



## THOUGHTS ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES



### **Uncertainty, fear, and the point where thinking begins**

Uncertainty arises from the fear of loss.

Not from a lack of information.

Not from insufficient analysis.

But from the idea that something we have could become less — or disappear altogether.

This idea is not purely rational in a narrow sense.

It does not emerge only when numbers turn negative or facts are missing.

It arises where meaning is touched.



Money is often just the carrier.  
What is truly at stake is usually something else:  
security, control, orientation —  
sometimes even the image we have of ourselves.

As long as nothing is at stake, openness is not threatening.  
Indeterminacy then feels like possibility.  
Like space.  
Like freedom.

Only when loss becomes conceivable does this openness change.  
It tightens.  
It gains weight.  
It becomes uncertainty.

And with uncertainty, fear enters the picture.



This fear is not pathological.  
It is not a weakness.  
Nor is it a sign of immaturity.  
It is a deeply human response to the experience  
that the future cannot be controlled.

Fear of loss is therefore not a flaw in the system.  
It is part of the system.

The problem does not begin with fear itself.  
It begins with the attempt not to feel it.

Fear does not want to be understood.  
It wants to be ended.  
Not tomorrow — now.

It presses toward action, toward order, toward reassurance.  
Not because this order will last,  
but because it promises immediate relief.

And this is where much of what we call rational,  
professional, or prudent thinking begins.

Models, forecasts, rules, safeguards —  
all of them serve a similar function:  
they reduce the experience of uncertainty.

Not uncertainty itself,  
but its burden.

This explains why we seek explanations even when  
we know they often only emerge in hindsight.  
Why we prefer a plausible model to an open question.  
Why we would rather smooth, postpone, or reinterpret losses than endure them.



This is not a moral judgment.  
It is an observation.

Those who cannot bear the fear of loss  
try to control uncertainty.

They try to make it measurable.  
To confine it.  
To distribute it.  
To delegate it.

Not because they believe uncertainty can be eliminated entirely,  
but because control creates a feeling: agency.

That feeling is real.  
But it is not without cost.

The more energy we invest in controlling uncertainty,  
the less space remains to understand it.  
And the stronger the urge for control becomes,  
the narrower the space in which decisions  
are actually possible.

What is often overlooked is this:  
uncertainty does not disappear through control.  
It merely changes its form.

It returns as surprise.  
As rupture.  
As an event that “no one could have seen coming.”

Not because it was invisible,  
but because it lay outside what one was prepared to allow.

At this point, systems often react with haste.  
Not because they are poorly constructed,  
but because they were designed for avoidance —  
not for endurance.

There is another stance.

It begins with accepting that uncertainty is not a temporary condition.  
Not a deficiency that vanishes with more knowledge.  
But a fundamental condition of any open future.

This stance does not say:  
uncertainty is good.

It only says:  
uncertainty is there.



And it asks a different question.

Not:  
How do I prevent loss?

But:  
Which losses can I carry — without losing myself?

This is not a technical distinction.  
It is an existential one.

Those who allow this question stop fighting uncertainty reflexively.  
They stop covering it up immediately.  
They allow it to be present — without letting it take over.

And this is where thinking begins.

Not where uncertainty disappears.  
But where fear of loss no longer dominates every decision.



Thinking begins when not everything has to be secured at once.  
When time is allowed to matter.  
When processes are accepted as non-linear.  
When setbacks, doubt, and phases of not knowing  
are understood as part of the path.

This is not an invitation to passivity.  
Nor a romanticization of loss.

It is an invitation to honesty.



Honesty about the limits of control.  
Honesty about the relativity of security.  
Honesty about the fact that resilience does not  
arise from avoidance,  
but from the ability to endure strain.

Those who allow this honesty do not become invulnerable.  
But they become calmer.

And perhaps it is precisely this calm  
that makes it possible to make decisions  
that do not merely provide short-term relief,  
but remain sustainable over time.

Not because they are perfect.  
But because they arise from a different relationship  
to uncertainty.



---

**AUTHOR: PETER KRAUS**

---

**PETER.KRAUS@AMYGDALUS.COM**

---