Fearless Standpoint Theory: Origins of FMS-9 in Arthur Schopenhauer's Work

R. Michael Fisher

Technical Paper No. 86

In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute

Fearless Standpoint Theory: Origins of FMS-9 in Arthur Schopenhauer's Work

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

Contact author(s):

r.michaelfisher52@gmail.com

First Edition 2019

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.

Fearless Standpoint Theory: Origins of FMS-9 in Arthur Schopenhauer's Work

- R. Michael Fisher,[1] Ph.D.

Technical Paper No. 86

Abstract

The author shares a brief autobiographical history of his intellectual studies as Schopenhauer's philosophy (and psychology) from the 19th century has some basic connections with Wilber's philosophy (and psychology) in the 20-21st century. He draws upon his early writing of a Fearless Standpoint Theory (FST) which was heavily influenced by Wilber to assert there are deeper roots back to his theory now that he has recently been studying Schopenhauer. The importance of FST, especially in its new synthesis, is given emphasis in this technical paper as part of advancing the author's overall fear management systems research and applications for the 21st century.

---

[1] Fisher is an Adjunct Faculty member of the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary, AB, Canada. He is fearologist and co-founder of In Search of Fearlessness Project (1989-) and Research Institute (1991-) and lead initiator of the Fearlessness Movement ning (2015-). 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 CSIIE of Integral & 'Fear' Studies. Fisher is an independent scholar, public intellectual and pedagogue, lecturer, author, consultant, researcher, coach, artist and Principal of his own company (http://loveandfearsolutions.com). He has five leading-edge books: *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). Currently, he is developing The Fearology Institute to teach courses. He can be reached at: r.michaelfisher52@gmail.com

Introduction to Fearless Standpoint Theory[2]

For 30 years I have been searching in and across disciplines, cultures, time, geographies and history, in order to put together the best holistic-integral mapping of the topic "fear" –and, in particular, how its nature and role has changed over time and across cultures—and, to show that one's interest in the topic (pretty much universally) is an interest that is all about improving one's fear management capacities. Whether that motivation is for 'good' or for 'bad' results is a complex topic I won't go into here. What I have been passionate about is multiple perspectives on the topic "fear" (and fearlessness).

Long ago, it occurred to me that *fear itself* may be, more or less, controlling the very ways we come to know fear—and that is, likely (theoretically) very problematic and distortive. It impacts how one conceives and carries out fear mangement policies and practices—at the individual and institutional and collective scale. You can read my work in various documents on the problems of finding a good "epistemology of fear." However, all along that very systematic pointing out the problems, I also have been intrigued to uncover a notion of a Fearless Standpoint Theory (FST) as a positive, and highly potent, possibility to explain and to research the phenomena of fear (and 'fear')—in the largest sense of those terms. FST is my own (meta-methodological) term and as of a recent search on the Internet and in Research Indexes, no one else has even cited my use of this term, never mind trying to understand it. That's very unfortunate. Anyone who wants to understand my work on fear/fearlessness will 'miss' what is going on in my work without first understanding (at least in part) what FMS-9 (Fear Management System-9 means)—and, concomitantly, the use of FMS-9 as the location along the spectrum of consciousness[3] (evolution) for FST to develop and help us manage fear better as a species.

FST has been discussed briefly in many of my publications for decades, but 11 years ago I took some time to articulate FST as having a critical role in Fear Studies and in analyzing and undermining the Fear Problem. I refer all readers to Fisher (2008)[4] for detailed background on FST, as I do not

---

[2] Sometimes this is called "nondual standpoint"—and, I'm going to talk a bit more about that later as relevant especially to Schopenhauer's investigations and adoption of Eastern philosophies (and some mysticism) where nondual consciousness and concepts prevail.

[3] For a generic overview of consciousness evolution, which I follow, see Wilber, K. (1977/82). *Spectrum of consciousness.* Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House.

