

UNITED WISDOM

Courage: Acting While Fear Remains

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A25 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Courage: Acting While Fear Remains

Epigraph

> *What is courage?*

Plato, Laches, a question in the discussion of courage; an excerpt. The dialogue examines different answers and ends without a final definition.

What this article is about

A person is about to say something important and notices that fear has not disappeared. They have prepared, chosen their words and understood the purpose of the conversation, yet still want to postpone it. Real courage seems to require confidence first. While their voice trembles and they want to retreat, acting feels insufficiently mature. They can wait a long time for a state that need not arrive before the first step.

This article considers courage as thoughtful participation in action while fear remains. It does not grant permission to ignore danger. We need to understand why we are acting, what we know about the circumstances, who bears the consequences and what support can be arranged. The useful question is not how to stop being afraid permanently, but whether there are sufficient grounds for this step under present uncertainty.

We will distinguish fear, risk assessment, preparation and ethical responsibility. Philosophical texts help pose questions but do not replace knowledge about a particular situation. The practice is for ordinary, voluntary decisions. It is not anxiety treatment, a compulsory exercise or a demand to remain in dangerous circumstances.

I. Fear does not provide a ready-made decision

During a work meeting, a specialist notices an error in their own calculation. It has not yet produced consequences, but correcting it will require acknowledging it to colleagues. They fear appearing unreliable. They might decide that this fear prohibits speaking up. Alternatively, they might take fear as a signal to confess loudly at once. Both approaches hand the decision to a feeling. Between them remains the possibility of checking the calculation, understanding the consequences and choosing a suitable way to communicate the correction.

Fear indicates a significant threat or an expectation of an unfavourable outcome. The experience itself establishes neither the likelihood of that outcome nor the only right action. Anxiety before a conversation can coexist with sufficient reasons to speak. Calm can coexist with inadequate understanding. The intensity of a feeling and the quality of a decision should

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

therefore be considered separately, without requiring the first to be switched off before the second becomes possible.

In Plato's Laches, definitions of courage are examined. Proposed answers are not the author's final word. For our question, the willingness to investigate which actions deserve the name is useful. Visible determination does not remove the need to think. This is a philosophical motif, not a proven psychological technique for judging every frightened person.

In an ordinary situation, reflection can start simply: what action is involved, what threat am I expecting and why am I considering this step? Sometimes these questions reveal that the action needs changing. Sometimes they confirm that it remains appropriate. Fear can persist in either case. The absence of immediate relief neither disproves the decision nor requires raising the stakes to demonstrate courage.

II. What makes participation worthwhile?

Not every difficult action has sufficient purpose. Sometimes people take risks because others call refusal weak. Sometimes they fear losing their image as a decisive person and agree to something they do not consider necessary. Courage then becomes service to someone else's expectation. The action remains difficult, but that difficulty does not clarify its purpose.

In the workplace example, communicating the error has a purpose that needs no heroic image: colleagues require accurate information to make a decision. This differs from publicly proving honesty at any cost. It allows a form that actually communicates the correction: check the data, tell the responsible participant and clarify whether a wider revision is needed. The task determines the format, rather than a demand to appear fearless before the largest possible audience.

Purpose can be examined by imagining the consequences without witnesses. If nobody learns how determined I was, will the action still be needed? This question supplies no universal answer but can reveal a substitution. A conversation about a relationship boundary may remain meaningful without anyone's approval. A risky display before a group may lose almost all its purpose when the audience disappears.

A grand public mission is not required. Asking for clarification, declining an unsuitable commitment or protecting agreed working conditions may be sufficient grounds. The size of the scene does not define courage. What matters is that the action serves a real task and respects those affected by its consequences. A small conversation may require as much participation as a striking public performance.

III. Clarify which fear remains

Being afraid can mean very different expectations. One person fears rejection, another lost income and a third aggression. These circumstances call for different decisions. Calling them all a growth zone removes the distinction between an unpleasant conversation, substantial financial stakes and immediate danger. No language of courage should conceal that difference.

For an ordinary decision, it helps to name the anticipated outcome concretely. What might the other person say or do? What facts support that expectation? What remains unknown? An unpleasant reaction can be possible without becoming a certain future. Real signs of risk may also be noticed, requiring advice, protection or another route. Specificity offers more possibilities than a general demand to overcome fear.

If violence, coercion or serious health risks are involved, the task becomes arranging safety and competent support. Declining a dangerous action does not mean lacking courage. The important step may be leaving, contacting people who can assist or refusing an imposed test. This boundary matters especially when someone else urges us to prove how brave we are.

