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Beings are numberless; I vow to save them.

Delusions are inexhaustible; I vow to end them.

Dharma gates are boundless; I vow to enter them.

Buddha’s way is unsurpassable; I vow to become it.

- The Bodhisattva Vow (Winston, 2002)
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#### Nice to meet you judge I’m you, you’re me, we’re all each other– now vote neg

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

#### The ego- or the fake perception of the individual- is the root of all suffering

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH+ r0w@n

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands**. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion**; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as **delusion is** basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the **ego instincts** in Buddhism **is one of the forms of craving**. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. **The craving for egotistical pursuits** **has** its **deeper spring in** the dogma of personal immortality. This is **the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life.** The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. **Such** annihilationist **views** may be **closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide**. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. **The ego illusion is** not merely an intellectual construction, but is **fed by deeper affective processes.** Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of **the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively** may turn out to be **more subtle expressions of their ego**, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Their concepts of economics ignore all internal critiques, start from the point of goods not people, forgets about the interconnected universe, and will inevitably collapse to totalitarianism and agrarianism

E. F. Schumacher, 69, Buddhist Economics, Schumacher Center for New Economics, 8-13-1969, DOA: 12-27-2021, https://centerforneweconomics.org/publications/buddhist-economics/, r0w@n [bracketed for gendered language]

“Right Livelihood” is one of the requirements of the Buddha’s Noble Eightfold Path. It is clear, therefore, that there must be such a thing as Buddhist economics. Buddhist countries have often stated that they wish to remain faithful to their heritage. So Burma: “The New Burma sees no conflict between religious values and economic progress. Spiritual health and material well-being are not enemies: they are natural allies.”1 Or: “We can blend successfully the religious and spiritual values of our heritage with the benefits of modern technology.”2 Or: “We Burmans have a sacred duty to conform both our dreams and our acts to our faith. This we shall ever do.”3 All the same, such countries invariably assume that they can model their economic development plans in accordance with modern economics, and they call upon modern economists from so-called advanced countries to advise them, to formulate the policies to be pursued, and to construct the grand design for development, the Five-Year Plan or whatever it may be called. No one seems to think that a Buddhist way of life would call for Buddhist economics, just as the modern materialist way of life has brought forth modern economics. Economists themselves, like most specialists, normally suffer from a kind of metaphysical blindness, assuming that theirs is a science of absolute and invariable truths, without any presuppositions. Some go as far as to claim that economic laws are as free from “metaphysics” or “values” as the law of gravitation. We need not, however, get involved in arguments of methodology. Instead, let us take some fundamentals and see what they look like when viewed by a modern economist and a Buddhist economist. There is universal agreement that a fundamental source of wealth is human labour. Now, the modern economist has been brought up to consider “labour” or work as little more than a necessary evil. From the point of view of the employer, it is in any case simply an item of cost, to be reduced to a minimum if it can not be eliminated altogether, say, by automation. From the point of view of the workman, it is a “disutility”; to work is to make a sacrifice of one’s leisure and comfort, and wages are a kind of compensation for the sacrifice. Hence the ideal from the point of view of the employer is to have output without employees, and the ideal from the point of view of the employee is to have income without employment. The consequences of these attitudes both in theory and in practice are, of course, extremely far-reaching. If the ideal with regard to work is to get rid of it, every method that “reduces the work load” is a good thing. The most potent method, short of automation, is the so-called “division of labour” and the classical example is the pin factory eulogised in Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations.4 Here it is not a matter of ordinary specialisation, which mankind has practiced from time immemorial, but of dividing up every complete process of production into minute parts, so that the final product can be produced at great speed without anyone having had to contribute more than a totally insignificant and, in most cases, unskilled movement of his limbs. The Buddhist point of view takes the function of work to be at least threefold: to give [people] a chance to utilise and develop [their] faculties; to enable [them] to overcome [their] ego-centredness by joining with other people in a common task; and to bring forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence. Again, the consequences that flow from this view are endless. To organise work in such a manner that it becomes meaningless, boring, stultifying, or nerve-racking for the worker would be little short of criminal; it would indicate a greater concern with goods than with people, an evil lack of compassion and a soul-destroying degree of attachment to the most primitive side of this worldly existence. Equally, to strive for leisure as an alternative to work would be considered a complete misunderstanding of one of the basic truths of human existence, namely that work and leisure are complementary parts of the same living process and cannot be separated without destroying the joy of work and the bliss of leisure. From the Buddhist point of view, there are therefore two types of mechanisation which must be clearly distinguished: one that enhances a man’s skill and power and one that turns the work of man over to a mechanical slave, leaving man in a position of having to serve the slave. How to tell the one from the other? “The craftsman himself,” says Ananda Coomaraswamy, a man equally competent to talk about the modern West as the ancient East, “can always, if allowed to, draw the delicate distinction between the machine and the tool. The carpet loom is a tool, a contrivance for holding warp threads at a stretch for the pile to be woven round them by the craftsmen’s fingers; but the power loom is a machine, and its significance as a destroyer of culture lies in the fact that it does the essentially human part of the work.”5 It is clear, therefore, that Buddhist economics must be very different from the economics of modern materialism, since the Buddhist sees the essence of civilisation not in a multiplication of wants but in the purification of human character. Character, at the same time, is formed primarily by a man’s work. And work, properly conducted in conditions of human dignity and freedom, blesses those who do it and equally their products. The Indian philosopher and economist J. C. Kumarappa sums the matter up as follows: If the nature of the work is properly appreciated and applied, it will stand in the same relation to the higher faculties as food is to the physical body. It nourishes and enlivens the higher man and urges him to produce the best he is capable of. It directs his free will along the proper course and disciplines the animal in him into progressive channels. It furnishes an excellent background for man to display his scale of values and develop his personality.6 If a man has no chance of obtaining work he is in a desperate position, not simply because he lacks an income but because he lacks this nourishing and enlivening factor of disciplined work which nothing can replace. A modern economist may engage in highly sophisticated calculations on whether full employment “pays” or whether it might be more “economic” to run an economy at less than full employment so as to insure a greater mobility of labour, a better stability of wages, and so forth. His fundamental criterion of success is simply the total quantity of goods produced during a given period of time. “If the marginal urgency of goods is low,” says Professor Galbraith in The Affluent Society, “then so is the urgency of employing the last man or the last million men in the labour force.”7 And again: “If . . . we can afford some unemployment in the interest of stability—a proposition, incidentally, of impeccably conservative antecedents—then we can afford to give those who are unemployed the goods that enable them to sustain their accustomed standard of living.” From a Buddhist point of view, this is standing the truth on its head by considering goods as more important than people and consumption as more important than creative activity. It means shifting the emphasis from the worker to the product of work, that is, from the human to the subhuman, a surrender to the forces of evil. The very start of Buddhist economic planning would be a planning for full employment, and the primary purpose of this would in fact be employment for everyone who needs an “outside” job: it would not be the maximisation of employment nor the maximisation of production. Women, on the whole, do not need an “outside” job, and the large-scale employment of women in offices or factories would be considered a sign of serious economic failure. In particular, to let mothers of young children work in factories while the children run wild would be as uneconomic in the eyes of a Buddhist economist as the employment of a skilled worker as a soldier in the eyes of a modern economist. While the materialist is mainly interested in goods, the Buddhist is mainly interested in liberation. But Buddhism is “The Middle Way” and therefore in no way antagonistic to physical well-being. It is not wealth that stands in the way of liberation but the attachment to wealth; not the enjoyment of pleasurable things but the craving for them. The keynote of Buddhist economics, therefore, is simplicity and non-violence. From an economist’s point of view, the marvel of the Buddhist way of life is the utter rationality of its pattern—amazingly small means leading to extraordinarily satisfactory results. For the modern economist this is very difficult to understand. He is used to measuring the “standard of living” by the amount of annual consumption, assuming all the time that a man who consumes more is “better off” than a man who consumes less. A Buddhist economist would consider this approach excessively irrational: since consumption is merely a means to human well-being, the aim should be to obtain the maximum of well-being with the minimum of consumption. Thus, if the purpose of clothing is a certain amount of temperature comfort and an attractive appearance, the task is to attain this purpose with the smallest possible effort, that is, with the smallest annual destruction of cloth and with the help of designs that involve the smallest possible input of toil. The less toil there is, the more time and strength is left for artistic creativity. It would be highly uneconomic, for instance, to go in for complicated tailoring, like the modern West, when a much more beautiful effect can be achieved by the skillful draping of uncut material. It would be the height of folly to make material so that it should wear out quickly and the height of barbarity to make anything ugly, shabby, or mean. What has just been said about clothing applies equally to all other human requirements. The ownership and the consumption of goods is a means to an end, and Buddhist economics is the systematic study of how to attain given ends with the minimum means. Modern economics, on the other hand, considers consumption to be the sole end and purpose of all economic activity, taking the factors of production—and, labour, and capital—as the means. The former, in short, tries to maximise human satisfactions by the optimal pattern of consumption, while the latter tries to maximise consumption by the optimal pattern of productive effort. It is easy to see that the effort needed to sustain a way of life which seeks to attain the optimal pattern of consumption is likely to be much smaller than the effort needed to sustain a drive for maximum consumption. We need not be surprised, therefore, that the pressure and strain of living is very much less in say, Burma, than it is in the United States, in spite of the fact that the amount of labour-saving machinery used in the former country is only a minute fraction of the amount used in the latter. Simplicity and non-violence are obviously closely related. The optimal pattern of consumption, producing a high degree of human satisfaction by means of a relatively low rate of consumption, allows people to live without great pressure and strain and to fulfill the primary injunction of Buddhist teaching: “Cease to do evil; try to do good.” As physical resources are everywhere limited, people satisfying their needs by means of a modest use of resources are obviously less likely to be at each other’s throats than people depending upon a high rate of use. Equally, people who live in highly self-sufficient local communities are less likely to get involved in large-scale violence than people whose existence depends on world-wide systems of trade. From the point of view of Buddhist economics, therefore, production from local resources for local needs is the most rational way of economic life, while dependence on imports from afar and the consequent need to produce for export to unknown and distant peoples is highly uneconomic and justifiable only in exceptional cases and on a small scale. Just as the modern economist would admit that a high rate of consumption of transport services between a man’s home and his place of work signifies a misfortune and not a high standard of life, so the Buddhist would hold that to satisfy human wants from faraway sources rather than from sources nearby signifies failure rather than success. The former tends to take statistics showing an increase in the number of ton/miles per head of the population carried by a country’s transport system as proof of economic progress, while to the latter—the Buddhist economist—the same statistics would indicate a highly undesirable deterioration in the pattern of consumption. Another striking difference between modern economics and Buddhist economics arises over the use of natural resources. Bertrand de Jouvenel, the eminent French political philosopher, has characterised “Western man” in words which may be taken as a fair description of the modern economist: He tends to count nothing as an expenditure, other than human effort; he does not seem to mind how much mineral matter he wastes and, far worse, how much living matter he destroys. He does not seem to realize at all that human life is a dependent part of an ecosystem of many different forms of life. As the world is ruled from towns where men are cut off from any form of life other than human, the feeling of belonging to an ecosystem is not revived. This results in a harsh and improvident treatment of things upon which we ultimately depend, such as water and trees.8 The teaching of the Buddha, on the other hand, enjoins a reverent and non-violent attitude not only to all sentient beings but also, with great emphasis, to trees. Every follower of the Buddha ought to plant a tree every few years and look after it until it is safely established, and the Buddhist economist can demonstrate without difficulty that the universal observation of this rule would result in a high rate of genuine economic development independent of any foreign aid. Much of the economic decay of southeast Asia (as of many other parts of the world) is undoubtedly due to a heedless and shameful neglect of trees. Modern economics does not distinguish between renewable and non-renewable materials, as its very method is to equalise and quantify everything by means of a money price. Thus, taking various alternative fuels, like coal, oil, wood, or water-power: the only difference between them recognised by modern economics is relative cost per equivalent unit. The cheapest is automatically the one to be preferred, as to do otherwise would be irrational and “uneconomic.” From a Buddhist point of view, of course, this will not do; the essential difference between non-renewable fuels like coal and oil on the one hand and renewable fuels like wood and water-power on the other cannot be simply overlooked. Non-renewable goods must be used only if they are indispensable, and then only with the greatest care and the most meticulous concern for conservation. To use them heedlessly or extravagantly is an act of violence, and while complete non-violence may not be attainable on this earth, there is nonetheless an ineluctable duty on man to aim at the ideal of non-violence in all he does. Just as a modern European economist would not consider it a great achievement if all European art treasures were sold to America at attractive prices, so the Buddhist economist would insist that a population basing its economic life on non-renewable fuels is living parasitically, on capital instead of income. Such a way of life could have no permanence and could therefore be justified only as a purely temporary expedient. As the world’s resources of non-renewable fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas—are exceedingly unevenly distributed over the globe and undoubtedly limited in quantity, it is clear that their exploitation at an ever-increasing rate is an act of violence against nature which must almost inevitably lead to violence between men. This fact alone might give food for thought even to those people in Buddhist countries who care nothing for the religious and spiritual values of their heritage and ardently desire to embrace the materialism of modern economics at the fastest possible speed. Before they dismiss Buddhist economics as nothing better than a nostalgic dream, they might wish to consider whether the path of economic development outlined by modern economics is likely to lead them to places where they really want to be. Towards the end of his courageous book The Challenge of Man’s Future, Professor Harrison Brown of the California Institute of Technology gives the following appraisal: Thus we see that, just as industrial society is fundamentally unstable and subject to reversion to agrarian existence, so within it the conditions which offer individual freedom are unstable in their ability to avoid the conditions which impose rigid organization and totalitarian control. Indeed, when we examine all the foreseeable difficulties which threaten the survival of industrial civilization, it is difficult to see how the achievement of stability and the maintenance of individual liberty can be made compatible.9 Even if this were dismissed as a long-term view there is the immediate question of whether “modernization,” as currently practiced without regard to religious and spiritual values, is actually producing agreeable results. As far as the masses are concerned, the results appear to be disastrous—a collapse of the rural economy, a rising tide of unemployment in town and country, and the growth of a city proletariat without nourishment for either body or soul. It is in the light of both immediate experience and long term prospects that the study of Buddhist economics could be recommended even to those who believe that economic growth is more important than any spiritual or religious values. For it is not a question of choosing between “modern growth” and “traditional stagnation.” It is a question of finding the right path of development, the Middle Way between materialist heedlessness and traditionalist immobility, in short, of finding “Right Livelihood.”