[4] Fisher, R. M. (2008). Fearless standpoint theory: Origins of FMS-9 in Ken

want to repeat all that over again here. Suffice it to say, that articulation of the idea of FST was utilized long before 2008; it was (and still is) largely based on the integral philosophy of Ken Wilber. I'll say a few words on that link here but to note the important point is (as I said in 2008):

> Ontologically and epistemologically [i.e., metaphysically and philosophically], Wilber's view of fear is unsurpassed in my view and yet still incomplete. He himself has not bothered to ferret out the "fear" and "fearlessness" material in his own theories. Adapting Wilber's schemata, I have developed my own version of a evolutionary/developmental and cultural historical perspective of fear management systems 0 to 9 (also using a few other models like Spiral Dynamics).[5]

Basically, I have taken the many decades of synthesis in Wilber's transdisciplinary meta-theoretical research, philosophizing and writings and pulled out the particular relevant aspects related to "fear" (Fear) in the widest and deepest sense of that term, philosophically (and metaphysically). I began my own published synthesis of Wilber's writings on Fear in Fisher (1997).[6] In that publication and others, I have used (theoretically) the FST to make sense of fear management systems (evolutionarily), and to make sense of fear and all the other forms of it and the responses to it, e.g., bravery, courage, fear-less, fearlessness and finally fearless.[7]

In this Wilberian tracking, FST is meant to be a perspective (really, a meta-perspective) on all the other perspectives on fear (see Fisher, 2008). It challenges all other perspectives on fear. It challenges them, you could say, "fearlessly" which is essential if we truly are after the big and deep truths about what is going on.
It is nondual in its view or standpoint, at least, theoretically. I wanted the "highest" view where I could study the phenomena of fear, alt-

---

Wilber's work. Technical Paper No. 31. Vancouver, BC: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute. See also my teaching video on "fearless" as one of six ethical referents in responding to fear (a spectrum approach) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0KE6TGirOIc

[5] Ibid., p. 1.

[6] See Fisher, R. M. (1997). *Thanatos* and *Phobos*: 'Fear' and its role in Ken Wilber's transpersonal theory. Technical Paper No. 4. Calgary, AB: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

[7] See summary of these and the ten fear management systems in Fisher, R. M. (2010). *The world's fearlessness teachings: A critical integral approach to fear management/education for the 21st century*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

hough, it is not the only view or perspective I take. Thus, FST ought to produce some interesting, if not profound discoveries about fear that typically are not offered by other perspectives. Again, as reminder, any breakthroughs on fear are going to be potentially breakthroughs on fear management/education. I truly am committed to improving the latter as an educator, and as a fearologist I am most dedicated to the former.

As I studied Wilber's work on fear systematically, I have very recently taken on studying Arthur Schopenhauer's view(s) on fear and its role in human nature, human condition and human potential. This research is very preliminary and I have made by first sketch on his thought and my particular interpretation of it (Fisher, 2019).[8] Although Schopenhauer by no means systematically articulated fear in comparison to Wilber, I have seen a good deal of his writing on fear, its nature and role and there is no doubt in my mind it is core to his overall philosophy—again, even if he doesn't explicitly state he is talking about fear. I also read between the lines to pull out even more how fear is so crucial in his work. And, that said, indeed, I am an amateur on Schopenhauer's work and much more study is required as well that would have to include how Schopenhauer's interpreters talk about fear in his work.

Equally (and dialectically) important, as Schopenhauer's philosophy incorporates critical aspects on fear's role, I also see at times (not often) he refers to "fearless" as well. I'll get to that below. Suffice it to say, my search in this technical paper is very specific. I will not rework his writing on fear or try to advance it herein. My purpose is only to look at fear just enough in his work to then point to how he is actually striving (partly successful, perhaps) in articulating a perspective on life and on Life, which is a perspective *as his* philosophy is—whereby he takes up some version of a FST. I'll rely, at times, on progressive and supportive interpretations of Schopenhauer by a few other contemporary philosophers to make my case.

---

[8] Fisher, R. M. (2019). Schopenhauer on fear. Technical Paper No. 84. Calgary, AB: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Schopenhauer[9] on Fear and Fearless

The great man of letters, Thomas Mann, wrote of Arthur Schopenhauer's philosophy with great admiration and applause, in essence saying it is "emotional, breathtaking, playing between violent contrasts, between instinct and mind, passion and redemption."[10] AS, for short,

> [F]orever changed the intellectual map of the Western world, and without him we would have had a very different and weaker Freud, Nietzsche, Hardy, Wittgenstein, Beckett, Ibsen, Conrad.[11]

I am one interested in all such figures who have this capacity, and take the great risks to change the entire mindscape of tradition, of thought, and AS has indeed done so on many accounts, albeit, that is not my purpose here to show that. I look within his work for how he may have laid the basis for changing (i.e., transforming) how humans relate to fear—that is, how fear management/education needs to transform and that's of no little importance. We face such grave aspects of a global Fear Problem today in the 21st century, in the Anthropocene era—that, it seems wise to look into our roots of philosophical workings that can help us now.