NIMH distinguishes ordinary anxiety from conditions in which it persistently interferes with life. We are not diagnosing anyone here. Fear that is severe, increasing or noticeably limiting everyday life can be discussed with a qualified professional. An individual decision practice does not replace assessment. Participation remains voluntary even when an action looks simple from outside: another person does not know the full burden of the experience.

IV. Preparation that supports action

Preparation can reduce uncertainty without removing fear. Communicating a calculation error may require checking it again, identifying the affected conclusions and proposing a correction. Making a request may require clarifying what is needed and whom to ask. Declining a commitment may require identifying precisely what is being declined and how to communicate it promptly. Preparation supports the action's content in each case.

Sometimes, however, preparation becomes an endless condition of entry. A person rehearses every possible response, rewrites the message and looks for more reassurance that nobody will be upset. Complete assurance still does not exist. If preparation aims to eliminate every unpleasant feeling, its endpoint keeps moving. It helps to decide beforehand which information the decision genuinely requires and what will make preparation sufficient.

For example, the person can choose to verify essential data, formulate the message's purpose and identify its recipient. Some unknowns then remain to be discovered in conversation. This boundary does not demand acting blindly. It separates necessary checking from an attempt to

control the whole future. If preparation reveals a significant new danger, the plan needs reconsideration; a previously chosen deadline does not erase important circumstances.

Support can also be arranged: discuss the issue with a competent colleague, ask a trusted person to be present or choose a format in which speaking is easier. This does not diminish personal participation. Courage does not require acting without resources. Asking for support may itself be the difficult part, especially for someone accustomed to treating any help as proof of inadequate independence.

V. Understanding risk and considering others

Good judgement matters, but it cannot provide exact knowledge of every outcome. Information may be limited, consequences ambiguous and other people may have legitimate interests that cannot be reduced to our convenience. Courage then concerns how incomplete knowledge is handled: acknowledge limits, avoid impossible promises, identify acceptable stakes and respect others' decisions.

In Book III of the Eudemian Ethics, Aristotle discusses courage in relation to reasoning and danger. We use this as a historical question about an action's quality. Ancient social hierarchies and demeaning descriptions are not applied to contemporary readers. Philosophical discussion does not establish an acceptable risk for a particular family, organisation or medical situation. Those circumstances require separate consideration.

Suppose someone wants to begin a project and fears failure. Their willingness to lose personal time does not authorise risking the shared family budget without discussion. One participant's courage may rest on another's unspoken exposure to loss. Assessment therefore includes who pays for a possible error and whether they were included in the decision. Agreeing with a goal does not always mean accepting any price for achieving it.

Considering others also provides reasons to stop. If a method requires deception, pressure or breaking an agreement, a strong desire to overcome fear does not justify it. Another way to pursue an acceptable aim can be sought. People can acknowledge that they do not yet know how to handle the task well enough. This preserves learning and requests for assistance instead of turning determination into permission to override others' boundaries.

VI. A small step need not promise higher stakes

An initial action can have limited scope. Before a difficult conversation, ask to agree on a time. For an unfamiliar project, obtain information from an appropriate person. When an error must be reported, start with verification and contact with the responsible participant. A limited step answers a concrete question and reduces the commitment accepted at once.

Making a step smaller does not make every dangerous situation safe. A small part of an unsuitable action can remain unacceptable. Not every threat can be addressed by dividing the task or approaching gradually. This matters especially for health, violence and other circumstances requiring competent assessment. The practice offered here is not a self-directed treatment programme for fear.

For an ordinary voluntary decision, identify what the step can reveal. Asking about a conversation's timing establishes when it is possible. An information meeting can clarify a project's conditions. There is no need to promise all further stages beforehand. What is learned may confirm the plan, change it or show that continuing is unsuitable. Retaining the right to reconsider makes action more responsible.

Someone who has arranged a meeting may still fear the conversation itself. This does not erase what has been done. A concrete result can be acknowledged: a time was agreed, information gathered or a participant notified. The next task can then be considered in light of new circumstances. This does not turn life into a succession of compulsory trials. It allows participation in the part of the action whose purpose and conditions are currently understood.

VII. When fear concerns someone else's judgement

Sometimes the anticipated harm is chiefly that another person will see our uncertainty. We want to ask for what is needed without pauses, a trembling voice or an awkward beginning. The real task acquires a second task: creating a perfect impression. The more important that impression becomes, the harder it is to begin, even when the content is clear and circumstances allow conversation.

An imperfect delivery can be allowed beforehand. A person may request a little time, consult notes or say that beginning is difficult. These actions do not promise a favourable reaction. They expand the available way to participate. Reporting the workplace error remains useful even without a confident tone. Accurate data and a timely correction matter more than performing calm.