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

For the better part of the last two-thousand years the people of the Western world have been conditioned to view our existence in terms of our history; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of the apocalyptic worldview; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged, the response to this uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview. In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs, they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes detrimental to the possibility of legitimate public discourse and engagement. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, we also run the risk of dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form, if not the language, of traditional prophetic warnings. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly it is exploited at every turn by news media and politicians to reinforce public support for existing power structures, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, the creation of a Buddhist worldview in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### No action is disconnected from liberation- the aff’s indulgence in contemporary politics condemns us to their fear-machines

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

#### Meditation and reflection unifies the body and the mind- shedding us from the ego and helping us embrace ethicality

Forge, 97, (Paul G. La Forge, Divine Word Missionary and professor in the Business Management Department of Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, Masters Degree in Clinical-Counseling Psychology, he holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 12/13, From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics Journey: The Second Annual Internationa Vincentian Conference Promoting Business Ethics (Sep., 1997), pp. 1283-1295, “Teaching Business Ethics through Meditation”, JSTOR)//LOH + r0w@n

Business Ethics taught only from books and textual materials may occupy an important place in education, but my purpose is different. My goal is to help the students become ethical persons. This requires an ability to perform three seemingly simple tasks: First, to recognize ethical issues; second, to analyze them; and third, to act upon them. The ethical principles derived from textual materials covered in a Business Ethics course have their place, but only as a tool or a standard used by an ethical person. The purpose of this article is to show how **meditation can be used to** help the student to **become an ethical person**. My purpose in using meditation to teach Business Ethics is to produce people with an "Ethical Vision". Meditation gives students an awareness of ethical issues in their lives and leads to the discovery and application of models of ethical conduct to serve as guides to behavior in general and to ethical decision making in particular. In effect, I use meditation to stop the world. There are many ways to stop the world and many kinds of meditation. I will restrict myself to two forms, namely, discursive and non-dis cursive meditation. The classroom communica tion process between the instructor and the students is slowed down by both non-discursive and discursive meditation so that students can learn to use meditation to accomplish the three tasks mentioned above. Non-discursive **meditation greatly contributes to the process of constructing** a vision because it gives people **a sense of themselves and their place in the world.** Discursive meditation, in its many forms, gives substance to an ethical vision because it leads to an awakening to the existence and importance of ethical issues in life. In part one, I will describe how the students are led through non-discursive meditation to discover themselves as ethical persons. They are also given the tools to explore ethical issues through non-discursive meditation. In part two, I will discuss a transition state between non-discursive and discursive medita tion. After discovering themselves as ethical persons, the students are led to use non-discur sive meditation as a technique to construct their own ethical value system and apply it to their own lives. At this transition stage, an art medium is extremely useful for discovering and analyzing meanings, especially ethical meanings. Through non-discursive meditation, the indi vidual is taught to become aware of him/herself and his/her place in the world. However, non discursive meditation is not an end in itself. Discursive meditation, as is explained in more detail in part three, gives the participant a chance to compare who he/she is with what he/she should be. Here the student is encouraged to compare the values he/she has discovered about him/herself during non-discursive meditation with an ideal, and construct a system of ethical principles for him/herself using discursive meditation. Textual materials are recommended here and the student is encouraged to search for the ideal. The result is the development of a person with an ethical vision through meditation in both non-discursive and discursive forms. I. Discovering ethical issues through non-discursive meditation An ethical person must become aware of his/her self, his/her ethical values, and his/her place in the world. Non-discursive meditation can be a powerful device **to teach** students how they can stop their world and take stock of their lives because **the body itself participates in the meditation as the locus of experience and insight, inseparably one with the mind** (Takeuchi, 1993, p. xx). At this point, the process is entirely self centered and observational, without the con straint of reference to any system of ethics or values. Thus viewed, it is only a first step, but a very necessary first step **to** becoming an ethical person. Because this step is only a means to an end, virtually any school of non-discursive meditation will suffice. There are many kinds of non-discursive meditation techniques, such as Taikyokken, Zen, and Yoga; these teach people to look at and reflect on their place in the world. The goal is to teach students a way of stopping and reflecting, to provide a context for devel oping and applying their own values. Therefore, non-discursive meditation is not used as an end in itself. Taikyokken, Yoga, or Zen all have their proponents, but in an ethics class, they serve only as a tool, not as a philosophy. **Non-discursive meditation serves to** stop the world. Students, like business people, lead busy, active, stressful lives. Non-discursive meditation serves to put a brake on the activities of a busy day. The ethical person must be able to stop this world and reflect upon life. This is an ability to step aside from normal activities in order to recognize ethical issues that arise in business or personal life.

### K Affs

#### Nice to meet you judge, I’m you, you’re me, we’re all each other– now vote neg

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

#### The ego- or the fake perception of the individual- is the root of all suffering

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH+ r0w@n

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands**. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion**; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as **delusion is** basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the **ego instincts** in Buddhism **is one of the forms of craving**. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. **The craving for egotistical pursuits** **has** its **deeper spring in** the dogma of personal immortality. This is **the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life.** The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. **Such** annihilationist **views** may be **closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide**. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. **The ego illusion is** not merely an intellectual construction, but is **fed by deeper affective processes.** Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of **the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively** may turn out to be **more subtle expressions of their ego**, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### No action is disconnected from liberation- the aff’s indulgence in contemporary politics condemns us to their fear-machines

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

#### The affirmative is a performance of the link of a problem to its solution- that ignores the way mindsets and situational dynamics shape our world and doom the aff’s movement

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program, degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

For most of us, having been educated to a global modern standard, it Is natural to assume that It is only through moving In the direction of greater universalIty and equality that lnequtiy can be overcome, poverty reduced, and dignity made possible kir all. That Is. we believe that It Is through our eonuixnialtty - not our dIfferences — that we will find a happy rente to global tranafonnatlon. M I understand it, the main tille of this conference, Woridvtews Make s Dllfererice. in.’itsts otherwise. And I would like to take a few moments to press the point that global transformation for greater equity, dignity asid happiness will not come abon I through deepening our sense of coinnionafity alone, but only to the degree that we also activate our diflërences as the basic condition for nuituol confrthutfrwr it Is a cantraJ tenet of Buddhist Qdjtis - but one that I believe Is shared by all systems of effective religious, social and political peaetlee - that meaningful change can only be Initiated and sustained on the basis of present circumstances, as they have corne to be. In the present era, the any things have come to be is very much a function of the interlocking array of pence-ses that we refer to as ‘globalisation’. Let me mention three key siflcts of these Processes, each of them in large measure both driven by and driving sclenupæ ap techookigical advances. ¡ and most notably perhaps. Is accelerattp,g and Intenslfy change. Globalisation la bringing not only nave thenge traire rapidly, but alan the advent of qualitatively distinct kinds of change Of particular Importance is the phenomenon kflOWi1 ‘emergence’. stnicturaliy significant changes occurring ¡ in con1pie, syst that in principle could not have been nucipe, but that after the fact do make pertaci sense.Second are homogenislng effects that led many early cnc globalisation to fear the Westernisation or Me nialdisation world, but that In fact have fostered truly global forms of pul culture and, more Importantly, patterns of convergence that. for example. allow credit cards to be used the world over and are beginning to enable students to take advantage of virtually borderleas higher education. Third arr pluralizing effects that hase taken the form of resurgent national and ethnic Identities, but also niche global production networks, and such acutely uneven geography of development that the top 2% of the world’s people now own of global wealth while the bottom 50% own less than 1%. As a combined result. we are not only in an era of change. but a change of eras. More specifically, I would submit that we are in the midst of a transition from an era dominated by problem-solution to one dominated by predicament-resolution. Problems arise when changing circumstances make evident the laihire of existing practices for meeting abiding needs and interests. **Solving problems Involves developing new or improved means for arriving at ends we fully intend to continue pursuing**. For example, gas/electric hybrid automobile engines solve the problem’ of rising fuel costs. Predicaments occur when changing circumstances lead to or make us aware of conflicts competition among our own values. Intereata. development sitas, and constructions of meaning. **Predicaments cannot be solved- They can only be resolved through sustaining detailed attention to** situational dynamics and realising both enhanced clarity and more thoroughly and deeply coordinated commitments. World hunger Is not a problem. Enough food is grown to supply adequate nutrition for all, **What Is lacking Is the resolve** to bring our economic. social and political values, Intentions and practices into alignment with doing so. World hunger is a predicament. And an increasingly significant part of the reason that we make so little headway In addressing It and other apparently intractable issues like global climate change, illiteracy and mounting economic inequity is because we persist in thinking about them as problems awaiting technical solution, rather than as predicaments commanding sustained and ever deepening resolve. In sum 21st centuiy patterns of globalisation are raising crucial questions about the owa arid riwwung difference, presenting u with a poradoxicaJ Impasse ur axnia On the other hand, we need to more fully recognize and respect difference, going beyond tolerating differences from and among others to enable differences to matter more, not less. On the Other hand, we nerd to engage In more robust collective action and global common cause. ,omtrng differences within shared find deepening To Ignore our differences now is to fail resolving current predicaments and to foster conditions for more, and more Intense, predicaments in the future.

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

For the better part of the last two-thousand years the people of the Western world have been conditioned to view our existence in terms of our history; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of the apocalyptic worldview; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged, the response to this uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview. In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs, they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes detrimental to the possibility of legitimate public discourse and engagement. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, we also run the risk of dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form, if not the language, of traditional prophetic warnings. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly it is exploited at every turn by news media and politicians to reinforce public support for existing power structures, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, the creation of a Buddhist worldview in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

#### Competitiveness is irrationally derived from selfishness – mindset shifts can bring us away from the overconsumption it drives

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 5) //T.C.