AS was not well known in his life-time, to put it mildly; however,

> One reason Schopenhauer's work has had this wide personal appeal [to many later after his death] probably lies in its directness and seriousness. He is not writing for fellow-philosophers; rather, he is confronting the deepest philosophical issues, of life, suffering and death, with a urgency absent from most professional philosophy.[12]

---

[9] For a quick biographic summary (what I think is relevant) of Schopenhauer, see Fisher (2019), pp. 9-13.

[10] Quote from Mann in Yalom (2005, p. 50). Yalom, I. D. (2005). *The Schopenhauer cure.* NY: HarperCollins.

[11] Ibid., p. 50, quote from the narrator of the novel by Yalom (2005).

[12] Berman, D. (1995/2002). Introduction. In Schopenhauer, A., *The world as will and idea* (pp. xvii-xxxix). London, UK: J. M. Dent, p. xxxiii.

This Schopenhauerian methodological and political attitude is very attractive to me—as I suspect it offers deeper "terrible truth" when needed over and above getting approval ratings from one's peers and/or superiorities in academia. My main interest is that he was "emotional" and cared about "feelings" greatly in his philosophizing—but also he was confronting *fear* and doing so quite systematically, before the earliest of existentialists like Kierkegaard and those that followed upon his lead. It is natural to turn to philosophy to understand fear, and it is more obvious to turn to the existentialists—at least, if you are a modern person investigating. Yet, Schopenhauer is a bit earlier on the scene than Nietzsche and Kierkegaard, and that intrigues me as to what he has to offer to Fear Studies before the over-coloring of his ideas by Nietzsche (especially) and other existentialists to follow.

Before I go too far, it ought to be clarified that neither I, AS or Wilber have a typical view of "fearless" that would be easily defined or made meaning of by only common sense definitions and imaginaries. This is crucial in my work and I have often challenged readers of my work to not get trapped in a premature cognitive or imaginative closure, where they think they know exactly what I am talking about with both the topic "fear" and "fearless" (as well as "fearlessness"). I encourage readers to explore this self-reflectively and to investigate my other writing on this problematic.

Now, as for what exactly Schopenhauer thought, how he defined fear and how he defines fearless, this is a complicated topic I have not yet investigated enough. That means, that I am going to have to carry an ambivalent confidence while writing the remainder of this technical paper. One can assume that at least, Schopenhauer is taking fear as a common term and making meaning of it in common language and conceptual frameworks or perspectives. I think that's true—in part; however, at the same time I think he is using more complicated than 'normal' notions/contexts to understand both fear and fearless—and, especially, he has to go well outside the normal bounds of the thought of his day, in order to promote a FST.

I wish there was an easier way to approach this preliminary investigation without such ambivalency and doubt. Nonetheless, let's proceed, and maybe in the future I'll find better ways to handle the problems of definitions and meanings—and, that said, you can be sure, to some degree, I will at times be imposing my own unique definitions

and meanings on Schopenhauer's work and I will attempt to make that conscious and say so in the text, if at all possible.

There is a required attention in reading this to think both of the context (perspective) which Schopenhauer is thinking and writing—based in Germany at the time of the 19th century, and there is also a subtle understanding he likely has that cannot be expressed in words—so, when I give a quote to discuss in this technical paper, one has to read it softly, hold it gently, and give it a lot of breathing room before imposing or jumping on it—and thus, ending up literalizing and overly closing down what the quote might mean. I'll give an example of this right off the start—and, practice myself what it is I am asking of readers. I trust this will help somewhat overall in this (re-) interpreting of Schopenhauer in the light of today, and in the light of my own work.

AS's relationship in his early 20s with the great philosopher-artist Goethe is one interesting starting point. AS wrote about the controversy (conflict) he had at times with Goethe and the feelings Goethe had that AS was undermining his work at points, even though AS served him and admired him as a mentor and scholar overall. AS wrote,

> [O]ne can see me, always alone, raising high the banner of his [Goethe's] color theory in *fearless* opposition to the entire learned world. [italics added for emphasis][13]

There is a hermeneutical inquiry demanded to understand this passage and the emphasis on not just brave support he gave to Goethe, but "fearless" was AS in doing what he did, at least in his mind. He stuck out his neck to support Goethe's radical work and there was an alone quality to that—and, he may have been only one of few doing so at the time. It was hard on his reputation to so risk, but he obviously felt a kinship towards Goethe, and AS later would write and lecture to find most people rejected his genius as well. There is also the emotional tie to a man, a father-like figure, as it is well-known that

