Fear as 'Disclosure of Truths': The Educational Significance of An Existential-Phenomenological Insight

Jani Kukkola
University of Oulu

Abstract

The article illustrates a particular existential-phenomenological view of the emotion of fear and its connection to self-educative process of grasping the world and gaining self-knowledge. According to this view, originally promoted by Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and in educational philosophy Otto Friedrich Bollnow (1907-1991), fear is closely connected to a specific understanding of 'unconcealment', or 'disclosure' of truths. In the article it is shown, that this understanding sheds special educational insights on the connection between fear and gaining knowledge.

Keywords: fear, unconcealment, education, Heidegger, Bollnow.

1. Introduction

Fear is a broad and challenging theme, and thus an intriguing philosophical problem. Fear, whatever its source, can become a controlling factor in a person's life (Burton 2011, 113). But even more intriguing is the thought of such negative feeling as fear having educational relevance. It can be assumed, that fear is powerful and pervasive in school practices and thus central to many education discourses. However, it has received very little focused attention in the educational literature, although understanding of how fear works is extremely important as fear and wellbeing are inextricably linked. Research in experimental psychology shows some indications on the use of classroom fear and efficacy appeals from student's perspective and in addition, the teachers' views towards fear and

efficacy appeals have been studied to some extent (Putwain & Roberts 2012). These functionally focused experimental studies pay however very little attention to educational purposes. Thus, it seems that we are currently a long way from knowing how fear operates in education, although this insight has been attempted to grasp already in some respects (Jackson 2011, 39). In fact, there are some fruitful preliminary remarks on how fear holds a key to educational, intersubjective involvement (Cristian 2012, 9-36), and how corporeality (to which fear is necessarily closely connected) plays a role in hermeneutic conceptions of educational practice (Meurs 2012, 363-376). There are however shortcomings and even pitfalls to these treatments. Firstly, no deeper-level coherent definition of fear is provided in order to fully grasp the potential multiplicity, or multimodality, of fearful existence in educational settings. If it were understood better what fear means conceptually and phenomenally, we could talk more deeply about its role (and use) in education. Secondly, the treatments on fear focus first and foremost on its instrumental use in educational practice. Fear is seen as something that serves as a tool to gain access to a deeper level educational involvement. But whether fear itself opens up an educational space, or even *the* space we are already familiar with, hasn't been treated or even problematized. Thirdly, education has been understood in a very strict sense as formal schooling, and thus the phenomenological problems that arise result from this defect (Cristian 2012, 32). The purpose of this article is to pinpoint a relevant theoretical guideline to how fear would play a more significant role and have a fundamental, underlying purpose in education. To achieve this, I will outline a specific existential-phenomenological account of what fear and education fundamentally amounts to, by referring to philosopher Otto Friedrich Bollnow's educational characterisation of Martin Heidegger's notion of truth as disclosure and his analytic of fear.

2. What We Think We Know About It So Far: From Reactionary to Anticipatory Philosophy of Fear

When one thinks of fear, what comes to mind is that fear is a negative feeling. Among others, David Hume (2000) has defined fear as a psychological reaction and a disposition

between the feelings of pain and pleasure. John Patrick Day (1991, 37) criticizes this approach and claims that neither hope nor fear are to be considered as objects of psychological analysis, pointing out certain factual relations between positions in the mixture of pain and pleasure. He claims these feelings to be a matter of philosophical analysis, showing certain logical relations between certain measures. For instance, person A fears for a certain degree that –Q, but believes that the probability for Q is good. In this sense, philosophical analysis shows us the factual relation of hope and fear to probability, faith and desire. Also, fear is not necessarily a fundamental, primitive feeling, unlike it might seem at first. Instead, it could be considered as an attitude towards probabilities of certain situational statuses. One easily associates fear with threat. Threat may come in many different forms: isolation, destruction of the essential, or even death. This implies that fear is an attitude towards the future. Whether it is a primitive emotion or not, or to be considered elemental to human existence, is secondary to the fact that it is preparation and reaction to the actualization of some potential threat.