Not every listener responds respectfully, however. If there are grounds to anticipate humiliation or punishment, permission to be awkward is insufficient. The channel, possible accompaniment and protection of agreed rights need consideration. Social fear sometimes reflects real power conditions. It cannot always be explained as the frightened person's inner insecurity. Arranging the conversation should account for circumstances as well as the speaker's state.

It is also useful to distinguish our decision from another person's response. We can choose a timely, respectful message. We cannot guarantee agreement, gratitude or an absence of irritation. Our measure of participation should therefore concern what we actually control.

Otherwise, every disapproval becomes proof that the action was mistaken, even when the listener had a different position or difficulties of their own.

VIII. Acting and reconsidering can belong to one decision

Reconsideration can seem weak: once an action begins, the intention must be completed regardless of what is discovered. This makes action rigid. New information becomes a test of resolve. Yet a decision can include permission to stop under specified circumstances. An agreed condition for reconsideration helps maintain direction rather than merely sustain movement.

In How We Think, Dewey connects reflection with examining the grounds and consequences of a belief. This educational and philosophical motif can become a question here: what information might change the plan? It is not a universal algorithm for choosing correctly. It does recognise that acting and investigating circumstances can support one another. A first step may be justified because its immediate grounds are sufficient and further clarification remains possible, rather than because everything is already known.

A person might agree to an introductory project meeting without promising to join the project. They identify important conditions beforehand: the actual workload, responsibility, available resources and participants' rights. If the conditions turn out substantially different from those offered, courage does not require signing against the evidence. Acknowledging uncertainty initially prevents the false feeling that the first step created an irrevocable obligation.

Fear can persist after a justified refusal too. Disappointing people or losing an opportunity may be frightening. That feeling does not establish that the refusal was wrong. Grounds and consequences need consideration again. Responsible action may mean continuing, changing the format or stopping and explaining. None of these outcomes can be determined in advance by how forcefully the word courage is used.

IX. Duty within a tradition and a particular choice

In the Bhagavad-Gita, reflection and steadfastness appear within Krishna and Arjuna's religious discussion of duty, knowledge and devotion. That context cannot be reduced to modern advice to fulfil any announced plan. The martial narrative and religious assumptions do not authorise violence or unconditional obedience to someone else's task. Here we consider thoughtful participation while maintaining the analogy's limits.

Readers may ask how duty appears in their own situation. Was a specific commitment accepted, or merely an expectation of always being convenient to others? Was agreement free? What changed after the original promise? These questions do not retell an ancient

teaching as a psychological method. They make the grounds for action in contemporary life more explicit.

Plato's examination of a definition, Aristotle's account of virtue, a religious discussion of duty and Dewey's educational reflection have different purposes. We do not claim that they describe a single psychological model. Comparing them reveals several aspects of the question: what to call courage, how action relates to reasoning, what we consider ourselves responsible for and how we examine an intention's grounds.

The comparison has a limit: it does not make a particular decision on someone's behalf. Their circumstances remain significant. They can respect a tradition without accepting a dangerous imposed role. They can maintain a commitment while discussing how it is fulfilled. They can acknowledge fear and still participate voluntarily in an appropriate action. Connecting traditions expands the questions rather than eliminating the right to answer.

X. After the step: consider participation without judging feelings

After an important action, we want to know immediately whether we were brave enough. Sometimes we assess ourselves by whether anxiety remains. If it does, the attempt seems unsuccessful. Yet the action may already have fulfilled its purpose: information was communicated, a request made or a boundary stated. Feeling and result can follow different timelines. A properly considered step cannot be promised to produce calm.

A review can focus on several facts. Was the action's purpose understood? What information was considered? Were consent and acceptable stakes preserved? What actually happened? What now needs clarification or correction? These questions support learning without giving a person a permanent label. An error can be acknowledged and corrected without proving that everything done was either wholly good or wholly bad.

Notice which support helped. Brief notes, an agreed time or a competent colleague's participation may have made a difference. Preparation may have been too lengthy or the communication channel unsuitable. A later decision can use these observations. Repetition need not happen immediately. One meaningful experience does not enrol someone in an ongoing programme of overcoming fear in which every week requires a greater risk.

Courage while fear remains thus includes several quiet capacities: choosing a meaningful aim, considering circumstances, accepting a manageable share of responsibility and taking a voluntary step. Sometimes it includes declining an unsuitable method or asking for help. Fear may remain part of the experience. It need not be an enemy to destroy before a person is allowed to participate in their own life.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary situation involving voluntary action without an immediate threat to safety. Do not use the practice to make yourself endure violence, treat severe anxiety alone or prove a willingness to take risks. Where competent assessment or protection is needed, arranging that support is a task in its own right.