---

[13] Cited in Schopenhauer, A. (2012). *On the fourfold root of the principle of sufficient reason and other writings.* New York: Cambridge University Press, n.p. [original 1813]

AS's father was ridden by depression, anxiety and fear.[14] One quick diagnosis by Yalom (2005) reflects that AS had something to prove to himself, to Goethe and perhaps to the world—to prove he was himself not going to be over-determined by excess fear and anxiety in his life and career. Yalom (*via*, his narrator of the novel) wrote,

> Nor was there abundant love for others in their [family] household—not for the young Arthur Schopenhauer.... Arthur's love-bereft childhood had serious implications for his future. Children deprived of a maternal [and parental] love bond fail to develop the basic trust necessary to love themselves, to believe that others will love them, or to love being alive. In adulthood they become estranged, withdraw into themselves, and often live in an adversarial relationship with others [the world].[15]

Albeit, I personally (and professionally) question this reductive psychoanalytical analysis of the whole of AS in this quote, it's not a big stretch to suggest that AS's personality was fear-based[16] to a great extent. And, from my view, that would lead to him 'naturally'—igniting the universal spirit of fearlessness[17]—and, yes, even going to the extremes of overcoming his terror of existence and objects in existence (like 'failed' and 'disappointing' father or mother figures) *via* a kind of pursuit of invigorating and emotional, bombastic, a dramatization. He would pursue "fearless" actions and thoughts—the kind that stir everyone up and get them upset, tend to frighten them, and thus, the conflicting relations from his earliest memories and childhood repeat and are 'working through' some kind of process to heal (arguably) and set Arthur 'free' (i.e., liberate him from suffering). How successful that drive to be fearless was and how exactly AS saw or imagined being fearless is hard to say, though he gives indicators—especially later, see his view on Her (Nature).

---

[14] Yalom's (2005) narrator noted AS's father's suicide and that from the start (even in the womb), Arthur was raised in "the stormy setting... a loveless marriage, a frightened, protesting mother, an anxious, jealous father" (p. 33).

[15] Yalom's narrator, p. 42.

[16] AS himself in his secret diary *Eis Eauton*, wrote, "I have inherited from my father that fear which I myself am cursing... and fighting with all the willpower I possess" (P IV, 2, I 20) (cited in Safranski, 1991, p. 12). Safransky, R. (1991). *Schopenhauer and the wild years of philosophy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[17] From my three decades of research I have a dictum: *When fear arises, so then does fearlessness* (e.g., see Fisher, 2010, among many other works of mine).

Another example, of fearless in AS's discourse comes from his own writing in his earliest book in 1813, like the quote above, where he is discussing in quite a mature voice for his young age, that the best (his idealized) philosophers (like his idealized philosopher-self) are,

> ... that which is [relatively] little [unpopular, unknown], but possessed with confidence and irrefutable certainty.... [in contrast to those he judges lesser philosophers] to that which is a lot [big, popular], built for the most part on rhetoric, on being impressive, in being contentious.... [18]

AS had little patience or love for the pompous and charismatic in the world of philosophy.[19] And, more importantly, AS points out tangentially a very important observation/interpretation of such charismatic people (e.g., male philosophers of the times)—they, he said, are easily brought down from their "pleasure" because in "any moment [they could] be disturbed by uncorrupted and [truth-bearing] *fearless* criticism[20] [italics added for emphasis]. To become a philosopher by choice, AS, who had other options, is a path of becoming a critic. Not surprising AS would qualify this early in his career as a fearless critic not just an ordinary critic and not just a critic like many of the 'big' philosophers whom he saw underneath were not so powerful, strong and rather fear-based themselves but just knew how to cover it more so than perhaps AS knew how to do or chose to do. I think there is good evidence that in AS's philosophy there is a worthiness of great import to be vulnerable—this is not a trait one finds in the W. Enlightenment philosophers overall.

FST is where "fearless" is truly authentic and as I said, based on nondual consciousness—a very mature state and stage of development for any human beings. Very rare do individuals tap into the nondual state, but they may in various ways like through meditation practice and/or even near death experiences. However, according to Wilber's work there is even more rare the individual who advances to the maturation (post-post formal) stage of consciousness and a grounded life in a nondual standpoint—that is FST. This is technical

---

[18] Schophenhauer (2012), n.p.

[19] D. Berman (1995/2002), for e.g., notes AS never fit in well with academia and left it early in his career, and in 1858, when AS had gained some academic notoriety late in his life, he declines invitation to be a member of the Berlin Royal Academy (p. xiv).

