
My Educational Philosophy of Fear Education: Early 1980s



R. Michael Fisher

© 2021

Technical Paper No. 124

In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute

My Educational Philosophy of Fear Education: Early
1980s

Copyright 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the publisher/author. No permission is necessary in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews, or other educational or research purposes. For information and permission address correspondence to:

In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute
920A- 5 Ave. N. E., Calgary, AB
T2E 0L4

Contact author(s):

r.michaelfisher52@gmail.com

First Edition 2021

Cover and layout by R. Michael Fisher
ISOF Logo (original 1989) designed by RMF

Printed in Canada

The In Search of Fearlessness Institute is dedicated to research and publishing on fear, fearlessness and emotions and motivational forces, in general, as well as critical reviews of such works. Preference is given to works with an integral theoretical perspective.

My Educational Philosophy of Fear Education: Early 1980s

R. Michael Fisher,¹ Ph.D.

©2021

Technical Paper No. 124

Autobiographical Reflections

I have just spent the last three hours in bed in a hypnopompic state of consciousness that elicited a good deal of ideas about where to start a book on 'my philosophy of education' at the age of 69. I got up at 3:30 am to urinate and drink a bit of water. My body, not my mind, was ready to go back to sleep.

Earlier that night I took out some old files of writing and articles I've stored for decades on philosophy of education. I was preparing to write my next book, my fourth one this year, entitled: *The Fear Problematique: Role of Philosophy of Education in Speaking Truths to Power in a Culture of Fear* (Information Age Publishing). I'm pretty jazzed with this project obviously, as it is my first 'real official' book on educational philosophy in the field of Philosophy of Education.

¹ Fisher is a former Adjunct Faculty member of the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary, AB, Canada. He is an artist, educator and fearologist and co-founder of In Search of Fearlessness Project (1989-) and Research Institute (1991-) and lead initiator of the Fearlessness Movement ning (2015-) and founder and Senior Editor of the *International Journal of Fear Studies*. The Fearology Institute was created by him recently to teach international students about fearology as a legitimate field of studies and profession. He is also founder of the Center for Spiritual Inquiry & Integral Education and is Department Head at CSIE of Integral & 'Fear' Studies. He has written and co-written and published several books, for example: *The World's Fearlessness Teachings: A critical integral approach to fear management/education for the 21st century* (University Press of America/Rowman & Littlefield), *Philosophy of fearism: A first East-West dialogue* (Xlibris) and *Fearless engagement of Four Arrows: The true story of an Indigenous-based social transformer* (Peter Lang), *Fear, law and criminology: Critical issues in applying the philosophy of fearism* (Xlibris); *India, a Nation of Fear and Prejudice* (Xlibris); *The Marianne Williamson Presidential Phenomenon* (Peter Lang); *Resistances to Fearlessness* (Xlibris). He can be reached at: r.michaelfisher52@gmail.com

Typically in my past, when I wrote proposals and/or other works on philosophy of education they've been rejected by book publishers, journal editors, reviewers and the like. On top of that set of scars, any actual face-to-face exchanges with academic and professional philosophers of Education at universities I attended or in conferences, characteristically didn't go well. I was usually as critical about their narrow-minded and uncreative philosophical thinking (judgement) about my work as they were critical of my 'amateur' work. It was like trying to mix water and oil. During my Ph.D. (Philosophy of Education) degree (2000-03) I was so disenchanted by this conflict with academics that I "divorced" them all and the whole field of Philosophy and Education.

Despite this past tenuous relationship with so-called "philosophers" of education, I was excited to go into reading my old notes late at night. First, was a number of quotes I'd jotted down decades ago from a book called *Therapeutic Education* by Devereux (1956). Although, his book was "an interdisciplinary science, which seeks to accomplish therapeutic aims by educational means,"² I really liked the interdisciplinary attitude and cool title. He is not an educational philosopher *per se* but he is offering philosophizing about the important role of "education" within the field of therapeutics of all kinds.