If we are to honestly discuss economics, we must admit that emotional factors - fear and desire and the irrationality they generate - have a very powerful influence on the market place. Economic decisions about production, consumption and distribution - are made by people in their struggle to survive and prosper. For the most part, these decisions are motivated by an emotional urge for self-preservation fear and desire drive us to our worst economic excesses. The forces of greed, exploitation and over-consumption seem to have overwhelmed our economies in recent decades. Our materialistic societies offer us little choice but to exploit and compete for survival in today's dog-eat-dog world. But at the same time, it is obvious that these forces are damaging our societies and ravaging our environment.

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

#### Meditation and reflection unifies the body and the mind- shedding us from the ego and helping us embrace ethicality

Forge, 97, (Paul G. La Forge, Divine Word Missionary and professor in the Business Management Department of Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, Masters Degree in Clinical-Counseling Psychology, he holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 12/13, From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics Journey: The Second Annual Internationa Vincentian Conference Promoting Business Ethics (Sep., 1997), pp. 1283-1295, “Teaching Business Ethics through Meditation”, JSTOR)//LOH + r0w@n

Business Ethics taught only from books and textual materials may occupy an important place in education, but my purpose is different. My goal is to help the students become ethical persons. This requires an ability to perform three seemingly simple tasks: First, to recognize ethical issues; second, to analyze them; and third, to act upon them. The ethical principles derived from textual materials covered in a Business Ethics course have their place, but only as a tool or a standard used by an ethical person. The purpose of this article is to show how **meditation can be used to** help the student to **become an ethical person**. My purpose in using meditation to teach Business Ethics is to produce people with an "Ethical Vision". Meditation gives students an awareness of ethical issues in their lives and leads to the discovery and application of models of ethical conduct to serve as guides to behavior in general and to ethical decision making in particular. In effect, I use meditation to stop the world. There are many ways to stop the world and many kinds of meditation. I will restrict myself to two forms, namely, discursive and non-dis cursive meditation. The classroom communica tion process between the instructor and the students is slowed down by both non-discursive and discursive meditation so that students can learn to use meditation to accomplish the three tasks mentioned above. Non-discursive **meditation greatly contributes to the process of constructing** a vision because it gives people **a sense of themselves and their place in the world.** Discursive meditation, in its many forms, gives substance to an ethical vision because it leads to an awakening to the existence and importance of ethical issues in life. In part one, I will describe how the students are led through non-discursive meditation to discover themselves as ethical persons. They are also given the tools to explore ethical issues through non-discursive meditation. In part two, I will discuss a transition state between non-discursive and discursive medita tion. After discovering themselves as ethical persons, the students are led to use non-discur sive meditation as a technique to construct their own ethical value system and apply it to their own lives. At this transition stage, an art medium is extremely useful for discovering and analyzing meanings, especially ethical meanings. Through non-discursive meditation, the indi vidual is taught to become aware of him/herself and his/her place in the world. However, non discursive meditation is not an end in itself. Discursive meditation, as is explained in more detail in part three, gives the participant a chance to compare who he/she is with what he/she should be. Here the student is encouraged to compare the values he/she has discovered about him/herself during non-discursive meditation with an ideal, and construct a system of ethical principles for him/herself using discursive meditation. Textual materials are recommended here and the student is encouraged to search for the ideal. The result is the development of a person with an ethical vision through meditation in both non-discursive and discursive forms. I. Discovering ethical issues through non-discursive meditation An ethical person must become aware of his/her self, his/her ethical values, and his/her place in the world. Non-discursive meditation can be a powerful device **to teach** students how they can stop their world and take stock of their lives because **the body itself participates in the meditation as the locus of experience and insight, inseparably one with the mind** (Takeuchi, 1993, p. xx). At this point, the process is entirely self centered and observational, without the con straint of reference to any system of ethics or values. Thus viewed, it is only a first step, but a very necessary first step **to** becoming an ethical person. Because this step is only a means to an end, virtually any school of non-discursive meditation will suffice. There are many kinds of non-discursive meditation techniques, such as Taikyokken, Zen, and Yoga; these teach people to look at and reflect on their place in the world. The goal is to teach students a way of stopping and reflecting, to provide a context for devel oping and applying their own values. Therefore, non-discursive meditation is not used as an end in itself. Taikyokken, Yoga, or Zen all have their proponents, but in an ethics class, they serve only as a tool, not as a philosophy. **Non-discursive meditation serves to** stop the world. Students, like business people, lead busy, active, stressful lives. Non-discursive meditation serves to put a brake on the activities of a busy day. The ethical person must be able to stop this world and reflect upon life. This is an ability to step aside from normal activities in order to recognize ethical issues that arise in business or personal life.

### Short

#### The ego- or the fake perception of the individual- is the root of all suffering

**De Silva, 98** (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH+ r0w@n

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands**.  The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion**; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as **delusion is** basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the **ego instincts** in Buddhism **is one of the forms of craving**. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. **The craving for egotistical pursuits** **has** its **deeper spring in** the dogma of personal immortality. This is **the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life.** The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death.  **Such** annihilationist **views** may be **closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide**.  The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear.  This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live.  **The ego illusion is** not merely an intellectual construction, but is **fed by deeper affective processes.** Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego.  Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of **the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively** may turn out to be **more subtle expressions of their ego**, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing.  Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. **Yowell, 15**, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

**For** the better part of **the last two-thousand years the** people of the **Western world have been conditioned to view** our **existence in terms of** our **history**; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of **the apocalyptic worldview**; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is **a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable**. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged**, the response to** this **uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview.** In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs,they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes **detrimental to** thepossibility of **legitimate public discourse and engagement**. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, **we** also run the **risk** of **dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form**, if not the language, **of** traditional **prophetic warnings**. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. **It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset**; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly **it is exploited** at every turn **by news media** and politicians **to reinforce public support for existing power structures**, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, **the** creation of a **Buddhist worldview** in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It **can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction**. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. **Yowell, 15**, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

**If** their **work is to be truly impactful** and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal **it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more** than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed**, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which** determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, **allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is** strongly associated with **the generation of suffering within the self** (Hattam, 2004). **The mind** which cultivates bodhicitta **works not for the benefit of self but instead** from a quality of mind characterized **by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic** 43 **goodness which disregards preconception and expectation** and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, **to undertake** the task of **critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.**

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. **Moore, 16**, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021,<https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified **mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness**—as **a**n especially helpful **path toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment**. The Buddha describes how one can build the **four establishments of mindfulness**, which are **awareness of the body** (sensation), **feeling** (emotion), **mind** (thoughts), and **phenomena** (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk **dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, **mindfulness is the opposite of clinging**. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

#### Meditation and reflection unifies the body and the mind- shedding us from the ego and helping us embrace ethicality

**Forge, 97**, (Paul G. La Forge, Divine Word Missionary and professor in the Business Management Department of Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, Masters Degree in Clinical-Counseling Psychology, he holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 12/13, From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics Journey: The Second Annual Internationa Vincentian Conference Promoting Business Ethics (Sep., 1997), pp. 1283-1295, “Teaching Business Ethics through Meditation”, JSTOR)//LOH + r0w@n

Business Ethics taught only from books and textual materials may occupy an important place in education, but my purpose is different. My goal is to help the students become ethical persons. This requires an ability to perform three seemingly simple tasks: First, to recognize ethical issues; second, to analyze them; and third, to act upon them. The ethical principles derived from textual materials covered in a Business Ethics course have their place, but only as a tool or a standard used by an ethical person. The purpose of this article is to show how **meditation can be used to** help the student to **become an ethical person**. My purpose in using meditation to teach Business Ethics is to produce people with an "Ethical Vision". Meditation gives students an awareness of ethical issues in their lives and leads to the discovery and application of models of ethical conduct to serve as guides to behavior in general and to ethical decision making in particular. In effect, I use meditation to stop the world. There are many ways to stop the world and many kinds of meditation. I will restrict myself to two forms, namely, discursive and non-dis cursive meditation. The classroom communica tion process between the instructor and the students is slowed down by both non-discursive and discursive meditation so that students can learn to use meditation to accomplish the three tasks mentioned above. Non-discursive **meditation greatly contributes to the process of constructing** a vision because it gives people **a sense of themselves and their place in the world.** Discursive meditation, in its many forms, gives substance to an ethical vision because it leads to an awakening to the existence and importance of ethical issues in life. In part one, I will describe how the students are led through non-discursive meditation to discover themselves as ethical persons. They are also given the tools to explore ethical issues through non-discursive meditation. In part two, I will discuss a transition state between non-discursive and discursive medita tion. After discovering themselves as ethical persons, the students are led to use non-discur sive meditation as a technique to construct their own ethical value system and apply it to their own lives. At this transition stage, an art medium is extremely useful for discovering and analyzing meanings, especially ethical meanings. Through non-discursive meditation, the indi vidual is taught to become aware of him/herself and his/her place in the world. However, non discursive meditation is not an end in itself. Discursive meditation, as is explained in more detail in part three, gives the participant a chance to compare who he/she is with what he/she should be. Here the student is encouraged to compare the values he/she has discovered about him/herself during non-discursive meditation with an ideal, and construct a system of ethical principles for him/herself using discursive meditation. Textual materials are recommended here and the student is encouraged to search for the ideal. The result is the development of a person with an ethical vision through meditation in both non-discursive and discursive forms. I. Discovering ethical issues through non-discursive meditation An ethical person must become aware of his/her self, his/her ethical values, and his/her place in the world. Non-discursive meditation can be a **powerful device to teach** students how they can stop their world and **take stock of their lives** because **the body itself participates in the meditation as the locus of experience and insight, inseparably one with the mind** (Takeuchi, 1993, p. xx). At this point, the process is entirely self centered and observational, without the con straint of reference to any system of ethics or values. Thus viewed, it is only a first step, but a **very necessary first step** **to becoming an ethical person**. Because this step is only a means to an end, virtually any school of non-discursive meditation will suffice. There are many kinds of non-discursive meditation techniques, such as Taikyokken, Zen, and Yoga; these teach people to look at and reflect on their place in the world. The goal is to teach students a way of stopping and reflecting, to provide a context for devel oping and applying their own values. Therefore, non-discursive meditation is not used as an end in itself. Taikyokken, Yoga, or Zen all have their proponents, but in an ethics class, they serve only as a tool, not as a philosophy. **Non-discursive meditation serves to** **stop the world**. Students, like business people, lead busy, active, stressful lives. Non-discursive meditation serves to put a brake on the activities of a busy day. The ethical person must be able to stop this world and reflect upon life. This is an ability to step aside from normal activities in order to recognize ethical issues that arise in business or personal life.