[20] Ibid., n.p.

in details beyond the scope of this paper. The point is, I am looking for further evidence for AS's commitment, even if implicit, in a FST on life on Life and on philosophy itself.

Before I get to that latter issue, it is worth pointing to a few biographers' quotes that give their view on 'fearless' and its association to AS. First, I wish to bring forth the controversial claims of Zimmern (1876), one of the first to write a substantive and respected biography on AS's life and work. She noted "The rousing [philosophical-political] appeals to the German nation with Ficthe had thundered forth with fearless energy in the winter of 1808, during the French occupation of Berlin." Indeed, AS was no big fan of Fichte, and avoided such associations, and especially with politics in general. The 'fearless' in this use is likely more bravado (cf. AS's critique of the non-ideal philosophers—of which, one can assume Fichte fit into that category because he was quite 'big' and popular at the time).

In contrast (arguably), Zimmern highlights the positive qualities of Heinrich (AS's father), as one of "uncompromising patriotism"—of which no doubt AS was in stern rebellion to as with Fichte—and, then says Heinrich was one of "rectitude" and "principled" "qualities his son [Arthur] inherited. His fearless love of truth[21] and honest utterance of his opinion"[22]—and, that's quite a different take and one most interesting. When "fearless love" is put together, then we have something more expanding than bravado could ever indicate or point to, never mind embody in ethical being. Fearless love is a love without fear, is another way of putting it. I have (with others) written a good deal on this contrasting polarization of these two great meta-motivational forces—Love *vs.* Fear (or Love *and* Fear).[23] The nondual standpoint (or FST) embraces these meta-motivations and makes them one (One)—and, at the same time, integrally respects they are (Many) distinct waves, or forces, as Wilber calls them—and, they may easily move into a pathological relationship with each other (as oppositions)—with great destruction. This is a metaphysical basis

---

[21] An interesting aside (of complication) is Johanna's (AS's mother) journal notebooks early on in her marriage to Heinrich, where she labels and praises her husband's "fearless openness" to speak his mind (Safranski, 1991, p. 12).

[22] Zimmern, H. (1876). *Arthur Schopenhauer, his life and philosophy.* Retrieved from http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Arthur-Schopenhauer,_his_Life_and_Philosophy

[23] For a recent overview see Fisher, R. M. (2019a). Educational philosophy for the Anthropocene: Zak Stein's inquiry. Technical Paper No. 85. Calgary, AB: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

that needs further exploration in/with AS's metaphysics.[24] I have no doubt that AS was pursuing the nondual philosophies of Hinduism and Buddhism as part of his corrective project—that is, his search for a "fearless" (i.e., loving) way of living—and, if that was too difficult to achieve (and it is) in one's individual development—there is the *consolation*[25] of such a nondual philosophy (standpoint) nonetheless—and, that is to offer a meta-perspective on all philosophies and worldviews and assess them (at least intellectually) as to their ethical (and consolation) value, depending on how fear-based they are and how fearless they are. I'll return to that shortly.

Reframing, metaphysically (philosophically) "love" into something to be understood deeply within a FST, is a radical move for a W. philosopher and one I have attempted in my career on this topic. Perhaps, there is a kinship in his work on love to mine, however, that investigation would lead us astray from returning to the case I am making more overtly in this paper. Before getting to AS's own view of FST (implicitly, at least), a couple more examples set the stage for our understanding, as offered by contemporary observers of AS and his work. First, is the rather judgmental position of a psychiatrist (and existential psychotherapist) Irvin Yalom (2017), who has studied AS extensively for a novel of ideas regarding AS and psychotherapy, and perhaps even before that. Yalom says "Schopenhauer was abrasive, *fearless*, and exceedingly isolated.... a tormented man" and then more assertions re: AS's unhappiness and pessimism about life etc. (italics added for emphasis).[26]

The label of pessimism and misanthrope are quite common in reviews of AS. What is less common, if not very rare, is the assertion of "fearless" as a trait of AS. Note, earlier I mentioned AS's mother stating similarly that her husband (AS's father) was "fearless" in

---

[24] I highly recommend: Head, J. (2016). Schopenhauer on the development of the individual. *Epoché, 20*(2), 427-46.