I liked his critique of the dominating so-called "remedial" correctives of behaviorism and a good deal of psychotherapies as well. His vision for a *deep* therapeutic education was to intervene into "defective ego functions,"³ of which today I would call *fear-based* defense mechanisms and personalities, etc. At least, that's some of what I gathered from my notes. I don't recall having read the book thoroughly but rather scanned it, took some notes and moved on. I do this a lot as my research methodology, rarely reading whole books or articles from start to finish. I'm rather looking for specific things to record and treasure for my library. I collect (especially, fear-) quotes by the tens of thousands. It would take too long otherwise, several life-times in fact, to read everything I'm interested in thoroughly. This is especially problematic when one is a transdisciplinary thinker like I am.

It's my pragmatic solution, even if not an ideal one. Reflecting on my gathering methodology in this moment gives me some insight to why

² Devereux (1956), p. 55.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

professional philosophers may find my philosophical writing unconventional and superficial even—for typically they are trained in the old school of slow deep study and thorough reading of the canonical texts of the ‘great’ (mostly dead White male) philosophers—and, especially of those in their chosen field of philosophical inquiry—e.g., in Philosophy of Education. Sure, not all philosophers do this. However, I have not developed as an amateur philosopher at all by that disciplinary tradition and means,⁴ and thus I see myself always as an outsider looking-in; yet, I feel I have a lot to offer the field of philosophy and educational work and *visa versa*.

Back to last night. I had a whole lot of other articles in my old folder I could have picked for reading last night but because it was writing by George Devereux I was particularly enthralled to start there as preparation for my own new philosophy of education book and a focus on the issue of *fear*, which I believe ought to be at the top of the list of priorities of all Education, therapeutics and otherwise. My inquiry for the new book is on how the Fear Problem(atique) is addressed or not by philosophers and educators. I have a significant connection to Devereux’s work, which began in 1981 when I discovered a marvelous humanistic methodology book with lots of brazen philosophical thinking in it that was intended as a massive critique of hegemonic sciences, including behavioral and human sciences methodologies and their paradigms. I love that kind of critical writing/thinking, as I agreed with the editors⁵ of that book entitled *Human Inquiry*, that we need new ways of thinking how to do research.

We need new ways of thinking how to make research *truly educational*, and yes, a step further—to make it transformative and liberational. I’ll never forget the title of one of the essays (Torbert) entitled: “Why Educational Research Has Been So Uneducational.” Dare I say, up to that point of my professional career studying Education for a BEd. degree and becoming a certified school teacher (1978-80), I found most everything I read on education research so boring and obvious, I kept asking: “why do people do studies of things we all already know the answer to?” What a waste of time. But I also had to ask myself what gets in the way from creating critical and raw philosophizing and researching methodologies that would really get down to core truths being revealed. That is, finding out knowledge and knowing, understanding, that really critiques untruths and

⁴ For good or ill, I’m not sure, the fact is I have never taken (completed) an official post-secondary Philosophy course in my life.

⁵ Reason & Rowan (1981).

upends the old (false) assumptions and traditions of what we think is “educational.”

That’s where George Devereux came into my intellectual life, even if only briefly then in 1981—fact is, I have often cited his work ever since in my writing on fear/anxiety and its role in knowledge construction. By the way, I have always chosen to roll anxiety into fear and call everything related “fear.”⁶ That’s why Fear Education is my aim not Anxiety Education. The longer argument for that methodological and philosophical move is complicated and beyond the scope of this paper but you can find rationale for this in many of my published works. Simply, anxiety, guilt, and shame are *cousins* of fear (and ‘fear’), for my purposes.