## Theory of Power

#### Nice to meet you, I’m you, you’re me, we’re all each other– now vote neg

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

## Links

### Link- Debate

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### No action is disconnected from liberation- the aff’s indulgence in contemporary politics condemns us to their fear-machines

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC “solutions” and reflect personally and collectively on karma and interdependence

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program , degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

Hers hock it is a great — and. Indeed, humbling - honour to be able to open the academic sessions of the “Third International Conference on Gross National Happiness: Worldviews Make a Difference: Towards Global Transformatlon. Although the comparison is not at all warranted. It Is hard for me not to recall the opening remark of the 9th century Chan Buddhist master, Linji. when he was invited by the provincial governor to speak before an audience of several hundred people about the meaning of Buddhist enlightenment: As soon as I open my mouth. I will have made a mistake.” Like Linji. however. I am obliged to speak. As I understand it. ours Is a gathering that seeks to shed practical light on the means-to and meaning-of happiness, where happiness is understood not only as a matter of subjective well being, but also as a distinctive quality and direction of relatIonships - a quality and direction of our interdependence and Interpenetration. The hope expressed In the title of this conference and In the efforts we haire been expending in coming together is. I think, not at all misplaced For the most part, humanity is getting things right. Globally, we now produce enough food to feed every person on the planet. We have realised living conditions and developed medical Practices that allow us collectively to enjoy the longest life expectancies in history. Literacy is at an historical high. Tflrnunlcatjon takes place at the speed of light. World-class rare are available to anyone with Internet access, and the range of choices exercjsj in pursuit of lives worth leading by the ever nearly seven billion people Is wider and deeper than it has Unjve’ — a pursuit globally recognised as a basic and rsal human right. The devil, as the saying goes. “is In the details”. More than 800 million people today are chronically hungry. One out of every five people currently live in what the World Bank terms ‘absolute poverty’ — condItions so degraded and degrading that they do not afford even the hope of a dignified life. One billion people do not have access to clean drinking water, and 2.6 billion live without adequate sanitation. One out of every seven people in the world are illiterate two out of every three of these being women or girls), and functional illiteracy affects nearly one out of every four people living In many of even the most highly developed countries. For tragically large numbers of people, the fact that they ‘possess’ universal human rights does little to offset the effects of systematically perpetrated human wrongs. The fact that humanity Is mostly getting things right Is scant consolation to those living in absolute poverty or to those surviving on less than whet $2 a day might buy In the United States today, a population that Is now equal to that of every man. woman and child alive in 1965. What must be done to open spaces of hope for these mothers, fathers, sons and daughters? How do we avaIt out fnsn present conditions, as they have come to be. to realise - at a bare mInimum - dignIfied lives for all? One place to begin. I think, Is to reflect personally and collectively on a key implication of the Buddhist teachings of karma and interdependence; all experienced realities imply responsibility. We are all in some degree compilcit with the inequity and suffering that are no less a part of the contemporary world than are Ita many wonders. Fortunately, 55 the Buddha insisted. it is precisely because of karma that we are able to realise lives dedicated to the liberating resolution of all trouble and suffering. By changing the complexion of our values-intentions-actions, we can change the patterns of outcome/opportunity that shape our personal and public experiences. Indeed, the degree that we heed the Buddhist Injunction to see all things as Impermanent. It is clear that there really is no question about whether change is possible. Change is already continuously underway. The only real question Is: change by what means and with what meaning? Or to turn the question around: since change is ongoing. why does it seem to be heading us In the direction of greater Inequity end greater suffering for greater numbers? How do we go about effectively changing the usoy things are changing’ A unifying aim of the various sessions of this conference is to reflect on., how best to answer the question just posed about opening spaces of hope and dignity for all, and about orienting change towards greater equity and happiness. As a prelude to theta let tir oiler a few thoughts of my own. mt, it is my own conviction, that truly dignified lives cannot be lived by any unless dignity is a reality for all. It Is my further conviction that all will not enjoy dignified lives until the differences of each are enabled to make a difference for all.

#### The affirmative is problem-solution oriented this means they will never be able to resolve their harms, only through the alternative framing of predicament-resolution can real change occur

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program, degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

For most of us, having been educated to a global modern standard, it Is natural to assume that It is only through moving In the direction of greater universalIty and equality that lnequtiy can be overcome, poverty reduced, and dignity made possible kir all. That Is. we believe that It Is through our eonuixnialtty - not our dIfferences — that we will find a happy rente to global tranafonnatlon. M I understand it, the main tille of this conference, Woridvtews Make s Dllfererice. in.’itsts otherwise. And I would like to take a few moments to press the point that global transformation for greater equity, dignity asid happiness will not come abon I through deepening our sense of coinnionafity alone, but only to the degree that we also activate our diflërences as the basic condition for nuituol confrthutfrwr it Is a cantraJ tenet of Buddhist Qdjtis - but one that I believe Is shared by all systems of effective religious, social and political peaetlee - that meaningful change can only be Initiated and sustained on the basis of present circumstances, as they have corne to be. In the present era, the any things have come to be is very much a function of the interlocking array of pence-ses that we refer to as ‘globalisation’. Let me mention three key siflcts of these Processes, each of them in large measure both driven by and driving sclenupæ ap techookigical advances. ¡ and most notably perhaps. Is accelerattp,g and Intenslfy change. Globalisation la bringing not only nave thenge traire rapidly, but alan the advent of qualitatively distinct kinds of change Of particular Importance is the phenomenon kflOWi1 ‘emergence’. stnicturaliy significant changes occurring ¡ in con1pie, syst that in principle could not have been nucipe, but that after the fact do make pertaci sense.Second are homogenislng effects that led many early cnc globalisation to fear the Westernisation or Me nialdisation world, but that In fact have fostered truly global forms of pul culture and, more Importantly, patterns of convergence that. for example. allow credit cards to be used the world over and are beginning to enable students to take advantage of virtually borderleas higher education. Third arr pluralizing effects that hase taken the form of resurgent national and ethnic Identities, but also niche global production networks, and such acutely uneven geography of development that the top 2% of the world’s people now own of global wealth while the bottom 50% own less than 1%. As a combined result. we are not only in an era of change. but a change of eras. More specifically, I would submit that we are in the midst of a transition from an era dominated by problem-solution to one dominated by predicament-resolution. Problems arise when changing circumstances make evident the laihire of existing practices for meeting abiding needs and interests. Solving problems Involves developing new or improved means for arriving at ends we fully intend to continue pursuing. For example, gas/electric hybrid automobile engines solve the problem’ of rising fuel costs. Predicaments occur when changing circumstances lead to or make us aware of conflicts competition among our own values. Intereata. development sitas, and constructions of meaning. Predicaments cannot be solved- They can only be resolved through sustaining detailed attention to situational dynamics and realising both enhanced clarity and more thoroughly and deeply coordinated commitments. World hunger Is not a problem. Enough food is grown to supply adequate nutrition for all, What Is lacking Is the resolve to bring our economic. social and political values, Intentions and practices into alignment with doing so. World hunger is a predicament. And an increasingly significant part of the reason that we make so little headway In addressing It and other apparently intractable issues like global climate change, illiteracy and mounting economic inequity is because we persist in thinking about them as problems awaiting technical solution, rather than as predicaments commanding sustained and ever deepening resolve. In sum 21st centuiy patterns of globalisation are raising crucial questions about the owa arid riwwung difference, presenting u with a poradoxicaJ Impasse ur axnia On the other hand, we need to more fully recognize and respect difference, going beyond tolerating differences from and among others to enable differences to matter more, not less. On the Other hand, we nerd to engage In more robust collective action and global common cause. ,omtrng differences within shared find deepening To Ignore our differences now is to fail resolving current predicaments and to foster conditions for more, and more Intense, predicaments in the future.

### Link- Justice

#### Their use of an ethical frame of “injustice” presumes a metaphysics of discrete individuals for injustice to be acted by and on – that’s both conceptually incorrect and leads us to egoistic violence

Carpenter 17 Carpenter, Amber, works in ancient Greek and classical Indian philosophy, with a topical focus on the metaphysics, epistemology and moral psychology underpinning Plato’s ethics and Indian Buddhist ethics, taught or held visiting research appointments at the University of York, St Andrews, Cornell, Oxford, the University of Melbourne and Yale University. BA (Yale), PhD (Kings College London). "Ethics without Justice." A Mirror Is for Reflection: Understanding Buddhist Ethics (2017).

This study in the Buddhist claim that we ought to eliminate anger, and the distinctively Buddhist mode of doing so, has shown that the link between injustice and anger presumes a metaphysics. The moral perspective that picks out injustice as a special and additional kind of harm requires a metaphysics of discrete individuals, doing and “being done to” in turn, with a clear distinction between the two. But such a metaphysics and its moral categories engender in turn certain typical modes of thought—in particular, obsessing about Who is to Blame. Particularly in our victim-status-claiming age, we should wonder whether this is especially fruitful—or apt.

The Buddhist cannot show that their view will confirm or conform to all our intuitions about injustice because their basic metaphysical presumptions do not support the centrality of autonomous agency as a distinctive sort of cause, nor the violation of that by such free agents as a distinctive sort of harm. This is not, however, just an oversight or a morally horrifying omission. The proposal of an alternative metaphysics is the proposal of an alternative way of conceiving the moral. For every exercise in appreciating what no-self means, and what its implications are, is simultaneously an exercise in detachment, in recognizing the impulse to blame and resent as harmful assertions of oneself over and against others. Removing the conceptual structures for righteous indignation strips our evaluations of situations and persons of its self-assertiveness. Rather than being enervating, or blinding us to what moral responsiveness demands, this outlook is resolutely practical. None of this denies the no-self anger-eliminativist the resources necessary for forensics: we can see that some sets of conditions have intentions among them, and we can recognize that under some circumstances, these are more effectively engaged with in modes that differ from how we would engage with a forest fire.30 To regard someone’s raging violence as a forest fire does not mean that we turn the fire hose on it; it means that we consider the enabling conditions and defeating conditions and seek to eliminate the one and enhance the other.31

At the same time, as no-self introduces fluidity into our practices of individuation, it presents us with the entangled mutual causation of all factors and the simultaneous suffering. To see no-self, Buddhist-wise, just is to see that everything is conditioned and conditioning. Released from the demands of indignation, we are left with the only attitude that is appropriate in the face of suffering—a practically oriented care to relieve that suffering. Karuṇā is not an additional feature of a Buddhist outlook or the next thing on the list of dogmata. Care just is the affective and practical recognition of no-self metaphysics. Without discrete individuals to appeal to in any situation—these the perpetrators, these the victims—we have only efficacy in removing suffering as the standard preventing us from nihilism. Where before there were culprits to blame, and myself to exonerate or assert in retaliation, there is now only suffering, for which care to alleviate it is simply what is left when I am no longer distracted by righteous indignation.

### Link- Modern Economics

#### Their concepts of economics ignore all internal critiques, start from the point of goods not people, forgets about the interconnected universe, and will inevitably collapse to totalitarianism and agrarianism

E. F. Schumacher, 69, Buddhist Economics, Schumacher Center for New Economics, 8-13-1969, DOA: 12-27-2021, https://centerforneweconomics.org/publications/buddhist-economics/, r0w@n [bracketed for gendered language]