Fear, as all the other emotions, can be seen to be physiological in its core nature (Niiniluoto & Räikkä 1996, 9; Svendsen 2008). The theories of emotion are strongly linked to the theories of the body, as many phenomenologists have noted (Sartre 1971; Merleau-Ponty 1962; Welton 1999). However, this does not rule out the constitutive element of the environment to emotions, nor does it mean that fear as such would not be a subjective experience. Thus, fear rises from primitive reactions to one's environment. When we fear, our hands shake, the heart bounces intensively and cold sweat runs on our skin. We observe our surroundings more concisely and vividly. It is all about various bodily experiences. Fear is a defence mechanism of a living being. Every living organism weaves a web of relations to its own experiences, which define the objects of these experiences to be either desired or not desired. This notion is also founded in the ideas of biosemiotics (Deely 2007; 2010). Everything we experience with our senses gain a meaning through desire, intention towards a goal or purpose (Irvine 2006). We live in our own meaningful circle of life, which is build up from our

perceptions. We either want the objects of our perceptions, or we dislike them and want to avoid them. To put it simple, there are useful and harmful things in the world. Others we want to have and others we like to discard. Usually it makes sense to desire things that are useful to us and avoid things that are harmful, at least if one's intention is to promote one's wellbeing. Fear seems to be such self-preservation, desire to avoid harmful objects, which threaten one's existence.

The kind of analysis of fear illustrated here focuses mainly on the *object of fear*, on the fearful. And this fearful is rendered as something negative to the subject who is in fear. However, the negativity of fear concerns not only the cause of fear, but also the state of fear. This brings us to the phenomenological understanding that has been only faintly reflected in this treatment so far, namely that fear is a constitutive aspect to worldliness. What this means is that fear could constitute the world as it is. Next I will pursue further this particularly fresh and intriguing notion.

3. Towards Existential-Phenomenological Approach to Emotions

Martin Heidegger has proposed an idea of being as anxiety (*Angst*) in his book *Being and Time* (1962). According to Heidegger, this anxiety can be seen as a result from the understanding of purposelessness of the existence, describing this purposelessness or looseness through the metaphor of *letting be* (in German *Gelassenheit*). What this means, is that we are anxious when we feel that there is very little we can do in a situation, when we are not in control of our lives. This, for Heidegger, is a constitutive part of the essence of being (Heidegger 1962, 131). Anxiety and fear are both *Dasein*'s[1] ways of *being-in-the-world*. Fear is, in Heidegger's opinion, not an attribute of Dasein, but it *is* this *being-there* itself. Fear is a mode of this "worldly life", a way of being attuned to it (Heidegger 1962, 126-133). To put it more simply than Heidegger's own words, fear reveals us how hazardous our existences are, how dangerous it is to live. At times, fear may be the only thread that keeps what exists from not existing.

Fear, for Heidegger, has mostly very little to do with the object of fear (Heidegger 1962, 133). In contrast to this notion, Jean-Paul Sartre has defined emotions as human relations to the world. For Sartre (1971), knowledge is not the only way to perceive the reality, but the emotions are also one crucial way to gain awareness, to be in relation to the reality. Sartre makes a categorical distinction between fear and anxiety. Fear, in Sartre's terms, is a relation between the subject and an object in the world, whereas anxiety is caused by realisations through self-reflection, when the subjective cognizance is forced to face itself. In this sense fear is opposite to authentic existence, it causes us to depart from authentic living. However, Sartre's notion has problems in the light of Heidegger's thinking. To my understanding, Sartre deviates from Heidegger's philosophy when he speaks of the individual's relation to the world. Sartre speaks of the psychology of human beings. But Heidegger does not say anything about the human psyche or objective relations to the world. It is, in fact, this subject-object –relation that Heidegger pursues to discard. And he does this by not speaking of individuals, but of *supra-individual ways on life* (Vadén 2012, 19).

My interpretation is, that in the existential-phenomenological sense, fear is an attitude to existing in the world, as it shows (and defines) what might be a potential threat to the existence itself. Fear is, indeed, from this point of view, *anticipation* and forecasting. We fear in advance and not only when the threat is actual, because then it might be too late. We prepare, doubt and are alert, all for the sake of fear. It is a signal that there may be potentially threatening things emerging in the near future, and the meaning of fear for us is to anticipate and avoid those threats. In this sense, the greatest fear of all, and where all fears boil down to, is the fear of death, as Heidegger points out (Heidegger 1962, 236). It is fear over the possible end of our existence, our way of life in the world. But death is also something more: it is a narrowing down of possibilities. *Being-towards-death*, gloomily described here as fear of death, is not what Heidegger merely had in mind. For him, death is also the death of insignificant possibilities that are not in accord with the chosen, actual and authentic way of life (ibid., 231-236). If one

wishes to live one's life to the fullest, one needs to be honest about what one wishes to do with one's life. The same goes for political or cultural life, or being true to an ideology and so forth. Keeping doors open for possibilities one does not necessarily want or need but which are nice to keep open just in case, is not an authentic way of living (*ibid.*, 234).