In the *Human Inquiry* book, Chapter Seven, how could I forget Rowan’s (1981) first sentence in describing Devereux’s (1967) book:

This is a book about countertransference in social science.⁷

For most readers the meaning, never mind the radical implication of that one sentence, will be rather elusive. My point in this Tech Paper 124 is not to give a full articulation of Devereux’s writing. I’m rather pointing to an autobiographical and intellectual moment of immense insight and puzzlement for me. I had not the where-with-all and maturity to fully take in Rowan’s essay in those days. I knew Rowan somewhat from other writing he did on transpersonal psychotherapy and his familiarity with Re-evaluation Co-Counseling theory and practice,⁸ which I had been involved in since the early 1980s. But Rowan must have known how controversial his interpreting of Devereux, even in the one sentence opener, would be for

⁶ Kagan (1998), for example, is a psychologist-theorist who supports this more or less because he argues convincingly that it is a mess in the field of psychology in terms of defining “fear” and many researchers do not agree nor can show that there is a clear difference between anxiety and fear—it’s a fuzzy line. My own work on distinguishing fear from ‘fear’ is even more complex and fuzzy, and thus I offer no one clear (clinical) definition for *fear* as you will typically find in standard textbooks, dictionaries and encyclopedias.

⁷ Rowan (1981), p. 77.

⁸ E.g., Jackins (1965), with his roots of experimenting on healing in the 1940s-50s, offers an effective radical grass-roots adult education (movement) in emancipation and liberation for all peoples. This has greatly shaped my ongoing philosophy of life and how I live it daily. I have also taught this work, *via* a modification I have (with my partner Barbara Bickel) called Liberation Peer Counseling (LPC).

researchers and/or philosophers. The resistance and even denial of the claim would be enormous.

Only decades later in my graduate school studies on Education as knowledge production and consumption, did I return to re-read Rowan's take on Devereux. Recall that Devereux's 1956 book nearly 20 years earlier was on *therapeutic education* (primarily for clinicians), so he had been crafting a theory about therapeutics for a long time as well as thinking critically how therapeutics is applied in all sciences in some way. Specially, as Rowan asserts, it was a profound finding of Devereux's, with a unique therapeutics theory behind it drawing somewhat from psychoanalytic (Freudian) theory, that "research situations stir up anxieties."⁹ And, anxiety—that is fear—has immensely powerful implications in terms of how research questions are chosen, shaped, and how methodologies are designed, and how philosophies behind those questions and methodologies are also influenced by fear. Fear/Knowledge/Power go together.¹⁰ Right on!

Now, this is my kind of deep critical investigation material. This is in the field of Fear Studies and Fear Education work. Devereux was a pioneer here, as far as I am concerned. I simply cannot take more time and space to pursue this autobiographical vignette here. Suffice it to say, based on Devereux (and others) I began a long-time questioning of just how much fear influences Philosophy (and Education) and its methods, and knowledge? I'll return to that later. Suffice it to say in the moment, as a critic and fearanalyst, it is my interest to ask not what philosophy can offer to fear study, but what fear study can offer to philosophy—a dialectical, mutually transforming possibility. But it will only be mutual if philosophy itself is willing to look deeply enough in the 'mirror' (shadow) of its own practices to see how fear shapes philosophy practices themselves.

So, while lying in bed for three hours a number of other vignettes arose which I thought worth putting in this autobiographical introduction. I've

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ I am also very interested in applying the philosopher Michel Foucault's work here whenever one talks about knowledge/power, then we have to also include fear in that combination, especially if we draw anything from Devereux's work but also Maslow (1966). I have more drawn on Maslow's early work in his critique of cognitive pathologies (i.e., defensive, fear-based "deficit-motivated" implications) in the Sciences. See my other writings citing Maslow, which by the way is the topic of Chapter Eight in (Reason & Rowan, 1981)—and, this introduction to Maslow through *Human Inquiry* is something I'll be forever grateful of.

since, weeks later now, forgotten. I was finishing another book project, so I got distracted from this technical paper and now, I'll move to the crux of this paper which is to say something about where my philosophy of fear and education was heading as early as c. 1982-3. Because in my files that night I found a hand-written piece, which was never published. I'm going to reprint it here because it tells some of my intellectual thoughts close to the bone—of my being. I noticed, in the margins, a red ink quote on this unpublished paper: “It is life near the bone where it is sweetest” (Thoreau, 1973:329).