“Right Livelihood” is one of the requirements of the Buddha’s Noble Eightfold Path. It is clear, therefore, that there must be such a thing as Buddhist economics. Buddhist countries have often stated that they wish to remain faithful to their heritage. So Burma: “The New Burma sees no conflict between religious values and economic progress. Spiritual health and material well-being are not enemies: they are natural allies.”1 Or: “We can blend successfully the religious and spiritual values of our heritage with the benefits of modern technology.”2 Or: “We Burmans have a sacred duty to conform both our dreams and our acts to our faith. This we shall ever do.”3 All the same, such countries invariably assume that they can model their economic development plans in accordance with modern economics, and they call upon modern economists from so-called advanced countries to advise them, to formulate the policies to be pursued, and to construct the grand design for development, the Five-Year Plan or whatever it may be called. No one seems to think that a Buddhist way of life would call for Buddhist economics, just as the modern materialist way of life has brought forth modern economics. Economists themselves, like most specialists, normally suffer from a kind of metaphysical blindness, assuming that theirs is a science of absolute and invariable truths, without any presuppositions. Some go as far as to claim that economic laws are as free from “metaphysics” or “values” as the law of gravitation. We need not, however, get involved in arguments of methodology. Instead, let us take some fundamentals and see what they look like when viewed by a modern economist and a Buddhist economist. There is universal agreement that a fundamental source of wealth is human labour. Now, the modern economist has been brought up to consider “labour” or work as little more than a necessary evil. From the point of view of the employer, it is in any case simply an item of cost, to be reduced to a minimum if it can not be eliminated altogether, say, by automation. From the point of view of the workman, it is a “disutility”; to work is to make a sacrifice of one’s leisure and comfort, and wages are a kind of compensation for the sacrifice. Hence the ideal from the point of view of the employer is to have output without employees, and the ideal from the point of view of the employee is to have income without employment. The consequences of these attitudes both in theory and in practice are, of course, extremely far-reaching. If the ideal with regard to work is to get rid of it, every method that “reduces the work load” is a good thing. The most potent method, short of automation, is the so-called “division of labour” and the classical example is the pin factory eulogised in Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations.4 Here it is not a matter of ordinary specialisation, which mankind has practiced from time immemorial, but of dividing up every complete process of production into minute parts, so that the final product can be produced at great speed without anyone having had to contribute more than a totally insignificant and, in most cases, unskilled movement of his limbs. The Buddhist point of view takes the function of work to be at least threefold: to give [people] a chance to utilise and develop [their] faculties; to enable [them] to overcome [their] ego-centredness by joining with other people in a common task; and to bring forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence. Again, the consequences that flow from this view are endless. To organise work in such a manner that it becomes meaningless, boring, stultifying, or nerve-racking for the worker would be little short of criminal; it would indicate a greater concern with goods than with people, an evil lack of compassion and a soul-destroying degree of attachment to the most primitive side of this worldly existence. Equally, to strive for leisure as an alternative to work would be considered a complete misunderstanding of one of the basic truths of human existence, namely that work and leisure are complementary parts of the same living process and cannot be separated without destroying the joy of work and the bliss of leisure. From the Buddhist point of view, there are therefore two types of mechanisation which must be clearly distinguished: one that enhances a man’s skill and power and one that turns the work of man over to a mechanical slave, leaving man in a position of having to serve the slave. How to tell the one from the other? “The craftsman himself,” says Ananda Coomaraswamy, a man equally competent to talk about the modern West as the ancient East, “can always, if allowed to, draw the delicate distinction between the machine and the tool. The carpet loom is a tool, a contrivance for holding warp threads at a stretch for the pile to be woven round them by the craftsmen’s fingers; but the power loom is a machine, and its significance as a destroyer of culture lies in the fact that it does the essentially human part of the work.”5 It is clear, therefore, that Buddhist economics must be very different from the economics of modern materialism, since the Buddhist sees the essence of civilisation not in a multiplication of wants but in the purification of human character. Character, at the same time, is formed primarily by a man’s work. And work, properly conducted in conditions of human dignity and freedom, blesses those who do it and equally their products. The Indian philosopher and economist J. C. Kumarappa sums the matter up as follows: If the nature of the work is properly appreciated and applied, it will stand in the same relation to the higher faculties as food is to the physical body. It nourishes and enlivens the higher man and urges him to produce the best he is capable of. It directs his free will along the proper course and disciplines the animal in him into progressive channels. It furnishes an excellent background for man to display his scale of values and develop his personality.6 If a man has no chance of obtaining work he is in a desperate position, not simply because he lacks an income but because he lacks this nourishing and enlivening factor of disciplined work which nothing can replace. A modern economist may engage in highly sophisticated calculations on whether full employment “pays” or whether it might be more “economic” to run an economy at less than full employment so as to insure a greater mobility of labour, a better stability of wages, and so forth. His fundamental criterion of success is simply the total quantity of goods produced during a given period of time. “If the marginal urgency of goods is low,” says Professor Galbraith in The Affluent Society, “then so is the urgency of employing the last man or the last million men in the labour force.”7 And again: “If . . . we can afford some unemployment in the interest of stability—a proposition, incidentally, of impeccably conservative antecedents—then we can afford to give those who are unemployed the goods that enable them to sustain their accustomed standard of living.” From a Buddhist point of view, this is standing the truth on its head by considering goods as more important than people and consumption as more important than creative activity. It means shifting the emphasis from the worker to the product of work, that is, from the human to the subhuman, a surrender to the forces of evil. The very start of Buddhist economic planning would be a planning for full employment, and the primary purpose of this would in fact be employment for everyone who needs an “outside” job: it would not be the maximisation of employment nor the maximisation of production. Women, on the whole, do not need an “outside” job, and the large-scale employment of women in offices or factories would be considered a sign of serious economic failure. In particular, to let mothers of young children work in factories while the children run wild would be as uneconomic in the eyes of a Buddhist economist as the employment of a skilled worker as a soldier in the eyes of a modern economist. While the materialist is mainly interested in goods, the Buddhist is mainly interested in liberation. But Buddhism is “The Middle Way” and therefore in no way antagonistic to physical well-being. It is not wealth that stands in the way of liberation but the attachment to wealth; not the enjoyment of pleasurable things but the craving for them. The keynote of Buddhist economics, therefore, is simplicity and non-violence. From an economist’s point of view, the marvel of the Buddhist way of life is the utter rationality of its pattern—amazingly small means leading to extraordinarily satisfactory results. For the modern economist this is very difficult to understand. He is used to measuring the “standard of living” by the amount of annual consumption, assuming all the time that a man who consumes more is “better off” than a man who consumes less. A Buddhist economist would consider this approach excessively irrational: since consumption is merely a means to human well-being, the aim should be to obtain the maximum of well-being with the minimum of consumption. Thus, if the purpose of clothing is a certain amount of temperature comfort and an attractive appearance, the task is to attain this purpose with the smallest possible effort, that is, with the smallest annual destruction of cloth and with the help of designs that involve the smallest possible input of toil. The less toil there is, the more time and strength is left for artistic creativity. It would be highly uneconomic, for instance, to go in for complicated tailoring, like the modern West, when a much more beautiful effect can be achieved by the skillful draping of uncut material. It would be the height of folly to make material so that it should wear out quickly and the height of barbarity to make anything ugly, shabby, or mean. What has just been said about clothing applies equally to all other human requirements. The ownership and the consumption of goods is a means to an end, and Buddhist economics is the systematic study of how to attain given ends with the minimum means. Modern economics, on the other hand, considers consumption to be the sole end and purpose of all economic activity, taking the factors of production—and, labour, and capital—as the means. The former, in short, tries to maximise human satisfactions by the optimal pattern of consumption, while the latter tries to maximise consumption by the optimal pattern of productive effort. It is easy to see that the effort needed to sustain a way of life which seeks to attain the optimal pattern of consumption is likely to be much smaller than the effort needed to sustain a drive for maximum consumption. We need not be surprised, therefore, that the pressure and strain of living is very much less in say, Burma, than it is in the United States, in spite of the fact that the amount of labour-saving machinery used in the former country is only a minute fraction of the amount used in the latter. Simplicity and non-violence are obviously closely related. The optimal pattern of consumption, producing a high degree of human satisfaction by means of a relatively low rate of consumption, allows people to live without great pressure and strain and to fulfill the primary injunction of Buddhist teaching: “Cease to do evil; try to do good.” As physical resources are everywhere limited, people satisfying their needs by means of a modest use of resources are obviously less likely to be at each other’s throats than people depending upon a high rate of use. Equally, people who live in highly self-sufficient local communities are less likely to get involved in large-scale violence than people whose existence depends on world-wide systems of trade. From the point of view of Buddhist economics, therefore, production from local resources for local needs is the most rational way of economic life, while dependence on imports from afar and the consequent need to produce for export to unknown and distant peoples is highly uneconomic and justifiable only in exceptional cases and on a small scale. Just as the modern economist would admit that a high rate of consumption of transport services between a man’s home and his place of work signifies a misfortune and not a high standard of life, so the Buddhist would hold that to satisfy human wants from faraway sources rather than from sources nearby signifies failure rather than success. The former tends to take statistics showing an increase in the number of ton/miles per head of the population carried by a country’s transport system as proof of economic progress, while to the latter—the Buddhist economist—the same statistics would indicate a highly undesirable deterioration in the pattern of consumption. Another striking difference between modern economics and Buddhist economics arises over the use of natural resources. Bertrand de Jouvenel, the eminent French political philosopher, has characterised “Western man” in words which may be taken as a fair description of the modern economist: He tends to count nothing as an expenditure, other than human effort; he does not seem to mind how much mineral matter he wastes and, far worse, how much living matter he destroys. He does not seem to realize at all that human life is a dependent part of an ecosystem of many different forms of life. As the world is ruled from towns where men are cut off from any form of life other than human, the feeling of belonging to an ecosystem is not revived. This results in a harsh and improvident treatment of things upon which we ultimately depend, such as water and trees.8 The teaching of the Buddha, on the other hand, enjoins a reverent and non-violent attitude not only to all sentient beings but also, with great emphasis, to trees. Every follower of the Buddha ought to plant a tree every few years and look after it until it is safely established, and the Buddhist economist can demonstrate without difficulty that the universal observation of this rule would result in a high rate of genuine economic development independent of any foreign aid. Much of the economic decay of southeast Asia (as of many other parts of the world) is undoubtedly due to a heedless and shameful neglect of trees. Modern economics does not distinguish between renewable and non-renewable materials, as its very method is to equalise and quantify everything by means of a money price. Thus, taking various alternative fuels, like coal, oil, wood, or water-power: the only difference between them recognised by modern economics is relative cost per equivalent unit. The cheapest is automatically the one to be preferred, as to do otherwise would be irrational and “uneconomic.” From a Buddhist point of view, of course, this will not do; the essential difference between non-renewable fuels like coal and oil on the one hand and renewable fuels like wood and water-power on the other cannot be simply overlooked. Non-renewable goods must be used only if they are indispensable, and then only with the greatest care and the most meticulous concern for conservation. To use them heedlessly or extravagantly is an act of violence, and while complete non-violence may not be attainable on this earth, there is nonetheless an ineluctable duty on man to aim at the ideal of non-violence in all he does. Just as a modern European economist would not consider it a great achievement if all European art treasures were sold to America at attractive prices, so the Buddhist economist would insist that a population basing its economic life on non-renewable fuels is living parasitically, on capital instead of income. Such a way of life could have no permanence and could therefore be justified only as a purely temporary expedient. As the world’s resources of non-renewable fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas—are exceedingly unevenly distributed over the globe and undoubtedly limited in quantity, it is clear that their exploitation at an ever-increasing rate is an act of violence against nature which must almost inevitably lead to violence between men. This fact alone might give food for thought even to those people in Buddhist countries who care nothing for the religious and spiritual values of their heritage and ardently desire to embrace the materialism of modern economics at the fastest possible speed. Before they dismiss Buddhist economics as nothing better than a nostalgic dream, they might wish to consider whether the path of economic development outlined by modern economics is likely to lead them to places where they really want to be. Towards the end of his courageous book The Challenge of Man’s Future, Professor Harrison Brown of the California Institute of Technology gives the following appraisal: Thus we see that, just as industrial society is fundamentally unstable and subject to reversion to agrarian existence, so within it the conditions which offer individual freedom are unstable in their ability to avoid the conditions which impose rigid organization and totalitarian control. Indeed, when we examine all the foreseeable difficulties which threaten the survival of industrial civilization, it is difficult to see how the achievement of stability and the maintenance of individual liberty can be made compatible.9 Even if this were dismissed as a long-term view there is the immediate question of whether “modernization,” as currently practiced without regard to religious and spiritual values, is actually producing agreeable results. As far as the masses are concerned, the results appear to be disastrous—a collapse of the rural economy, a rising tide of unemployment in town and country, and the growth of a city proletariat without nourishment for either body or soul. It is in the light of both immediate experience and long term prospects that the study of Buddhist economics could be recommended even to those who believe that economic growth is more important than any spiritual or religious values. For it is not a question of choosing between “modern growth” and “traditional stagnation.” It is a question of finding the right path of development, the Middle Way between materialist heedlessness and traditionalist immobility, in short, of finding “Right Livelihood.”