4. Fear as Unconcealment

Fear is a reaction to encounters disruptive of the powers of everyday life (Bollnow 1959, 51). But as pointed out, the state of fear is not only necessarily a negative thing. Fear plays a sensible role for us who fear. It is a reaction to threats, but it is also a way of being where one changes one's behaviour in order to preserve oneself from those threats. Notably, it is also quite straightforward to consider that when one is in fear, one remains in a lie about oneself. People intuitively deduce that fear indicates being in a lie: when one is fearful, one is not being true to all the capacities a person possesses. Therefore, one is untrue to oneself. When one is not fearful, on the other hand, one can live to the fullest of one's capabilities. But it is not as simple as that really.

Not all things that cause fear are necessarily destructive, even if considered threats at first. An encounter with something one has never encountered before can result in a new knowledge, even though the encounter may cause anxiety and fear at first. In fact, fear itself opens up new knowledge. I contend, that fear enables unconcealment of truths that would otherwise be inaccessible. Fear results in an initial assessment of what is encountered and without that fear, a necessary inherent aspect of the thing being encountered would remain unknown.

Heidegger's idea of truth as unconcealment posits that no situation of unknowing exists at the outset from which one then begins unrestrictedly to build knowledge or acquire truth (Heidegger 1962, 208-213). Rather, a situation of concealment exists at the outset and one must wrest the truth from it in an explicit exertion; one must 'tear the veil' from truth (Bollnow 1974, 8). I reckon this holds for both the truth about external things and for the inner truthfulness of a person. Heidegger

speaks of the 'error' in which a person always finds him or herself, and which belongs to the inner constitution of his or her Dasein (Heidegger 1962; 1942, 23). Fear is therefore a way of living that seems to reveal or remind us of an inherent 'error' or incapability.

Unconcealment (in German *Unverborgenheit*) is a term that first entered Heidegger's philosophy as a translation for the ancient Greek word '*alêtheia*'. The more standard translation for the word is '*truth*' (in German Wahrheit), but Heidegger elected for a literal translation; 'alêtheia' literally means '*not-concealed*' (Wrathall 2011, 1). Unconcealment is an event: it occurs for human beings, according to Heidegger, through 'the creative projection of essence and the law of essence' (Heidegger 2001, 7). The idea of unconcealment rejects the idea that uniquely right answers to questions exist, promoting, through that rejection, a type of epistemological relativism. Heidegger contends that we encounter entities as they are only in virtue of the world within which they can be disclosed and encountered (Heidegger 1962, 208-213). Unconcealment is therefore a privative notion: it removes concealment[2].

After first arguing that the view of truth as 'uncovering' has historical precedents among the Greeks, Heidegger discusses one of the more important, challenging characteristics of his theory of truth. Truth, he claims, refers in the first and most real sense not to objects but to Dasein. If we define truth as uncovering, truth must obviously be a characteristic of Dasein. Only in the sense of being uncovered can one say that 'objects' are true. 'True' and 'false' are characteristics of human activity in terms of one's hiding behind masks and deceits. It is, indeed, Dasein that most properly uncovers and discloses, and Dasein that is being disclosed. In chapter five of 'Being and Time,' Heidegger interprets the disclosure of Dasein in terms of 'state of mind' (thrownness), 'understanding' (projection), and 'fallenness.' In emphasising the role played by Dasein's disclosure in the meaning of truth, Heidegger recalls analyses of thrownness, projection, and fallenness, arguing that as an entity that uncovers, as an entity 'in truth,' Dasein reveals itself as *factical*, limited by what actually is; *in existential projection*, open to its own possibilities; and *fallen*, closed off to these possibilities by its

'they' involvement (Gelven 1989, 132). This last characteristic is particularly important because it introduces the idea of 'untruth.' For the most part, Dasein does not expose itself; it remains hidden. When hidden it is in untruth; this is due to its fallenness[3]. Heidegger points out that the very etymology of the Greek *aletheia* shows that truth is a type of violation or robbery of the 'normal' case; truth is snatched from the usual mode of untruth in the 'they' self. In this sense, I reckon, truth is practical, almost political. The whole structure of the existential analytic proceeds from an everyday and inauthentic existence, in which the grounds of authenticity can be spotted. This existence is worldly and societal, and outlines the boundaries of our true motives. We are all aware that we avoid those areas that will expose and reveal our innermost selves, meaning that a shrewd observer can recognise where our real selves are hidden by noting what it is we avoid.