An Outsider's/Outcast's View of Educational Foundations: A Case Study

-R. M. Fisher, c. 1982-3

[bold added for emphasis in this reprinting only]

“When I talk of foundations it comes to mind that I am speaking of something basic, something deep and structural on which all else is built. When you think of a large modern day towering office building you are captured visually and externally by its immediate size, showiness and ominous character. Big is still beautiful and architects do choose flashy designs and exterior veneers to please the consumer/owner of the building. Yet upon a little reflection, we all know intuitively the ‘beautiful showpiece’ is only as good/useful as is its foundation.

We are not so good at looking for the quality of skyscrapers' foundations. Often they are ‘hidden,’ far below the ground surface, in the cool, dark, damp dirt. These are unpleasant images to even think of, never mind to examine critically. Although, when passing by a great construction site downtown, it is interesting to watch the many curious bystanders (often social outcasts) who cannot resist the curiosity of poking their head through a ‘peep hole’ in the fence surrounding the great hole.

So much of the description above is metaphorical and analogous with educational foundations or foundations of knowledge in general. These foundations (i.e., sense of reality, self-sense, existential meaning and purpose, etc.) are often hidden in the deep dark recesses of the human unconscious/psyche (soul). They are rarely ever talked about at educational meetings of any sort. Yet, like the skyscraper, these foundations are basic, fundamental. They are the structures upon which all following structures

evolve and rest upon. If the foundation is no good, the surface structures will eventually ‘fall.’

Whether we speak about foundations of knowledge or foundations of a building, it is obvious that we, i.e., conscious human beings, created those foundations. But at this point our analogy falls apart. The foundation of a building has a ‘blue print,’ a specific design. This design is usually very carefully and rationally drawn up to be able to withstand the stresses of the surface structures and environmental conditions. So, in essence the ability, flexibility and adaptability of a foundation for a building will determine its longevity, safety and usefulness to the human beings and operations above. but the critical point here is that the foundations of our knowledge systems too are structures which take the stresses of the society and culture that rest upon them. These psychic foundations, if you will, also must be flexible, diverse and adaptable to withstand the cultural/environmental conditions about the surface. Now I must emphasize a major difference here in the creation of building’s foundations and the creation of psychic foundations.

Psychic foundations of knowledge have evolved unconsciously and not yet been designed or consciously co-created on a cultural scale, world scale. We have not been aware of our knowledge foundations as designers/as architects have been with their buildings. We as a humanity have not taken nearly the care in ensuring we have appropriate and good foundations underlying our cultures. These psychic foundations have until only in the last 80 years been hidden from us—we didn’t think to look at them, neither critically or aesthetically. We really have never asked if these foundations of knowledge we created and perpetuate and support are appropriate to our human needs, and I don’t just mean material needs but also existential needs. As educators we have never done this either, and the Educational establishment is one of the main socializing and perpetuating institutions in the modern world.

Educational foundations courses are among the most disliked courses for teachers and administrators to take. I have often heard of the teachers training in college say that those educational [philosophical] foundations courses are too *deep* and impractical. Yuk!

We in the W. world are antipathetic to looking under, inside and behind things in shadows and darkness. We would rather stay on the surface structures, dancing around madly and unsteadily, in the light, while our foundations remain hidden in the dark. And yet we must admit that somehow we have survived for several thousands of years as a culture, so our

foundations must be okay! Well, indeed the foundations of our knowledge systems and our psychic foundations have been adequate at times—but at other times of major cultural crises and declines, the very foundations were inappropriate to the environmental and surface structures at the time—eventually, the whole collapsed. History is full of the rise and fall of specific cultures.

Many authors today are writing about the crisis of our time in the W. world. Symptoms of economic and social/environmental and political decay are reminding us daily of our critical point in time. Could it be as they say, our foundations are old, outdated and no longer appropriate to the modern world? Has our surface structures in our culture grown so rapidly and so high up that our old foundations which did allow for that growth now cannot handle the stresses put upon it? Indeed, this does seem to be the case. But now the fall of our W. world is not isolated, and will bring the entire world down with it. This is because the entire world in the 20th century has become so interdependent economically and ecologically. Modern science and technology have helped to link the world in such a way that has never existed before in history. In the olden days one civilization could fall and many others would survive feeling little effects. No so today, if you doubt what I am saying just think of the potential ‘Nuclear Armageddon’ that exists today—no one wins, we are all in this mess together.