1. **Name the action and its purpose.** Write down what you want to do and whom it helps. Describe a result: communicate a correction, request clarification or decline a specific commitment. Wanting to appear fearless does not itself identify a useful aim.

2. **Clarify the anticipated outcome.** What are you afraid of here? Separate known circumstances from assumptions. If substantial danger becomes apparent, reconsider the route rather than demand greater effort.

3. **Check whose interests are affected.** Who may bear consequences? Is agreement, competent advice or further information needed? Personal willingness to risk something does not replace other participants' consent.

4. **Bound preparation.** Choose the actions genuinely needed and a clear sign that they are complete. Preparation serves the task, not a guarantee that unpleasant feelings disappear.

5. **Choose a manageable step and support.** An appropriate format may include notes, an initial request to arrange a time, a colleague's involvement or another safe channel. You do not have to do everything unaided.

6. **Retain a condition for reconsideration.** Identify new information that would require changing or stopping the action. The first step should not silently promise every later stage.

7. **Consider the result.** Afterwards, note what happened, what was communicated and what still needs clarification. Continuing anxiety is not the sole measure of success or error.

Return to the specialist who noticed a calculation error. They check the data, identify which conclusions need correcting and contact the responsible colleague. Acknowledging the mistake remains unpleasant. Nevertheless, the message enables information to be corrected before a further decision. If a more serious problem emerges, its circumstances determine the next step, rather than a desire to finish the admission quickly or prove personal honesty.

In another situation, someone wants to request a changed task deadline. Their immediate step is to explain available resources and propose a concrete option while remaining open to a different position. They do not promise that the listener will agree. Participation can be considered in terms of clarity and timeliness, followed by discussion of actual conditions. This keeps courage alongside responsibility without turning it into certainty that every desired decision must be accepted.

Stop when you have one justified next step, suitable support and an understandable condition for reconsideration. A successful action does not require deliberately increasing risk afterwards. If fear persistently interferes with life or becomes too distressing, discuss it with a qualified professional rather than endlessly making an individual practice harder.

Key quotation

> *my courageous actions are wise actions*

Plato, Laches, Nicias speaking in the debate about courage; a short excerpt from Benjamin Jowett's translation. This is a character's position, subsequently examined; the dialogue provides no final definition. Nicias is describing the actions he classifies as courageous, not praising his own personal exploits.

Connections between traditions

Platonic dialogue. Laches leaves the question of courage open. Its investigative form reminds us to examine definitions even when a word seems obvious.

Aristotelian ethics. The Eudemian Ethics passage read connects courage with reasoning about danger. It is historical virtue philosophy, not a contemporary classification of people or prescription for acceptable risk.

The Bhagavad-Gita. Steadfastness and reflection appear in the religious context of duty and devotion. That context remains; the work does not become a universal demand to follow someone else's plans.

Dewey and reflection. Examining the grounds of a belief supports asking what might change a decision. This is educational philosophy, not an experimentally proven algorithm for every life situation.

Contemporary NIMH information sets a separate boundary: persistent, severe interference from anxiety deserves professional discussion. Philosophical and religious analogies do not replace assessment.

Sources

1. Plato — Laches, or Courage, translated by Benjamin Jowett. Specified portions of the debate, Nicias's surrounding exchange and the ending read. The source of both brief quotation roles; characters' positions are not presented as Plato's final doctrine.

2. Aristotle — Eudemian Ethics, Book III. Entire III.1 read in J. Solomon's historical translation, with edition checks. Social hierarchies and demeaning descriptions are excluded from contemporary use.

3. NIMH — Anxiety Disorders. Main information text, reviewed December 2024. Used to distinguish an ordinary decision from seeking qualified assessment; no treatment practice is offered.

4. Bhagavad-Gita, The Song Celestial, Edwin Arnold. Selected XVIII passages on steadfastness, duty and reflection read. Religious context preserved; neither the whole book nor other translations are claimed to have been read.

5. John Dewey — How We Think, 1910. Chapter I read. Examining grounds is used as a philosophical connection; historical prejudices are not adopted.

Tags

courage, bravery, fear, voluntary participation, action, good judgement, responsibility, preparation, uncertainty, support, choice, purpose, consent, boundaries, safety, risk, respect, conversation, error, reconsideration, Plato, Laches, Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics, Bhagavad-Gita, Dewey, anxiety, professional help, participation, manageable step

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between traditions, intercultural dialogue and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.