Heidegger argues that the two really important results of his analysis of the phenomenon of truth are *firstly*, that truth belongs primordially to Dasein and *secondly*, that Dasein is both in truth and in untruth. The real opposite to truth is not a lie. A lie is secondary: a truth must exist first before one can consciously hide it in a lie. The real opposite of truth is 'the deceptive appearance whose indeterminateness, like a thick fog, hides the true essence of things' (Bollnow 1974, 9). Heidegger ascribes this deceptive appearance to the world of chatter and ambiguity in which everything is understood in an approximate manner, such that absolutely nothing is doubtful (Heidegger 1962; 1942). The path to truth consists therefore in conquering that deceptive appearance, I think. When a person is in fear, that person does not rely on chatter and ambiguity for his way of being, but is looking for sustainable grounds for knowledge. I would infer from this, that one gains relief from fear through knowledge of the true nature of things.

For Heidegger (1962, 180), fear can be divided into three categories: that which is considered fearsome, fearing as such, and that about which we fear. The 'fearsome,' that in the face of which we fear, is always something we encounter within the world and which may have either 'readiness-to-hand,' 'presence-at-hand,' or 'Dasein with' as its type of Being (Heidegger 1962,

180). 'Fearsome' involves itself; therefore, what we encounter is detrimental in character. That which is encountered shows itself within a context of involvements: that which is detrimental, which threatens us, is not yet within striking distance, but is coming close (Heidegger 1962, 181). In fearing as such, what we have characterised as threatening is freed and allowed to matter to us. Fear can regard the fearsome explicitly, and 'make it clear' to itself (Heidegger 1962, 181). Fear therefore 'unconceals' that which is feared, the fearsome.

A deceptive appearance is not untruth, however, in the sense of being consciously distorted; rather, it is an unproblematic condition in which a person is estranged from questions about the real truth. Truth is not gained in a neutral process of knowledge: it requires the cancellation of a deceptive but pacifying appearance. This process is, however, always a painful process that touches a person in his or her inmost depth (Bollnow 1959, 142; 1974, 9; Heidegger 1962, 34). If truth can never begin without presuppositions and always consists in conquering a given deceptive intelligibility, and if truth means lifting something out of concealment into the light of full visibility, the path to truth can never consist of building from the 'bottom up'; rather, it must consist of the circular procedure known to us from the methodology of the humanities, a procedure in which the universally fruitful path to truth is revealed (Bollnow 1974, 9).

Bollnow most certainly appreciates his mentor's conception of truth. He contends, that Heidegger's notion of truth as unconcealment is further substantiated by other views, which have made their impact upon the theory of knowledge from the most varied quarters. One of them is the view that the theoretical altitude is not self-sufficient but is a by-product of active life. Practice is more primal than theory. According to Bollnow (1974), Heidegger elaborated very impressively the way in which things are presented to us in the first instance in their obvious availability (Zuhandensein) and how it is only on this account that the mere existence (Vorhandensein) stands out in relief as, in Heidegger's conception, a deficient means of practical aquaintance with things. But this rules out the possibility of evolving at the

theoretical level a knowledge that is self-sufficient.

Also, rational knowledge is not separable from the underground of volitional impulses, feelings and moods, that these are not to be regarded as obstructions which one should try to eliminate as far as possible but that they enter into the ground of knowledge as inseparable postulates (Bollnow 1974, 10). When Heidegger states that we must leave the primary discovery of the world to 'mere mood', he is reiterating a stale of affairs, which makes the unconditioned evolution of knowledge impossible. On this ground does Bollnow present his own theory of moods and later his existential theory of education (Bollnow 1959).

5. Existential-Pedagogical Insight on Fear

As already hinted previously, Bollnow continues further on Heidegger's notion of truth as unconcealment, and extends this idea to cover all the emotions, and further including a phenomenological insight that in educational discourse has become called pedagogical atmosphere.

