concerns. And, profoundly, he observed they are all, more or less, fear-based in motivation. He interpreted these as “immature.” You ought to read his work on this to really feel into it.

I immediately see fear-based as similar to what Wilber (and others) have called these common (‘normal’) developmental stages “first-tier” structure/stages that we all have to work through from birth onward. That’s part of growing up. Unfortunately, Maslow underplayed the hurting/coping cycle dynamic that is infiltrating that developmental sequencing (e.g., he didn’t fully understand the “culture of fear” phenomenon, at least explicitly, though I am sure he intuitively knew it). He did conclude that our culture (meaning, American culture at the time) seemed to support only these D-values (one could easily call them F-values for Fear). And what about Maslow’s findings regarding Love?

Without a doubt Maslow talked and theorized about love (and/or Love). I am no expert on his work, though, most compelling to me is that he was finding something more nuanced in the “higher” levels of the human being’s capacities and “human nature”—see, for e.g., his peak-experiences research (e.g., Maslow, 1964). Maslow found a huge contrast in D-cognition/values as metamotivation from Being cognition/values (B-values). I would call these Love cognition/values (L-values). To wrap-up, I quote a wonderful paragraph on what I see Maslow (1964) is calling for in human growth and development theories and curriculum—of which, I think is a practical goal to aim for today:

The cognition of being (B-cognition) that occurs in peak-experiences

---

44 In fairness to Maslow and his generation after WWII, there was little to no research (or even naming) of the phenomena “culture of fear”—this, only became labeled and studied more commonly around the early to mid-1990s in the West (as far as I know, with a few rare exceptions as early as mid-1980s in Latin America and North America). However, Ernest Becker’s work in the 1960s-70s (e.g., Becker, 1973) was a pioneer in revealing (implicitly) what I would now call the ‘Fear’ Matrix and “culture of fear” as meta-contexts and metamotivational templates for development and culture especially. I don’t know if Maslow ever read Becker. I know Wilber has, and Wilber respects Becker and cited him often in the early years (1980s) of his career.
tends to perceive external objects, the world, and individual people as more detached from human concerns [needs]. Normally we perceive everything as relevant to human concerns and more particularly to our own private selfish concerns. In the peak-experiences, we become more detached, more objective, and are more able to perceive the world as if it were independent not only of the perceiver but even of human beings in general. The [B-] perceiver can more readily look upon nature as if it were there in itself and for itself, not simply as if it were a human playground put there for human purposes. [S]he can more easily refrain from [need-driven, deficit-driven, fear-driven] projecting human purposes upon it. In a word, he can see it in its own Being (as an end in itself) rather than as something to be used or something to be afraid of or something to wish for or to be reacted to in some other personal, human, self-centered way. That is to say, B-cognition, because it makes human irrelevance more possible, enables us thereby to see more truly the nature of the object in itself..... Which is to say it [perception] becomes more object-centered [i.e., worldcentric] than ego-centered [i.e., egocentric and/or sociocentric].” (pp. 71-71)

If Love is not enough, then let’s make B-cognition/values the way to go to start heading in a better direction (better therapia) than we are as societies (particularly, I’m criticizing the modern non-Indigenous societies). B-cognition/values most closely overlap with Four Arrows’ (2016) depictions of the Indigenous worldview.

However, we are left with what to make sense of ‘Fear’ in the Love-Fear schema and problematic, as well as the Indigenous-Western encounter in worldviews. There is so much more to be discussed and we require dialogues and lots of space and support to talk about and study Love and Fear and ‘Fear.’ Fisher (2006) was my academic publication that set out the initial architecture for ‘Fear’ Studies and ought to be essential reading for those of you with similar interests. I have set forth in this technical paper and synthesis some “directions” (goals) for humanity. It is an ethical imperative to better understand these dynamics (i.e., “ecology” of metamotivations). I conclude where I began this paper:

*If we don’t adopt the language/theory of Love-Fear, we'll end up by default with the destructive language/theory of Good vs. Evil.*

My point is, the Good vs. Evil (dualism) discourse hegemony, even if unconscious, is the default (at least, in the West). Using the very common
Love vs. Fear discourse will only continue to reinforce the Good vs. Evil discourse. At least, that’s the hypothesis I am suggesting here. I am not saying don’t use the Love vs. Fear, but don’t rely on it.

Yes, I realize my up-grade to Love-Fear (from Love vs. Fear) is still an inadequate *therapia*. This paper points to the requirement to include ‘Fear’ (analogous, if not homologous to ‘Evil’). This latter move on my part will thus return me into a rather conservative positioning on all levels (e.g., moral and political spheres). I do think we need firm (if not strategic) binaries (at times) when addressing certain phenomena (Wilber would agree)—even while admitting, as the postmodernists do, that binaries are often the nastiest (and fear-based) ways of making sense of reality. I have offered a ‘moral compass’ *via* the Uni-Bicentric Theorem and only applications and time will tell if it is particularly useful. What we best ought not forget is that the Fearlessness Movement has been around forever and will be as long as Life exists on planet Earth. I task is to find the best communicative ways to work with this System and Movement, not against it.

*Love vs. ‘Fear’* is the formation that is emerging from this synthesis—an ethical (“conservative”) move to reclaim the binary when addressing human cognition and values—that is, worldviews. By introducing the healing paradigm into the ‘corrective’ (*therapia*) as well as the developmental ‘corrective’ (*a la* Wilber, Maslow), as well as the philosophy of fearism (*a la* Subba) and Fearlessness (*via* CAT-FAWN, *a la* Four Arrows and the Indigenous perspective)—all combined, I am fairly sure we can effectively go after dismantling the ‘Fear’ Matrix. Let’s do it!

****

---

45 I would have to make a case for this, but it is very clear that Wilber is not afraid to use the term “evil” in his work, nor to make the binary distinctions, like between “healthy” and “unhealthy.” How exactly we ought to View that binary and enact it in applied ways, that is a much more complex debate and he would want to do it “skillfully” and without (ideally) creating excessive dualisms (i.e., more fear-based productions). However, I have found that he can take other (if not contrary) positions to his own nondual (non-binary) positioning—and, become quite adept at cutting through with the sword like the Sacred Warrior he is, *via* some particular binary distinction or another—but, that’s another analysis for another time.
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