So we are in a unique time of rapid change that is going on all about us, our growth is ‘cancerous’ and unchecked—it is killing the planet, literally. We steadfastly try all our old surface tricks to patch up the decaying structures and education is full of such reforms. Yet we can really see upon deep reflection these are only delaying the inevitable. The unrest, stresses and poisonous symptoms are only increasing. Even though we may stand proudly at times of our success in solving problems—but we always seem to create more problems, often worse.

Let’s shift briefly to the analogy of our building once more. The problems first seem to show up in the surface structures about ground (i.e., rooms, windows, operations, etc.) is where the environmental conditions are most changing and demanding upon the structures and operations. If management or beaucracies feel there is a need to for change they invariably find the easiest, and cheapest, way to accommodate any change. They may add on extra rooms by extending the surface structure or they may just shift, people, furniture or positions around. This change may be at different levels in the building at the top (which is usual) or on the lower levels. But rarely will they decide the problems they are having may originate from the

foundations of the building. Because they don't readily recognize the limitations of the structure of the foundation of the building they may make surface changes (i.e., additions) which will cause the building to topple over—collapse.

I think you can see how this would apply to the Educational establishment. In crude common sense terms, we all know the saying that an organization or system will get itself in trouble when it gets 'top heavy.' My point is that the world so connected now, basically is operating on the same psychic foundations of knowledge. Oh yes! I recognize the different ideologies that exist, but I contend they are surface structures albeit they are lower level floors, but they are not foundations. Just think of the example of the two great superpowers, the U.S. and Russia, we would ordinarily assume they are polar opposites in ideologies, and that is basically true and yet they both have created world destructive arsenals of nuclear weapons and they both function in the world economy and have massive ecological and social problems growing each year. This is because they too have many of the same deep structural foundations as we do in the West. I know you will want me to elaborate on the shared deep psychic/knowledge foundations and I will but first I want to reiterate the main point of this essay.

We, i.e., the world, has come to a unique point in its evolutionary history when we must make the conscious and willful free choice to begin to search inward into the roots, the foundations of our psychic/knowledge systems. The old foundations are no longer serving us usefully—in fact, they are destroying us—and eventually whether we like it or not the entire system will collapse. The reality of the surface structures is becoming more out of harmony, out of 'fit' with the deeper underlying foundational structures. The split is great! We can no longer avoid looking inwards to heal this 'great split' of surface and deep structures that has occurred in modern humanity.

I would contend, as many other authors have, we have extended our 'search' and journey to the outer limit (for all practical purposes), i.e., space, and we found little there about the real existential questions that bug us. We now need to turn our journey inward to the foundations—to find our real 'self' and truth; heaven is not out in the stars but 'heaven is within you', Jesus said. The ancient E. seers and sages have long known this. But science and scientific thinking have not.

We come now the nitty gritty of what I have been metaphorically trying to describe to you here. Educational foundations is about the understanding of

our roots, our fundamental knowledge and psychic structures upon which all else evolves and rests.

Educators, more than any others in our society must become aware of those ‘hidden foundations’ below upon which rests everything we teach. It is now our social responsibility to look deep and to examine the old foundations, decide rationally and intelligently if they are appropriate to the needs of today/the future, and if not begin to put together alternative foundations based on our deep inner experience and ‘new edge’ research as well as the ancient historical wisdom of humanity [e.g., Indigenous traditions]. What is appropriate education? Ultimately, I contend it must be future education as if the human being matters.¹¹

You might argue this is a ridiculous statement. Of course education is for human beings! Is it? Sure, on the surface structural levels it is. This is what is written in all the educational documents about the philosophy, goals and objectives of Public Education. Yet, when we really take an honest look around, we find somehow our system (not just education) is not really for the human being—you just have to look at the awful symptoms in our society of human waste and carnage.