> It would be blindness if one tried to suggest that the child's life could or should consist only of these pleasant emotions and attitudes. Also included, of course, are the opposing experiences of fear and doubt and the never-ending experiences of sadness. This can adversely affect a child more than an adult because the child is unable to defend himself or herself against the effects of these experiences. And as existential philosophy has commonly taught us, these disturbing experiences of life fulfill an important function in that they tear us out of our everyday taken-for-grantedness and lead us to a more authentic existence. (Bollnow 1966, 4)

Thus, one should not overlook the epistemic possibilities of fear as unconcealment in educational processes. However, there is a catch to it:

> The parent or educator must also know about this dark side of the child's world. The task of the adult lies in comforting and being available in the face of such threats. But I would not consider these experiences to be an actual part of the process of childrearing or education, that is, in the positive sense of contributing to the child's growth. (Bollnow 1966, 4)

The kinds of aspects of life as negative emotions are not something that educational processes willingly support or

attempt to maintain. However, one cannot assume that these processes would necessarily execute without the possibility or danger of the emotion such as fear. These critical, shaking aspects to education are what Bollnow refers to as existential, *discontinuous forms of education.* Bollnow uses the term 'encounter' to characterise further these processes by which we experience being struck by the resistance of the subject matter when something is given to us in our conscious experience. Bollnow limits the term to the ultimate, decisive experiences during which one is in a true sense 'shaken' and thrown off course by the power of the reality that confronts oneself. The 'wholly other' confronts a person, demanding and frightening (Bollnow 1959, 4). While encounter with that which is overpowering defines the ultimate quality of the interpretive process of the humanities, that encounter also permeates the details of everyday work in the humanities, work such as in educational processes. To a certain extent, every truth is characterised by fearful reality encountered as something independent of the subject. This is what is meaningfully called objectivity; that is, verification in the object (Bollnow 1974, 3-18).

Not only is fear a means to verify objects in the world as fearful, but also to verify or rather, constitute oneself in-the-world through the state of fear. This Heideggerian insight does not mean, however, that this self-world -constitution happens solely through fear. However, as Bollnow points out, there are fundamental existential-pedagogical motifs. In addition, the Heideggerian distinction of fear appears especially fruitful. Fear is rendered in Heidegger's treatment as a phenomenon of three levels: fear as that which is *fearful*, *fearing as such*, and that *about which we fear*. Bollnow sheds some additional light to why this distinction is important to make. Fearful can take many different forms, namely, the world can be seen in very different light according to what the objects which we fear are. Not everyone fear war, for instance:

> There is a certain romantic fascination with the danger of war. War, so taught already Heraclitus, is the father of all things. In war, so one learns further, is revealed for the first time the true greatness of men. The life of peace receives in this light a certain contemptuous after-taste. It is for the lame and the weak, for those who do not dare to pledge themselves. This view is rooted, it seems to me, in modern

> irrationalism, and thus this irrationalism seems to me to present a danger to peace which one cannot take seriously enough (Bollnow 1966, 82).

This passage shows how fearing is linked to the main motif in Heidegger's *Being and Time*, namely that Being is not out of time. Being is a timely occurrence that is constituted by the context in which it is. Being is not universal, but historically particular. Human Being as *Dasein* is thus constituted historically. This applies also to the self-world -relation that is constituted through fear. Existentialism shows how remarkably meaningful these 'negative emotions' can be, and how their objects can differ historically and contextually.

> These tendencies have been taken up in recent years, to an increasing degree, by existentialism and related currents of thought. After all of the deep reaching destruction of the prevailing order, after all of the experiences of the shocking abyss of existence, an attitude has formed which sees in the striving of peace and security only the remnants of a contemptible "bourgeois" world-view, a world-view which flees into illusions and protects itself from glimpsing the gruesome reality. In the face of the enormous endangerment of human life, it seems in this view to be treason to strive for safety and security, and the courageous suffering of the total threat seems – in this view – to be the single honorable attitude (Bollnow 1966, 82).