[25] Head (2016) notes that Schopenhauer's philosophical project, one that is quite amazing on many levels given the context of AS's life and the times he grew up and developed in (late 18th-19th century Germany), is dedicated to help the individual "through philosophy, religion, or the natural sciences, and the concomitant search for consolation in the face [of death and suffering] of the pessimistic truths about human existence" (p. 427). Such consolation is thus the very way I use it here. Interestingly, Yalom (2005) noticeably uses "consolation" (or some derivative, e.g., "solace") often in his book on Schopenhauer and the interplay of the purposes of existential psychotherapy and philosophical therapy.

[26] Yalom, I. (2017). *Becoming myself: A psychiatrist memoir.* New York: Basic Books, n.p.

some ways. Indeed, Yalom's accounting in this judgement is hard to pin down and with such an oblique presentation one doesn't know if "fearless" applied to AS is a positive or negative thing in Yalom's estimation. To note, the clinical psychology field in general (including psychiatry) is decidedly negative in ascribing "fearless" and/or "fearlessness" as abnormal in human development and typically pathological; which is not my way of ascription at all.

I suspect, after reading the novel by Yalom *The Schopenhauer Cure*, Yalom is actually ambivalent in ascribing fearless to AS. On the downside of the estimation it simply could be a judgement not any different than the bravado estimation I spoke of when people use the term "fearless" and, if so, then the Yalom statement would not support AS's work as coming from FST.[27] The main reason is that FST is founded on a (Wilberian) metaphysical fearless(ness), and an operational assumption that "fear has a metaphysical basis"[28] in human affairs. Such a definition is complicated and I'll touch on it later; point being, that having a fearless attitude or behaviors is not enough to constitute FST as a critical (corrective) meta-perspective on reality.

A last example: I think in terms of "fearless" applied to AS there is an important link articulated by Lutkemeier (2001), where they contrast AS's philosophical view of history with art. The AS analogy with history is (paraphrasing): "as a sailing boat that travels on the inscrutable sea of time,"[29] and thus is partially helpful indeed, and part of reflectivity and reason, but the historical perspective isn't in the end of any real ultimate guide or origin of solace—that is, of any real *consolation* under the fateful (tragic) ending of one's individual history—in death. Lutkemeier, in contrast, paraphrasing AS's analo-

---

[27] Some support can be found for this likely view (albeit, still ambivalent) is in Yalom (2005) talking autobiographically in his novel about Julius and his history of *chutzpah* in his youth (p. 73)—that is, nothing to do with ethical maturity but more so (in Yalom's words): "The new Julius had nothing to lose and fearlessly strolled up to clusters of students..." (p. 76). I would call this a cross between bravery-courage because it is relative low-level consciousness and intention as long as having "nothing to lose" is so prominent (but not the only) motivation to overcome fear(s).

[28] According to Sabry (2013, p. 170). Sabry, F. (2013). *The will's harmonic motion: The completion of Schopenhauer's philosophy*. iUniverse.

[29] Lutkemeier, T. (2001). *Chez soi: The aesthetic self in Arthur Schopenhauer, Walter Pater and T. S. Eliot: A study in aesthetic theories of Schopenhauer, Pater and Eliot, with special regard to notions of selfhood, time and influence.* Konigshausen & Neumann, p. 120.

gy, notes "whereas art is the *fearless* diver who breaks through the turbulent surface of the sea—who tears down the 'veil of Maya' [AS's term]—and who gets to the ground, and who thus looks into the true face of things, if only for a fleeting moment"[30] [italics added for emphasis].

Here is a wonderful pointing to FST—a perspective beyond time/history (and everyday phenomenal worldliness) as we usually know it—some kind of "aesthetic standpoint"[31] with transcendent possibility (albeit, *via* negation) is experienced, metaphysically—and, yes, psychologically and philosophically—if but, "only for a fleeting moment" (as a state of consciousness)—nonetheless—very real to AS and the Eastern spiritual traditions he is relying upon for guidance in some of his most essential thought. We are now dwelling in the thought of the philosophical Idealists and their distinction of the phenomenal (worldly world) and the noumenal (other-worldly world) realities.[32]

Perhaps, it is best to say that "fearless" (and/or "fearlessness"), in some sense of their meaningfulness and value, dwell not so easily in the materialist (hard empirical) phenomenal world of *Will to survive* (AS's basic theory). And, in a way nor is the experience of Art, which according to D. Berman, is "the most [central] and optimistic part of his [AS's] work, where he argues that in aesthetic perception we come closest to understanding the world as idea"[33] and a location of authentic *consolation* from the suffering of this-world. And, more so, *via* arts and aesthetic experience—a kind of *salvation* for AS—one is dwelling where the FST dwells in the metaphysical (if not, the other-worldly).[34]

---

[30] Ibid., p. 120.