#### Faith in modern economics relies on impersonality and distance from others – meditation is key to releasement

Nelson 11 – PhD in Economics, Professor of Economics @ UC-Davis, most known for her application of feminist theory to questions of the definition of the discipline of economics, and its models and methodology

(Julie, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 24)//BB

Many Buddhist writers on economic issues begin with the experience of meditation, of getting beyond the dualities of self and no-self, and speak a message of radical interdependence, peace, compassion and engagement. The energy of this discussion is open-hearted, immediate and joyful. But when the conversation turns to economic systems, it is repeatedly asserted that the contemporary economic system is radically impersonal and non-relational. It is claimed that economies are things entirely set apart from societies, and from the sorts of ethical norms and behaviors relevant to social life. The sort of system envisaged is not an organic system encompassing change, impermanence, and evolution, but rather a locked-up system, that – once set in motion – runs along automatically according to its own rules.¶ One can see this belief reflected in the frequent use of imagery of machines, engines and physics-like logic, laws or calculations. “Undeniably, the fuel that keeps the capitalist engine running is profit”, writes Sivaraksa (2002, 135, empha- sis added). “Large corporations are new forms of impersonal collective self”, writes Loy (2008, 88, emphasis in original). “Profitability and growth are becoming increasingly important as the engine of the world’s economic activity”, he contin- ues, and “the system has attained a life of its own” (2008, 88, 90, emphasis added). Jones, in a section on transnational corporations, describes capitalism as a structure or system driven by “the logic of the market” (2003, 162), while Santikaro refers to “the calculations of the market” (2005, 206).¶ The assumption of non-relationality is also reflected in metaphors of territory, whereby social or religious life is said to belong to one sphere, while economic life belongs to another realm, set off by “boundaries” or “confines” (Santikaro 2005, 204, 206). Personification is often used as well, treating capitalism as a distinct and permanent entity that acts on the world on its own behalf, and which possesses an essential “nature” (Aitken 1984, 29).

#### Wanting less is a necessary corrective to western economics

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, *Society and Economy* , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078)

In his paper "Towards a Progressive Buddhist Economics", Simon Zadek asks ¶ the important question of whether Buddhist economics is able to penetrate the ¶ modern economy to prevent it from driving us along a materially unsustainable ¶ path, and to uproot its growing hold on our psychological conditions. And he con- ¶ cludes that we have no choice but to engage in modernisation in an attempt to redi- ¶ rect it or at least reduce its negative effects (Zadek 1997). ¶ Today's dominating business models are based on and cultivates narrow ¶ self-centeredness. Buddhist economics points out that emphasising individuality ¶ and promoting the greatest fulfilment of the desires of the individual conjointly ¶ lead to destruction. ¶ Happiness research convincingly shows that not material wealth but the rich- ¶ ness of personal relationships determines happiness. Not things but people make ¶ people happy (Lane 1998). Western economics tries to provide people with happi ness by supplying enormous quantities of things. But what people need are caring relationships and generous love. Buddhist economics makes these values accessible by direct provision. ¶ Peace can be achieved in non-violent ways. Wanting less can substantially ¶ contribute to this endeavour and make it happen easier. ¶ Permanence, or ecological sustainability, requires a drastic cutback in the pres- ¶ ent level of consumption and production globally. This reduction should not be an ¶ inconvenient exercise of self-sacrifice. In the noble ethos of reducing suffering it ¶ can be a positive development path for humanity.

#### The affirmative’s faith in market economics is inherently marginalizing

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, Society and Economy , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078)//RM

Karl Polanyi refers to the whole process of marketisation as "The Great Trans- ¶ formation", by which spheres of society became subordinated to the market ¶ mechanism (Polanyi 1946). In the age of globalisation we can experience this ¶ marketisation process on a much larger scale and in a speedier way than ever. ¶ The market is a powerful institution. It can provide goods and services in a ¶ flexible and productive way; however, it has its own limitations. Limitations of ¶ the market come from non-represented stakeholders, underrepresented stake- ¶ holders, and myopic stakeholders. ¶ Primordial stakeholders such as nature and future generations are simply not ¶ represented in the market because they do not have a "vote" in terms of purchas- ¶ ing power. They cannot represent their interests in the language of supply and de- ¶ mand. Other stakeholders such as the poor and marginalised people are under- ¶ represented because they do not have enough purchasing power to signal their ¶ preferences in the market. Finally, stakeholders who are well represented in the ¶ market, because they have enough purchasing power, often behave in a myopic ¶ way; that is, they heavily discount values in space and time. Market prices usually ¶ reflect the values of the strongest stakeholders and favour preferences here and ¶ now. Because of these inherent limitations the market cannot give a complete, un- ¶ biased direction for guiding economic activities (Zsolnai - Gasparski 2002).

### Link- Western Democracy

#### Western democracy doesn’t go far enough to create change- only an adoption of universal responsibilities can co-exist with an ontology of dependent origination

William J. Long, 21, Buddha on Politics, Economics, and Statecraft, SpringerLink, 2-16-2021, DOA: 12-28-2021, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-68042-8\_3, r0w@n

This chapter outlines doctrinal Buddhist political and economic theory including its notions about interstate relations, which are based on its unique understanding of the nature of reality. Some readers may be surprised to hear that there exists a theory of politics in Buddha’s teachings. But in fact, Buddha spoke extensively about politics, contrary to the assertion of Max Weber who famously asserted that Buddhism was “a specifically a-political and anti-political status religion.” Although the overriding goal of Buddha’s teachings is the liberation of individuals from pervasive suffering, Buddha considered politics as important, not so much for its intrinsic value, but because it created an external environment that can facilitate or impede an individual’s pursuit of happiness, defined as spiritual advancement and achievement of wisdom about the true nature of oneself and the world. Although best understood as an extension of his teachings on human liberation, Buddha was also an original social and a significant political philosopher. Buddha’s social teachings parallel modern democratic thought, mixed market economics, and cosmopolitan internationalism in the West. This chapter outlines Buddha’s political and economic theory, including his thoughts about statecraft and the possibilities for international order. Keywords Buddhist politics Buddhist economics Buddhist statecraft Download chapter PDF Buddha on Politics1 Early Buddhist literature2 addresses several political, economic, and international issues. While the primary purpose of Buddha’s teachings is the liberation of individuals from pervasive suffering, his teachings also acknowledge the interdependence of the individual with society, polity, and economy. Buddha’s teachings sought to mediate these relationships constructively. Although largely unknown in the West, Buddha was an original and important social, political, and economic philosopher, and a rationalistic, humanistic, and democratic one at that (Ling 1981). What are the essential elements of Buddha’s normative vision for politics? Buddha saw politics not as an end in itself but as an instrument that could either provide favorable conditions or create harmful obstructions for individuals’ personal advancement. Buddha recognized that government is necessary to provide social order and welfare and that its values, content, and processes should be consistent with the “dharma.” “Dharma” (dhamma in Pāli) has many meanings but here refers to the teachings of Buddha and their realization, which are offered as universal or natural laws—such as the law of dependent arising and the suffering that results from ignorance of this basic truth. These laws are not created by Buddha, they operate with or without him, but Buddha revealed these laws and recommended that we examine them and act accordingly; not through blind faith, but through a process of rational human assessment.3 A political system organized consistent with these basic truths could minimize the manifest forms of suffering for all members of society—especially for the least fortunate whose visible suffering is greatest—and play a positive role in an individual’s attainment of higher forms of well-being. What does it mean to say that political practices must be consistent with the dharma for their legitimacy? A fundamental principle of the dharma relevant to politics is the equality and dignity of all individuals. Buddha stressed that all human beings have an inherent worth and capacity for enlightenment, so-called, “Buddha nature.”4 In contrast to the prevailing Brahmin teachings, Buddha rejected the caste system and argued that virtues were distributed equally, not hierarchically, across society. Buddha states: “Now since both dark and bright qualities, which are blamed and praised by the wise, are scattered indiscriminately among the four castes, the wise do not recognize the claim about the Brahmin caste being the highest … [anyone can] become emancipated … by virtue of dharma” (DN, 27, 2012 at p. 408). The dharma applies equally to everyone regardless of class, social status, or economic circumstance. Because citizen and ruler alike are equal under the law of dharma, political institutions should reflect this basic truth. For it’s time these were truly groundbreaking social insights. Buddha’s teachings also reflect the principle of equality when he prescribes that monarchy, the dominant form of government during his lifetime, should be based on popular consent (not divine right), conducted in consultation with the governed, even-handed in the application of justice, and conform to the dharma. Democracy, however, is the form of government where equality is paramount, and Buddha’s own political creation, the sangha (the order of monks and nuns in Pāli and Sanskrit), is governed by strict equality in its rules for admission, participation, administration, and dispute resolution. Because of the equality and ultimate goodness of every individual (and because they all suffer), Buddha taught that they are each worthy of our compassion and, at a minimum, should not be harmed by the state. Nonviolence or non-harm (ahimsa in Sanskrit and Pāli) is a natural corollary to Buddha’s teachings on the equality of human potential and the basis of the protection of individual rights.5 Perhaps the most direct example of this principle to politics is Buddha’s repeated admonition that a righteous ruler must follow the ethical precepts of no killing, no stealing, no lying, etc. More affirmatively, the successful leader must demonstrate compassion and care through the practices of kindness, equanimity, patience, and generosity. Nonviolence and equality are the bedrocks of Buddhist social justice, and good government requires moral and legal protection against the arbitrary use of power. Buddha, like America’s founding fathers, was concerned about the danger of tyranny. The third feature of Buddha’s political teachings is a tolerance for different political configurations and a pragmatic and non-doctrinaire (“liberal” or “pluralistic” in this sense) approach to political questions. Rather than overtly endorsing a particular form of government, Buddha, in befriending and advising republics and monarchs alike, implies that good governance can take more than one form but must allow for the maximization of individual happiness of its citizens (defined in a way that goes beyond mere sensual enjoyment to include self-realization) and that minimizes their suffering, allowing them to cultivate compassion, patience, generosity, meditative concentration, and wisdom while discouraging greed, hatred, and ignorance. Buddha did not explicitly advocate for a single form of government, and, at one level, recognized that different types of regimes could be considered legitimate if the spirit of the ruler and the ruled was in accordance with the dharma. Nonetheless, Buddha indicated a preference for democratic and representative forms of government. In his teachings and prescriptions, Buddha endorsed democratic principles such as citizen participation and free expression of opinion; deliberation, consultation, and consensus-building; voting and respect for popular consent; transparency via face-to-face meetings and public debate; primacy of the rule of law and limited government. We see these predilections in Buddha’s endorsement of republican principles in the sūtras and the incorporation of democratic principles into the rules governing Buddha’s own society of monks and nuns in the vinaya. Buddha’s teachings are directly relevant to contemporary politics and are compatible with the governance of a modern democratic state. Buddha’s political thinking parallels Western liberal-democratic thought with its emphasis on equal rights, protection against tyranny via equality before the law, and participatory and deliberative governance. The most important distinction between “dharmic” democracy and Western liberal democracy is Buddhism’s emphasis on one’s individual duties to others as much as one’s individual rights, duties that exceed compliance with the law. Where liberal democracy has little to say about the moral qualities of what constitutes good governance beyond the values of equality of opportunity and protection of individual choice and instead focuses on the process of good governance not the substance (Garfield 2001), “dharmic democracy” delineates a clear duty of care owed to others and to the natural world as well. Fundamentally, in dharmic democracy individuals have a duty not only to avoid abridging other’s freedoms, but to strive to develop a sense of universal responsibility and concern for all human beings and the natural world. Although this duty is everyone’s responsibility, political institutions and their leaders should reflect these principles, and policy should encourage their inculcation and practice. The emphasis on responsibilities as well as rights follows directly from Buddhism’s underlying ontology of dependent origination and a theory of causation that maintains our lives are not separate but deeply interdependent. Contemporary Buddhist writer and monk, Thich Nhat Hanh, captured this difference in the context of the United States when he remarked: “We have the Statute of Liberty on the East Coast. I think we have to make a Statute of Responsibility on the West Coast to counterbalance Liberty. Liberty without responsibility is not real liberty” (Hanh 2006 at p. 137). “Freedom” in Buddhist thought means freedom from the chains of self-grasping ignorance, not the unbridled pursuit of “self” interest.