But this is, in the end, an ironical comment. Is it really that existentialism shows and cultivates the negativity, the fearing and the fearful? This is doubtful, as it would offer again a new totality that superimposes an ahistorical view upon previous views that have been consciously rendered as historical. Heidegger points out, as Bollnow will elaborate, that even this view is historical and as such, without ultimate grounds:

> To me such an attitude seems dangerous and ultimately irresponsible; because it easily leads to a self-intoxication with the feeling of threat and to a passive surrender to terrible events. It is not that we would be blind to the threat, but rather that we recognize it in its full measure; I believe the single responsible attitude is one of opposing this temptation with the utmost determination. Accordingly, it seems to me that one of the most important tasks, perhaps the most important task overall, which education has to fulfill today is: To oppose all dark powers by cultivating the forces of rational insight and clear circumspection, or to speak generally, to lead human beings once again toward a right respect of reason (Bollnow 1966, 82).

And as any Heideggerian would point out, this 'right respect of reason' is the respect of historical reason; a reason that is not universally subjective, but historically intersubjective. We come back to the notion of unveiling of truths. There is no truth in subjective sense, but in the supra-individual sense of a revealed truth about the world. Self is a worldly thing, as Heidegger and Bollnow point out. Thus, self, or in this context, Dasein, is as much a worldly thing as a rock or a computer. Therefore, self can be disclosed to oneself as a worldly thing. This notion is remarkably educational in its core.

So what about fear, then? Is it a good thing or not? The reality of a cottage life ('hütte Dasein') is revealed to us only through the practice of living at a cottage. Similarly, the reality has its aspects which are only revealed or graspable through the ability to fear. Now, here fear has to be separated, once more, from other emotions or attitudes, such as hope or anxiety:

> Fear, so often taken as the opposite of hope ever since the Stoics' theory of emotions, is not enough. For fear is always a definite emotion, and therefore not the proper antithesis to that aura of indefinite anticipation which envelops the vast horizon of new possibilities held out to man by Hope (quite apart from the fact that it has not the same definite relationship to the future, since one can also be afraid of what is already present). Anxiety which, as a state of undefined emotions, has always been distinguished from fear as a definite emotion, must also be excluded, for it lacks even more the orientation toward the future so characteristic of hope. (Bollnow 1961, 266).

Fear in Heideggerian-Bollnowian terms is a definite emotion, a mental state, or even a definite attitude as a way of being-in-the-world. Fear is also easily framed out behaviour or worldly practice. It is not difficult to notice when a person is in fear. But the object of fear may change between people, and also by time or situation. This supposes, that fear as an attitude defines and constitutes world contextually in a way that other emotions or attitudes do not (e.g. care, anxiety etc.). Still, fear is linked closely with these other attitudes. Its in interestingly in Bollnow's treatise of pedagogical atmosphere (1964) that he links security and fear in a constitutive juxtapose in child-rearing. Although it seems that the impulses of a child's trust require special and cautious *care*, even when, from the perspective of the adult, these impulses appear excessive, for this trust is according

to Bollnow *the* foundation that must exist if the child is to develop properly. This care, which has the connotation to and concretizes Heidegger's famous Dasein's way of being-in-the-world, in relation to the changing needs of the developmental phases, advances in a dual direction. Firstly, the unconditional trust in mother and father is to be continued as long as it faithfully contains the child's world and presents continuing possibilities for the child. Secondly, the unconditional trust must necessarily break apart as soon as the child takes on some independence and notices inadequacies in even the best, most helpful person, for a person who is essentially imperfect cannot fulfill this function forever (Bollnow 1964, 14). People are not omnipotent, and the child eventually experiences their human weaknesses.

Thus, trusted and protected world carries from the beginning the seeds of its own transition. In fact, the totality of this trust is the grounds for its demise, for at some time the insight into mother's imperfections must break through. With this knowledge ends the completeness of the child's world (Bollnow 1964, 14). What is required of the parent or teacher when educating and child? Their task is to guide the child carefully through the disappointments in order to slowly and carefully allow him or her to leave behind the absoluteness of trust in one concrete other person, and to guide to a new state, no longer bound to a single person, which provides a firm support against all other possible disappointments of life. The central task is to create a space for such trust, which will form the ground of a sense of security in spite of all calamities and all threats. The child must be able to perceive the possibility of a sound world because without this basis no human existence can stand. And where this trust is omitted one may expect the occurrence of inner and outer disintegration. For Bollnow, education entails the possibility of hazardous outcomes, and we need fear to disclose this possibility to us. The erosion of the child's security remains an endangering condition, in which the dichotomy of fear and trust becomes best disclosed:

> There exists a duality of fear and trust, into which, unto the highest age, human life is placed, or as Jacobi called it, "an alternating song

between heaven and hell." Forever anew must the realm of security be won from the invasion of counter influences. (Bollnow 1964, 15).