My point, is that the educational system or any other institutional system dominating our culture, is not for the human being at the foundational level. The human being has not been defined at the foundational level, at least not appropriately, and that is why these surface institutions in the modern scientific and technological world are not meeting the needs of human beings? In the W., these systems may (for most of us) meet our physical/material needs but not our deepest existential needs of love, self-worth, meaning and purpose, etc. Not only that, these systems have raped the environment in which we live and grow. What kind of insanity is that? They have also created forces which will destroy everything and no one wins—what kind of schizophrenic game is that?

We have not looked at foundational issues for a long time? **Why is it we are so scared** to do so—to look inward, deeply? This is what is so sad about this insidious syndrome we have enclosed ourselves in. **What we need most to do, we fear the most?** I will now try to answer these questions and more. To begin with we must look at the origins of the great ‘split.’

¹¹ I wrote my first educational book (theory) in 1982-3, unfinished ms., with that name “*Appropriate Education: Education as if the human being matters.*”

[in red font: a quote was added: “The past is not dead history; it is the living material [foundation] out of which man makes himself [sic] and builds the future” (Dubos, 1968: 242)

[notes on margin: “The ‘Battle’ -it is not surprising that such an intellectual ‘head culture’ doesn’t even look at the foundations on which we walk and lie—we cushion our contact with shoes, souless, soles]

“So, how goes the battle?” This is a fairly common phrase I hear a lot these days—particularly between men. We do seem to love wars and battle, men, i.e., for that is whom I personally can best speak for. But his ‘battle-mentality’ has spread throughout our culture and dominated the interrelationships of humans-humans, humans-environment. It seems rather odd to me that our lives should be a battle, why is this so? or should I say why does this seem so?

To have a ‘battle’ there must be at least two sides, at least this is what is seen from each of the sides in a war. Each sees themselves as good and the other bad. In other words, there is a differentiation here and thus can be traced back if we look at the evolution of consciousness itself. We must look back to the origins of this ‘split’ between humans and humans, self and other, humans and nature, good and bad....

The underlying assumption here is that human beings have evolved from a pre-conscious condition in ancient pre-history to a particularly characteristic state of general consciousness today—often called ego-consciousness. The point of raising this assumption is important and is not a thought we usually acknowledge. With this assumption we also have to assume that knowledge and truth can be gained from investigating our *history of consciousness*. But as you can see, consciousness is not a physical entity to study. This means the scientific method will not do. So, rather, we have adopted the hermeneutic-phenomenological approach taken by several scholars.¹²

The pre-consciousness state was in pre-*Homo sapien* ancestors, 100,000 years ago. The type of consciousness is popularly referred to as a oneness with Nature, archaic slumber, Golden Age and Garden of Eden. Humans

¹² This method is described by [Ken] Wilber. It is sometimes also referred to as an existential-phenomenological approach, which denies the split of objective/subjective in research.

lived in harmony with Nature because they had not developed an ego which could perceive itself as being outside of Nature and inside its own body. The best summary is to say humans at this stage of consciousness are not separate from Nature.

So what happened to bring about this battle-mentality I spoke of earlier? The Fall occurred when the pre-conscious human became conscious, they 'awoke' and began to sense they were unique and different than the rest of Nature and yet they could easily join with Nature almost magically. It was since late *Homo sapiens* (2000 BC) that we developed a full fledged ego-I. We now stood out, apart from and isolated from Nature, good/bad, subject/object, self/not-self conceptions crystallized and we would no longer be able to related to the environment or other human beings like we used to.

I have simplified this evolution and much goes with it in other volumes. There are two points I want to make clear at this point regarding this evolution of consciousness: 1) first with the separation from Nature in human consciousness, humans began to feel alone and even worse we began to awaken to the awareness of our own mortalness, i.e., death on-coming. This what begun our *greatest existential fear*—this has increased steadily up to today, we are thought to be at the crossroads of height of this **fear**, 2) I briefly want to mention that children today go through the same basic stages of consciousness as did our ancestor stages of consciousness, this is the ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny (biogenic law).