### Link- IR

#### Their IR has the wrong starting point- only love can destroy hatred

William J. Long, 21, Buddha on Politics, Economics, and Statecraft, SpringerLink, 2-16-2021, DOA: 12-28-2021, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-68042-8\_3, r0w@n

Buddha on International Relations and Statecraft The Buddhist conception of politics as serving the common good extends to the international realm where our humanity and fundamental interdependence ultimately transcend national, racial, and other barriers, which are, at most, only conventional distinctions. This is not to say that the state must wither away in Buddhism. States, like our conventional designation of our “selves” as distinctive individual entities, can function effectively as long as one recognizes their nominal, transactional, and dependent nature and avoids grasping at them as inherently real. States can serve an important function by equitably supplying public goods. Likewise, a system of such like-minded states can “exist” and function effectively, if one recognizes and does not lose sight of the deeper, interconnected nature of all things. Thus, Buddhist statecraft is an international extension of Buddhist political and economic principles of equality, harmony, social welfare, nonviolence, conciliation, and mutually beneficial commercial exchange what has been summed up above as ruling in accord with the dharma, sometimes called “righteousness” in the Buddhist cannon.12 Buddha discusses statecraft mostly in parables,13 introducing the concept of world-ruler (cakkavatti in Pali, cakravartin in Sanskrit), who would provide exemplary leadership for states in the international system. The cakkavatti is a lesser or worldly Buddha that provides for the material welfare (more than the spiritual welfare) of mankind.14 By example and generosity (not violent conquest), this ruler (either a single individual or a representative body) establishes an ideal government with the consent of the governed which is followed by a series of similar democratic and constitutional states based on shared principles. This loose network of ideal states would constitute an international political system that served the interests of worldwide peace and prosperity. One can see certain parallels here with Kant’s vision of perpetual peace among like-minded representative states and with democratic peace theory and notions of an “international society” and cosmopolitanism in modern Western IR writings. Buddhist IR begins with the establishment of a righteous state, ruled by consent of the governed with policies consistent with the dharma. This government would work for the interest of its people with care, impartial justice, tolerance, and the equal promotion of material and spiritual welfare of society’s members. In modern parlance, the exemplar would be an enlightened democratic welfare state guaranteeing freedom and economic security and promoting equality, tolerance, and care for its citizens (Jayatilleke 1967). In time, this model would extend naturally and infectiously or “travel” to other parts of the world, via the Buddhist metaphor of a rolling “Wheel of Dharma,” much like Buddha’s initial teaching after his enlightenment set in motion a wheel of spiritual guidance. These other countries, in turn, would establish similar states with analogous governing principles and constitutions. The international system would not be centralized empire, but a loose constellation of states revolving around an archetypal entity (Tambiah 1976). In relating with other states, hostility and aggression is forbidden and the cultivation of friendliness and neighborliness and mutually beneficial commerce is endorsed, both to conform with the dharma and on grounds of expediency and efficacy, that is, aggression does not serve one’s self-interest in the long run. Buddha counseled, “Hatred never ceases by hatred in this world. Hatred ceases by love—this is the ancient law” (Dhp. 2007 at p. 105).15 A state could retain its army for defensive purposes but nonviolence is thought to be the higher ideal and Buddha counseled against the resort to war as a means of settling international disputes (King 2013).16 The first ethical principle in Buddhism is to refrain from killing or injuring any sentient being. There is little or no support for “just war” in Buddhism (Jerryson 2013; Jayasuriya 2009). Buddha said that wars only perpetuate future conflict. As noted, he also spoke out against the trading in weapons as “wrong livelihood.” In sum, in foreign affairs, the state has the obligation not to commit aggression and to cooperate with other states in a spirit of friendliness and equality for the common good of mankind. Like all Buddha’s advice, this admonition was offered for its practical benefits—it strengthened both the individual state and encouraged common bond of humanity that would bear fruit in international peace and prosperity. Buddha’s political doctrine of equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, and political institutions that serve the common good materially and spiritually find their ultimate fulfillment in a worldwide network of states each acting according to these principles. Hence, in Buddhism, states may exist, but they are artifacts that endure for the benefit of a broader humanity. Empirical Referents for Buddhist Statecraft: Aśoka’s Mauryan Empire and Contemporary Bhutan Buddhism has shaped many cultures throughout Asia and, more recently, has become influential in the West. Buddhism’s political impact has been more muted, however, in part, because from the start the Buddhist order, the democratic sangha, was to remain apart, although not wholly separate, from politics.17 The devoted practitioners of the sangha were to be considered a source of advice and example to the wider society and polity, but refrain from participating directly in the political process. So, there are few instances where one can find an empirical example of a political system founded truly on Buddhist principles or practicing what might be called Buddhist statecraft. This is not to say that Buddhism has not been used by politicians past and present to cloak their actions in Buddhist rhetoric, much as other religious traditions have been used, only that an authentic effort to align Buddhist principles with political practice is quite rare. I offer two possible cases of Buddhist statecraft—one ancient and one modern (an alpha and omega)—for consideration. The ancient case is the Mauryan Empire of King Aśoka, the first ruler of a Buddhist state, and the modern case is contemporary Bhutan—the only extant example of a democratic state that is rooted constitutionally, politically, and economically in Buddhism.18

### Link- Capitalism/Econ

#### Attachment and greed create systems of suffering- only though mindset change can we create meaningful material reform

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

The term ‘ironic affinities’ is one which I have borrowed from Kevin Brien’s (2004) work toward this very end. The irony here is that a system of religious thought which is focused on the internal sources of disharmony and suffering can be reconciled with a philosophical and economic system which is both critical of the influence of religion and focused on external causes of human suffering. The means to this reconciliation, as Brien points out, lies in the Buddhist understanding of the interconnectedness of reality through the philosophy of dependent origination and the training of wisdom as embodied through the practices of Right Thought and Right Understanding. It bears repeating at this point that a cornerstone of these teachings is summed up by the sentiment “With your thoughts you make the world.” The extrapolation that this forces us to make is not an illogical one; that individuals, who themselves are subject to suffering through the influence of greed, attachment, and craving, would in turn establish larger systems which can do little else but perpetuate suffering. Brien explains: Once again my suggestion is that, were the historical Buddha alive at the present time, and were he fully aware of the humanistic-Marxist perspective on social reality, he would quite naturally extend his notion of dependent coorigination to take account of the various mutually interconnected, and mutually interdependent, external factors operating in a given situation – the sort of factors that generate the various forms of human suffering and of alienation that Marx himself was so concerned to understand. […] Thus if the historical Buddha, with Marx’s bodhisattvic help, he could have identified the specific external factors that functioned to generate and sustain specific forms of suffering and alienation, he would quite naturally have seen that, when these 25 specific external factors arise, this specific type of suffering and alienation arises; and that if these factors were to cease operating, this suffering would also cease (2004:51). In this context the Marxist concern with identifying and understanding these external sources of suffering can be seen as a function of the collision of dependent origination and Marx’s own historical materialism. It reflects a social and economic reality that is the result of historical influence on our creation of self which acknowledges the internal sources of the root of suffering itself; and like the traditional Buddhist formulation as defined in the Third Noble Truth, it should be understood as an optimistic undertaking, to ultimately serve as an impetus for change. This formulation of a basic philosophical convergence between Buddhism and Marxism should fly in the face of the criticisms of fatalism which have been leveled at both philosophies. It provides the foundation for a liberatory praxis which seeks the cessation of suffering through the exercise of supreme agency across all levels of human organization. It is also rooted in a similar understanding of human nature, the second major interaction between Buddhism and Marxism which is essential to the creation of a Buddhist critical social theory. Human Nature in Marxism and Buddhism

### Link- Big Impacts

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

For the better part of the last two-thousand years the people of the Western world have been conditioned to view our existence in terms of our history; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of the apocalyptic worldview; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged, the response to this uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview. In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs, they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes detrimental to the possibility of legitimate public discourse and engagement. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, we also run the risk of dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form, if not the language, of traditional prophetic warnings. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly it is exploited at every turn by news media and politicians to reinforce public support for existing power structures, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, the creation of a Buddhist worldview in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

### Link – Globalization

#### Globalization forces ontological estrangement – creates forms of greed and consumerism that preclude individual liberation

Sivaraksa 2 (Sulak Sivaraksa is known in the West as one of the fathers of the International Network of Engaged Buddhists (INEB), 2002, “Economic Aspects of Social and Environmental Violence from a Buddhist Perspective,” http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/buddhist-christian\_studies/v022/22.1sivaraksa.html) //RM

As the culture of economic globalization, consumerism directly nourishes the unlimited greed of soulless transnational corporations. It will take quite a talent to miss this observation; markets dependent on consumption and controlled by powerful corporations cannot do otherwise. The consumers cannot be expected to know what they want; the demand must be manipulated or generated. The Unconscious of the consumer must be "told" what to purchase. Therefore, whereas the political and economic dimensions of globalization are marginalizing many people worldwide, particularly the poor, consumerism seeks the active participation of all classes. As a form of greed, consumerism obscures the path to personal liberation.¶ ¶ In many respects, consumerism is able to dominate much of contemporary society because individuals have become alienated from their culture and from each other. The sense of community that led people to share scarce resources and work cooperatively has been supplanted by the vile maxims of the masters of mankind, by an anger or competitiveness that causes people to seek acquisitions at the expense of their neighbors. In sum, consumerism is a consequence of using greed and violence to regulate socioeconomic relations.¶ ¶ At the most profound level, consumerism owes its vitality to the delusion of the autonomous individualized self; a self that exists independently of social relations and of human relations with nature: a human person is thrown into the world. For the Buddha, it was clear that the "self" constituted only a pattern of persistently changing experiences that had no more substance or permanence than those experiences.¶ ¶ We are deluded into seeking some transcendental subject, something that defines experience yet lies beyond the experience. We are exhorted to know ourselves and yet the "self" in this dualistic system remains unknowable. For the Buddhists, this delusion is the fundamental cause of suffering. Ontologically, we become estranged aspects of our experiences of others and ourselves. Hence we are precluded from any meaningful conception of identity.¶ ¶ Consumerism provides an artificial means of defining our existence by suggesting [End Page 53] that identity is realized through the process of acquisition. Put differently, consumerism is a perverse corollary of the Cartesian proof of personal existence: "I shop, therefore I am."¶ ¶ I have often referred to consumerism as a demonic religion because of the manner in which individuals become mired in a cycle of behavior that is fundamentally self-defeating: the insatiable desire for goods ultimately leads to despair or boredom.¶ ¶ However, the Buddhist practice of mindfulness may help the individual to realize gradually that "I breathe, therefore I am." In other words, bhavana will help us synchronize our heads with our hearts. The primary result will not be greater intellectual power, which is amoral and compartmentalized. Rather, we will achieve real understanding, or prajna. The less selfish we are, the more our prajna will merge with karuna, or compassion. Prajna and karuna are important for leading an alternative lifestyle, for overcoming consumerism. The two foster spirituality, which goes hand in hand with the engendering of harmony within ourselves, our society, and our natural habitat. In turn, this would help bring about social justice, fraternity, and ecological balance.

### Link – Science

#### Rationalist approaches to environmentally sustainability are doomed to fail

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 7-9) //T.C.

But is it in fact desirable to look on economics as a science? Although many believe that science can save us from the perils of life, it has many limitations. Science shows only one side of the truth, that which concerns the material world. By only considering the material side of things, the science of economics is out of step with the overall truth of the way things are. Given that all things in this world are naturally interrelated and interconnected, it follows that human problems must also by interrelated and interconnected. One-sided scientific solutions are bound to fail and the problems bound to spread. Environmental degradation is the most obvious and dangerous consequence to our industrialized, specialized approach to solving problems. Environmental problems have become so pressing that people are now beginning to see how foolish it is to place their faith in individual, isolated disciplines that ignore the larger perspective. They are starting to look at human activities on a broader scale, to see the repercussions their actions have on personal lives, society, and the environment. Specialization can be a great benefit as long as we don't lose sight of our common goal: as a specialized study, economics allows us to analyze with minute detail the causes and factors within economic activities. But it is a mistake to believe that any one discipline or field of learning can in itself solve all problems. In concert with other disciplines, however, economics can constitute a complete response to human suffering, and it is only by fully understanding the contributions and limitations of each discipline that we will be able to produce such a coordinated effort. Unfortunately, as it stands, economics is grossly out of touch with the whole stream of causes and conditions that constitute reality. Economics, and indeed all the social sciences, are, after all, based on man-made or artificial truths. For example, according to natural laws, the action of digging the earth results in a hole. This is a fixed cause and effect relationship based on natural laws. However, the digging which results in a wage is a conventional truth based on a social agreement. Without the social agreement, the action of digging does not result in a wage. While economists scrutinize one isolated segment of the cause and effect process, the universe manifests itself in an inconceivably vast array of causes and conditions, actions and reactions. Focused as they are on the linear progression of the economic events that concern them, economists forget that nature unfolds in all directions. In nature, actions and reactions are not confined to isolated spheres. One action gives rise to results, which in turn becomes a cause for further results. Each result conditions further results. In this way, action and reaction are intertwined to form the vibrant fabric of causes and conditions that we perceive as reality. To understand reality, it is necessary to understand this process.