Fear is thus a particular pedagogical notion, in relation to, but distinguishable from other phenomenal attitudes. This is educationally important in a fundamental way. Michael Bonnett (2000) has pointed out, that understanding the fundamental questions about education redefines education itself. What the treatment here in this article preliminarily suggests, is in fact that this fundamental understanding of education, namely being engaged in the constitution of the world (in this case through fear in particular) could be seen as a form of *self-education*. Although education as child-rearing or as teaching entails a certain attitude of care from the educator, one is left with just that: it is the task of the child to disclose the world as it is for her. In Bollnow's thought, this disclosing happens within the duality of trust and fear. Fear itself thus, *is* an educational phenomenon, and that it serves as an unconcealing force to educational outcomes in itself. Without fear, the world could not be disclosed but in particular and distorted ways. This requires a welcomed broad view of education, which traverses any formal or even informal practices that are attributed to it. Education is part of life entailed in a life-world, and phenomenally, education cannot be pinpointed to just one societal practice, but as a way of life it transcends only formal ways of educational practice (see Koskela 2012, 166). Education as self-education, or as non-formal educational practice becomes understood best if we allow it to be superimposed on nearly every human practice, and thus to all different aspects of human life-world such as the phenomenological understanding of fear.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have scrutinised fear as an aspect of what we might call the 'disclosure' of truth, truth that is never disconnected from a person who is 'in' truth; in other words, a person who knows the truth. Fear is rendered in Heidegger's treatment as a phenomenon of three levels: fear as that which is *fearful*, *fearing as such*, and that *about which we fear*. This notion differs greatly from other understandings of fear, which

focus mainly on *the object of fear* or fear as a distance between the poles of subject-positions such as desire or dislike. However, one should not consider these different lines of argumentation as opposite to each other. Rather, one should consider them as various distinguishable aspects or layers of the same phenomenon and thus offering a fruitful view on such intuitively negative but at closer inspection, fundamental aspect to being human. Not only does fear play constitutive role in being human, but there is a motif of 'becoming' underlying the fearful constitution of the self and the world, and implied in Bollnow's pedagogical writings. For Bollnow, education as child's eventual attempt to disclose the world is a potentially hazardous enterprise, which is necessarily constituted in the dichotomy between fear and trust. Otherwise, the world would not be unconcealed to its fullest. This notion of fear has pedagogical significance in itself that require further investigation. In this article it has been argued that the motif of fear as unconcealment or disclosure of truths can be shown to be a significant pedagogical motif that should be further studied upon both in educational research and in practical philosophy.

NOTES

[1] *Dasein*, "being there", a concept used by Heidegger in his work Being and Time (*Sein und Zeit)*, referring to a human being as a being who is able to question one's own condition of being-in-the-world. But Dasein is not only a person, but a being itself. Dasein can be best understood as a way of life, as in cultural life, political life etc., where life is not attributable to only one single individual.

[2] In his later works, Heidegger contends that concealment has two meanings: *one*, to have no awareness of a thing, and *two,* to have no possible context for a thing (Heidegger 2001). Meaning one describes a superficial form of concealment in which a thing exists but we lack a sense for it (Wrathall 2011, 2), while meaning two points to a more profound, fundamental form of concealment. For an entity to be is for it to stand in a context of constitutive relations. The lack of any possible context is therefore an ontological concealment, the absence of conditions in which the entity in question might manifest itself in being (Wrathall 2011, 2). A core notion exists here that can already be found in 'Being and Time,' namely that unconcealment consists of bringing things to awareness and of creating a context within which things can be what they are. Therefore, the core idea of unconcealment functions as a methodological principle.