So, from these two points we arrive at two conclusions of importance to this essay: 1) battle-mentality can only arise with **fear**—which, can only arise if there is a sense of 'Other-out-there,' our own **fear** is created by an ego which has become aware of its own death, but the only way the ego can cope with such an awareness is to repress the thought of it, and to substitute immortality symbols for itself in materialism¹³ [*a la* Ernest Becker]. This 'split' consciousness is called dualism and it is a consciousness type which has pervaded human thought and action for millennium. The critical point is that it is not reality Absolute. It is an **illusion**. We will come to this point later. Suffice it to say that dualistic thought is a handy way of dealing with and understanding the world and ourselves, we can manipulate Nature, and other humans, and accrue vast powers in doing so (thus the love affair we have with dualistic science and its progeny, technology). But this is immature consciousness in adult minds. It is not our mature potential. It

¹³ Again, much could be said about this in other volumes.

is out-of-date and is ultimately killing us. It is a foundation which must be outgrown.

The second important conclusion is that as educators we would be well advised to begin to understand this evolutionary history of consciousness in detail. For we are only able to teach children and educated children appropriately if we meet them where they are at. I don't just mean specific personalities but their state of consciousness [developmentally]. By understanding the mind of the Egyptian 2000 BC, we will understand a 3 year old child, etc. The state of consciousness which unfold ontogenetically within the child must be understood and nourished appropriately so the next stage of higher, more mature consciousness can develop appropriately. Then the real crux for educators is to ask what is the next stage of higher consciousness beyond egoic-consciousness, which we should be nurturing?

As educators [philosophers of education] we must ask this question because egoic-consciousness is an immature consciousness when we look at the entire cycle of consciousness (that is as *philosophia perennis*, sees it), and we must ask this question because it is clear we have not done very well in the world with our 'battle-mentality' (our dualistic-ego). We have battled everything and everyone to death and we are now showing the tool within ourselves as the 'battle' rages on inside of us in the guise of personal stress, anxiety [**fear**], discontent, loneliness and isolation.

The foundation is crumbling and I am 'calling' for a new one, a foundation which will help us to garden a new growth, a higher non-dualistic consciousness, a whole field-systems consciousness.¹⁴ We as educators [philosophers of education] must not continue to perpetuate an out-dated, decaying foundation of knowledge and self-sense to our children. Spare them this tiresome battle and then true peace can come to the world and stand firmly on a sound foundation." -The End

Concluding Thoughts

Looking back now, some 40 years, on what I was thinking and writing, I recognize the rather immature way I was conceiving and teaching, yet, there is this feeling that I sense my writing then is more palatable and understandable to more people today, than my latest writings.

¹⁴ Much more can be said about this in another volume.

Anyways, I have such a sense that the world has not changed much since 1982-3. I don't like saying that. It just feels true. The collective consciousness then and now, is not different substantively, although more people are more aware of greater problems, like Global Warming and the needs of Nature to be healed. Yet, that knowledge of such, is not necessarily translatable into a mature consciousness that really is willing to look deeply and critically at the 'foundations' that I speak about in the essay above.

Especially, disheartening, is how little advance in consciousness I see around me and in the world regarding the human relationship (e.g., ego) with fear itself. The Fear Education is so way behind, and I see no concrete ventures in the Public Education systems that are addressing how important fear is in determining everything, especially in determining the 'split consciousness' and 'Othering' processes—the 'battle-mentality' and conflicts on this planet. I suppose, there's not much more for me to conclude now. The real issue is whether educators and philosophers of education will be up for the task of moving the world, or even a few schools of Education in universities, to a fearlessness-based paradigm of education. Big question mark.

References

- Devereux, G. (1967). *From anxiety to method in the behavioral sciences*. Mouton & Co.
- Devereux, G. (1956). *Therapeutic education: Its theoretical bases and practices*. Harper & Bros.
- Reason, P., & Rowan, J. (Eds.) (1981). *Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Rowan, J. (1981). *From anxiety to method in the behavioral sciences*, by George Devereux: An appreciation (pp. 77-81). In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), *Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research*. John Wiley & Sons.