[31] A perspective offered on AS (by Vasalou), one that perhaps AS would have agree with as crucial to his overall philosophy—and, certainly to his *consolation* offerings to humanity and its freedom (liberation) project. Vasalou, S. (2013). *Schopenhauer and the aesthetic standpoint: Philosophy as a practice of the sublime.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

[32] Less confident can I speak about Idealism overall in W. philosophy/history, but I am confident of Wilber's (1995) articulation of *worldly* (Descendent path) and *other-worldly* (Ascent path) in his integral (neo-Plotinian) metaphysics. Wilber, K. (1995). *Sex, ecology and spirituality: The spirit in evolution [Vol. 1].* Boston, MA: Shambhala.

[33] D. Berman (1995/2002), p. xxix.

[34] Utilizing a Wilberian schema of a spectrum of consciousness, an argument could be made that Schopenhauer's philosophy (potentially) guides one beyond pre-egoic, through

I for one, take seriously the analogy of *art is the fearless diver* into account in understanding Schopenhauer and his philosophy. I wrote in my recent paper "Schopenhauer on Fear":

> What is the possibility of beyond Will for AS? [e.g., *via* the arts and aesthetic dimensions?[35]] It will take a bit of an explanation; it's complicated. I make here a link between *Nature* and *fearless*—and interweave AS's philosophy with his psychology—albeit, with my own spin on it.[36]

I recommend readers pursue this question I asked in my earlier technical paper focusing on fear in Schopenhauer's work—but the dialectic inevitability is that one has to then ask about "fearless" in his work, and that is exactly the nature of this technical paper at hand. I'll pick-up again from my earlier work AS's words on Nature and fearless in contrast to Culture and fear-based existence (e.g., the latter related to his central notion of *egoism* linked to Will to survive):

> [Cultural] Dogmas change and our knowledge is deceptive; but Nature never errs, her procedure is sure, and she never conceals it. Everything is entirely in Nature, and Nature is entire in everything.... It [Nature] has surely found its way into existence, and it will surely find its way out of it. In the meantime it lives, *fearless* and without care, in the presence of annihilation [death], supported by the consciousness that it is Nature herself,

---

the egoic, to the trans-egoic realms and subjectivities—freed, one could say from the psychosocial dimension of "egoism" (the latter, something belonging to the Will, as AS would theorize). This is a topic beyond the scope of this paper but any reliance on Hinduism and Buddhism philosophies (and psychologies) has to take into account this transcending of egoism in consciousness structures (levels) and stages—as that is part of the perennial philosophy underlying such philosophies (spiritualities from the East)—much less common in the West.

[35] Lewis (2014) wrote on Sophia Vasalou's perspective on AS's work: "Vasalou's patient and sensitive reading uncovers something much more interesting: that the proliferation of simile and analogy in Schopenhauer's work is an expression of his conception of philosophy and its method as essentially aesthetic in character" (p. 383). Lewis, P. (2014). [Book review] Sophia, V. *Schopenhauer and the Aesthetic Standpoint: Philosophy as a Practice of the Sublime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). *Philosophical Investigations, 37*(4), 383-86.

[36] Fisher (2019a), p. 19.

> and imperishable [eternal] as she is.[37] [italics added for emphasis]

Now, in bringing this bare skeleton of an exploration into FST in Schopenhauer to a close, let me note, following Head (2016), that,

> Schopenhauer's philosophical system describes various ways in which one can seek to transcend [liberate] the everyday world and thereby escape [i.e., bring some *consolation*] from the pain [fear] and suffering that fills our lives. At various points, he suggests that such an aim can be achieved through engaging with works of art in aesthetic experience (for example, in Book 3 of *WWRI*), undertaking compassionate actions that reflect the underlying unity of beings, and finally through ascetic [negation] practices that undermine the willing part of the human individual, our desires... (covered in Book 4 of *WWRI*).[38]

Many have said that AS has undertaken in modern times a rather unique and uncompromising quest for truth as a philosopher. I believe in turning to Nature, AS makes a strong case for his truth—if not, the universal truths so critical to understanding life, Life and living a sane life. A surprising number of critics and interpreters of AS over the past few hundred years have used "fearlessness" to characterize his life and work[39]—and, I (in part) wholly embrace that description and it is not without significance because fearlessness is the path upon which fearless is (in some sense) the end (telos) of evolutionary development.