[3] Every uncoveredness in the world occurs with a concealing of entities. For Heidegger, the default state of entities in the world is being covered over. Truth

understood as uncoveredness is as if stealing. "The factical uncoveredness of anything is, as it were, always a robbery" (Heidegger 1962, 294). This default state applies also to Dasein. Dasein's default state of being in the world is having the truth of its being covered. The understanding, dispositions, and skills that Dasein has at the first instant are the banalised understandings, dispositions, and skills of the one (*das Man*) (Wrathall 2011, 24). Therefore to my understanding, entities are initially manifest but nonetheless concealed in what they are most authentically. Authenticity, by contrast, consists in Dasein's learning to "uncover the world in its own way…this uncovering of the 'world' [is]…always accomplished as a clearing away of concealments and obscurities, as a breaking up of the disguises with which Dasein bars its own way" (Heidegger 1962, 129).

REFERENCES

Bollnow, Otto F. 1955. "Begegnung und Bildung.*" Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 1(1): 10-32.

Bollnow, Otto F. 1959. *Existenzphilosophie und Pädagogik. Die unstetige Formen der Erziehung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Bollnow, Otto F. 1974. "The Objectivity of the Humanities and the Essence of Truth." *Philosophy Today* 18(4):3-18.

Bollnow, Otto F. 1964. *Die pädagogische Atmosphäre. Untersuchung über die gefühlsmäßigen zwischenmenschlichen Voraussetzungen der Erziehung*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

Bollnow, Otto F. 1961. "The Meaning of Hope." *Universitas* 4(1): 263-273.

Bonnett, Michael. 2000. "Environmental concern and the metaphysics of education." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 34(4): 591-607.

Burton, Larry D. 2011. "Fear." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 20(2): 113-116.

Carman, Taylor. 2003. *Heidegger's Analytic.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cristian, Alin. 2012. "Daring to Fear: Optimizing the Encounter of Danger through Education." *Meta: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, and Practical Philosophy* 4(1): 9-36.

Crowell, Steven. 2007. "Conscience and Reason: Heidegger and the Grounds of Intentionality." In *Transcendental Heidegger*,

edited by S. Crowell and J. Malpas. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dahlström, Daniel. 2007. "Transcendental Truth and the Truth That Prevails." In *Transcendental Heidegger*, edited by S. Crowell and J. Malpas. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Day, John P. 1991. *Hope. A Philosophical Inquiry*. Helsinki: Acta Philosophica Fennica,

Deely, John. 2007. *Intentionality and Semiotics*. Scranton: University of Scranton Press.

Deely, John. 2010. *Semiotic Animal*. South Bend: St. Augustine's Press.

Gelven, Martin 1989. *A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heidegger, Martin. 1943. *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit. Zu Platons Höhlengleichnis und Theätet*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin. 2001. *Sein und Wahrheit*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.

Hume, David. 2000. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irvine, William B. 2006. *On Desire. Why we want what we want*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, Carolyn. 2010. 'Fear in Education.' *Educational Review* 62(1): 39-52.

Koskela, Jani 2012. *Discontinuity as Theoretical Foundation to Pedagogy – Existential Phenomenology in Otto Friedrich Bollnow's Philosophy of Education*. University of Oulu: Acta Universitatis Ouluensis.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Meurs, Pieter. 2012. "Education as Praxis: A Corporeal Hermeneutical Account." *Meta: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, and Practical Philosophy* 4(2): 363-376.

Mulhall, Stephen. 1996. *Heidegger and Being and Time*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Niiniluoto, Ilkka & Räikkä Juha (ed.). 1996. *Tunteet (Emotions)*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Putwain, David W. & Roberts, Christine M. 2012. "Fear and efficacy appeals in the classroom: the secondary teachers' perspective." *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology* 32(3): 355-372.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1971. *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*. London: Methuen.

Svendsen, Lars. 2008. *Philosophy of Fear*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Vadén, Tere. 2012. *Heidegger, Žižek ja vallankumous (Heidegger, Žižek and Revolution)*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Welton, Donn. 1999. *The Body*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wrathall, Mark. 2004. "Heidegger on Plato, Truth, and Unconcealment: The 1931–32 Lecture on *The Essence of Truth*." *Inquiry* 47(1): 443–463.

Wrathall, Mark. 2011. *Heidegger and Concealment*. Truth, Language and History. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jani Kukkola is a university lecturer at the Faculty of Education at University of Oulu, Finland, where he gained his doctorate in philosophy of education with highest distinction. His research interests are related to philosophy of education, phenomenology, university pedagogy and educational systems.

Address:
Jani Kukkola
Faculty of Education
P.O. BOX 2000
90014 University of Oulu, Finland
E-mail: jani.koskela@oulu.fi