Three liberating (at least, *consoling*) aims and approaches in

---

[37] Schopenhauer (1839/1995), p. 131. Schopenhauer, A. (1995). *On the basis of morality.* Trans. E. F. J. Payne. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett. [original 1839]

[38] Head (2016), p. 427.

[39] For my way of thinking (imaginary): Fearlessness is the way of the archetypal Sacred Warrior (see my FMS-7 integral Fearlessness perspective) (in Fisher, 2010). Now, for others writing about AS, Hathaway (1882), although a fundamental critic of AS's pessimism does acknowledge respectfully he had "a heroic consistency [that] cannot be denied... with giant fearlessness" (p. 249); another critic, but respectful, also admits "Schopenhauer had taught the nothingness of the world and evil of the Will with such glorious energy and fearlessness that men [sic] were inspired..." (McGill, 1931, p. 11). Hathaway, A. J. (1882). Schopenhauer. *Education: An International Magazine 2*, 234-60; McGill, V. J. (1931). *Schopenhauer: Pessimist and pagan.* Ardent Media.

Schopenhauer's work, convince me that he is not only a "pessimist" philosopher. Besides that argument, let me proceed to suggest that Schopenhauer's greatest engagement in a preliminary setting up of a FST comes within these three liberating aims, and more foundationally within his observation and interpretation of Nature (that, "never errs"). It is the latter foundation which arcs out his entire sense of reality, truth and then human nature and the human condition.

It appears *Nature is fearless*—at least, when looked at from the particular eternity standpoint (if not also an aesthetic standpoint)—and, most explicitly he is saying from Nature's standpoint in and of herself not merely from the human species standpoint observing Nature as an object of both love and hate. In the passage above Nature, for AS, is a reality but also a standpoint—and, it is right there we could gain a lot more understanding of the depths of AS's philosophy and ethics—and, his methodology—which, in my view, is based on the preliminary assumption (and intuition) that Nature is fearless in All and thus offers a fearless perspective on All, with no divide, no hiding, no denial, no excuses, no remorse—"free" (of caring), as AS writes. There's too much to unpack here to fit into this short technical paper but my point of the value of the FST is to not impose (project) any defense mechanism on reality—even on the human experience or existence itself. This later comes out in AS's discussion of the percepts of Buddhism and Hinduism—via, what is essentially a nondual ("free" of caring) observational and methodological standpoint that has no basis in fear of death/mortality. It is this latter issue exactly that interests me as someone called a fearologist. I want fear to not be the motivating force of my inquiries into truth. That's what a FST can do, even if AS only takes part of this agenda and spins onto its potentials from his philosophy of art/aesthetics and Nature.

Again, this is a sketch of potential ideas to pursue in further inquiries and in no way am I asserting anything "certain" at this point. If there is a metaphilosophy and metaphysics of need expressed in AS's work (as Head, 2016 argues), it is the need to find means (methods) and standpoints or worldviews which are not embedded in the paradigm of the Will to survive (as expressed in fear of death). This is where FST can offer, beyond what Buddhism and Hinduism does, as a more generic and universal standpoint of epistemology—but the work to be done is to link that to metaphysics in AS and then ethics ultimately—not merely, to find ways of consolation from suffering (pragmatic as that is in AS's philosophy and compassion)—there is a larger

methodological work to be unearthed I believe below that surface of need fulfillment—and, I'm speaking more to a trajectory of development and evolution itself. I am interested in the current evolution of humanity without being grounded down in a fear-based Will formation.

AS doesn't, as far as I know, make that claim so directly but I read it in most everything in his philosophical project. He found three liberating ways out of the 'Fear' Matrix and that's fantastic and surprising for his times and place in W. history but now we can take it much further—and, that is why I have introduced things like the "fearlessnessizing" of everything and a "fearlessness psychology"[40]—both of which, to remember, are based on FST. FST shows the theoretical possibility of liberation out of the 'Fear' Matrix—and, presumably will be least likely of other options to creating errors in doing so. A larger topic...

****

[40] Fisher, R. M., and Four Arrows (Jacobs, D. T.) (forthcoming). Indigenizing conscientization and critical pedagogy: Nature, spirit and fearlessness as foundational concepts. In S. Steinberg, B. Down and D. Nix-Stevenson (Eds.), *Sage Handbook of Critical Pedagogies (Vol.1)* (pp.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; and, see Fisher, R. M. (2019). Fearlessness Psychology: An introduction. Technical Paper No. 79. Calgary, AB: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.