### Link – Competitiveness

#### Competitiveness is irrationally derived from selfishness – rethinking is key to avert negative externalities of economic self-preservation

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 5) //T.C.

If we are to honestly discuss economics, we must admit that emotional factors - fear and desire and the irrationality they generate - have a very powerful influence on the market place. Economic decisions about production, consumption and distribution - are made by people in their struggle to survive and prosper. For the most part, these decisions are motivated by an emotional urge for self-preservation fear and desire drive us to our worst economic excesses. The forces of greed, exploitation and over-consumption seem to have overwhelmed our economies in recent decades. Our materialistic societies offer us little choice but to exploit and compete for survival in today's dog-eat-dog world. But at the same time, it is obvious that these forces are damaging our societies and ravaging our environment.

### Link – Fear

#### The affirmative actions is rooted in fear and desire, emotions which are based on ignorance, and a misconception of reality limiting the potential for happiness and true understanding of the world

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, <http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH>

\*we do not support the gendered language this author uses

Several modern scientific disciplines, such as biology, psychology and medical science, have started to study the effects of empathy on the human mind, body, health and relationships. Not surprisingly, they have ascertained that compassion is of tremendous help to our well-being. A compassionate frame of mind has a positive effect on our mental and physical health, as well as on our social life, while the lack of empathy has been found to cause or aggravate serious social, psychological and even physical disorders18. Recent research on stress shows that people who only seek short term pleasure, are more prone to stress than those who seek a higher purpose, who seek meaning rather than pleasure.19 Meaning generally is derived from values such as serving others, going beyond short term selfish needs. The fact that disregarding short term selfish needs is actually a source of longer term happiness, turns the classical economic notion of selfish individualism upside down. As economist Stanislav Menchikov observes: The standard, neoclassical model is actually in conflict with human nature. It does not reflect prevailing patterns of human behavior. [..] If you look around carefully, you will see that most people are not really maximizers, but instead what you might call ‘satisfyers’: they want to satisfy their needs, and that means being in equilibrium with oneself, with other people, with society and with nature. This is reflected in families, where people spent most of their time, and where relations are mostly based on altruism and compassion. So most of our lifetime we are actually altruists and compassionate What does all this mean for our economy? Here we are entering unchartered territory, as is always the case in a paradigm shift. But some things are clear. The debate is not simply on government versus markets. As noted earlier, I believe it is about deeper, spiritual issues. Economic thinking is primarily focussed on creating systems of arranging matter for optimal intake of consumption. It assumes that the main human impulses are competition and consumption, and it has sidestepped spiritual and moral issues because it would involve a qualitative judgment on values and other intangibles that go beyond its initial premises. But by assuming that the more we consume, the happier we are, economists have overlooked the intricate working of the human mind. At the root of this belief in the market lies a very fundamental misconception. That is, we have not really understood what makes us happy. Blind faith in economics has led us to believe that the market will bring us all the things that we want. We cling to the notion that contentment is obtained by the senses, by sensual experiences derived from consuming material goods. This feeds an emotion of sensual desire. At the same time, we are led to believe that others are our competitors who are longing after the same, limited resources as we are. Hence we experience fear, the fear of losing out, the fear that our desire will not be satisfied. So we can observe that the whole machine of expanding capitalism is fuelled by two very strong emotions: desire and fear. They are so strong that they appear to be permanent features of our condition. Yet Buddha taught that since these emotions are based on ignorance, a misconception of reality, they can be removed by the understanding of reality, which is the prime object of Buddhist practice. According to Buddhism, happiness is an inner experience, available to anyone, regardless of wealth or poverty. Further, fundamentally there is nothing that we lack. By developing the mind, our inner qualities, we can experience perfect wholeness and contentment. Finally, if we share with others, we will find that we are not surrounded by competitors. Others depend on us as we depend on them. I believe that if Buddha would be alive today, he would probably recreate economic theory based on a correct and complete understanding of what is a human being and what makes him happy. As long as economics is based on a partial or wrong image of ~~man~~ and his reality, it will not produce the results we need.

#### Anxiety and fear preclude inner peace

Yeshe 83 – Lama Thubten Yeshe

(“Anxiety in the Nuclear Age,” http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=128)//BB

What’s the good of worrying about things twenty-four hours a day, disturbing your mind and preventing yourself from having a peaceful and joyful life? It’s a waste of time. Nothing’s going to change just because you’re worrying about it. If something’s already broken, it’s broken. Worrying won’t fix it. This earth has always been destructive by nature, nuclear age or not. There’s always blood flowing someplace or another. Look at world history. It’s always been like this. Buddhism calls this interdependent origination, and that’s how the human mind works. Take America’s war in Vietnam, for example. That brought people together in a movement for peace. That’s also interdependent. Some people saw the horrible suffering, confusion, misery and destruction wrought by others, so they went the other way, thinking, “That’s not right,” and despite the difficulties, created a movement of peace and love. But the right way to eliminate harm from this earth is to first free your mind from the emotional disturbances that cause irrational fear of destruction, and then educate yourself and others in how to bring peace to the world. The first thing you must do is to control your own mind and commit yourself: “From now on, no matter what happens, I’m never going to use weapons to kill any human being.” That’s where world peace starts. Human beings can control their minds and actions such that they will never kill others; people can learn to see that harming others destroys not only the others’ pleasure and happiness but their own as well. Through this kind of education, we can prevent nuclear energy from destroying the world. We can’t just campaign for the complete abolition of nuclear energy. Like electricity, nuclear energy is useful if employed the right way. If you’re careless with electricity, it can kill you too, can’t it? With right knowledge and method, we should campaign to ensure that everybody on earth determines, “I will never use nuclear weapons to kill human beings.” If that happened, a nuclear conflagration could never occur. Not that it matters, but personally, I don’t believe that nuclear energy is going to destroy the earth. I do believe, however, that human beings are capable of making a program to ensure that people everywhere, irrespective of whether they live in communist or capitalist societies, determine not to use nuclear weapons to kill other human beings. If we were to undertake such an effort to educate people, I think we could achieve our aim within ten years. Here, I’m not talking from a Buddhist point of view; I’m not talking from any religion’s point of view. I’m talking from a humanist point of view, a realistic point of view. If people’s minds are out of control, they’re going to use nuclear weapons. But irrespective of whether people are religious or non-religious, communist or non-communist, believers or non-believers, I believe every human being is capable of understanding the difference between harmful and non-harmful actions and the benefit of everybody’s being peaceful and happy. Since it’s a universal reality, we can educate people to see it. With respect to fear and worry, the Buddha’s solution is to analyze the object of fear and worry. If you do this correctly, you’ll be able to recognize that you’re seeing the object as fundamentally permanent, which has nothing to do with its reality. Look at it and ask yourself, “Is this really worth worrying about? Is worry a solution or not?” Analyze the object: is it permanent or changeable? As the great saints have said, “If it’s changeable, why worry? If it’s not, what’s the use of worrying?” When you’re afraid, analyze the object of your fears. Particularly when you’re emotionally disturbed and anxious, you’ll find that there’s a concept of concreteness in your mind, which causes you to project a concrete object externally. Neither concept has anything to do with reality. Buddhism asserts that the mind of fear and worry always either overestimates or underestimates its object and never sees its reality. If you can perceive the fundamental, universal reality of your object of fear and worry, it will become like a cloud—it comes; it goes. When you are overcome with worry, you sometimes say, “It’s always like this.” That’s not true. Things never stay the same; they always come and go—that’s the reality. Also, when you’re occupied by anxiety and fear, you might mean well, but you automatically have a tendency to generate hatred. Hatred has nothing to do with peace and happiness, does it? Buddhist psychology teaches that fear and anxiety tend to produce anger, aversion and hatred. You say you want peace and happiness but your very mental state causes hatred. It’s contradictory. People who demonstrate for peace and other causes have to watch out for this, but you have to judge for yourself how far you can go without generating hatred. Everybody’s different. Let’s say we’re out there campaigning for peace but then the president says something with which we disagree. Should we get angry? Should we hate the president? I don’t believe so; that would be a mistake. If our concern for peace and happiness makes us angry, there’s something wrong. The president is a human being. He, too, wants peace and happiness. At the bottom of his heart, he wants to be happy; he doesn’t want to be miserable. This is the universal reality. Therefore, all of us in the peace movement should make sure that we don’t hate any human being. This is the most important thing. When we demonstrate, we should be true to our word. Being a politician is not easy. Even being a wife or a husband is not easy. Most situations come with responsibility and obligation. We can look outside and blindly criticize people who work as administrators and so forth, but realistically, their position can be very difficult. To be successful, the peace movement should be selfless. If we who campaign for peace are coming from a place of selfishness, a basic concern for, “Me, me, me,” we have little chance of success. If, instead, we have a broad view based on concern for all human beings—understanding that everybody wants happiness and nobody wants to be miserable—and can educate others to see this, if we work towards this goal continuously, ultimately we’ll achieve it. There are many meditations you can do to eliminate anxiety. But meditation doesn’t mean going off to the mountains. You have the key to change your mind at any time, wherever you are. You can learn to switch your mind from emotion to peace and, each time you get distracted, gently bring it back to peace again. Practice this over and over again. You can do this; it’s human nature. You have to realize what you’re capable of. Check your own life, from the time you were born up to now—how many times have you changed your mind? Who changed it for you? Buddha didn’t change it. Jesus didn’t change it. Who changed your mind? Analyze this for yourself. That is the beauty of being human. We have the capacity for liberation within us; we come with that ability. If we utilize our energy and intelligence correctly, we can discover that liberation and happiness are already there, within us. The fundamental principle of Buddhism is not to kill. As Buddhists, this is our main obligation. I think most of you could promise never to kill another human being. That makes me very happy. We all have same aim; we think alike. Even though I’m a Tibetan monk, an uneducated mountain man, and you’re educated people from industrialized, capitalist societies, we have the same understanding. We don’t know each other, but we can still work together. That’s the most beautiful thing about being human. We can communicate with others. We should try to educate people all over the world to the point where everybody says, “For the rest of my life, I will never kill another human being.” If every human being on earth could agree to that, what would there be to worry about? Who could possibly be paranoid? In one way, the peace movement is beautiful, and if we act according to its ideas, there’ll be no more racism, no more nationalism. We’ll be equally concerned for all people. There’ll be no more fanatical religious concerns; we won’t even care if people are religious or not. Our only concern will be peace. All that will matter will be that people everywhere love and take care of each other. Who cares who’s communist or non-communist? What’s in the human heart is what’s important, not whether people are communist or capitalist. If we talk to each other, we can change the human heart. At present, we might be located in a non-communist country, but we shouldn’t project that communists want kill people who aren’t. That’s not true. People in communist countries are ladies and gentlemen, too. Like us, they want to be happy and desire not to be miserable. Therefore, together we can reach conclusions without involving the dogma of philosophy, the dogma of religion, the dogma of nationality, the dogma of racism; we can come together without any kind of dogma. That is beautiful. That is the beauty of the human being—to bring human unity and understanding without being blinded by categories. If you go to Russia and ask people, “Do you want to be killed by nuclear missiles?” they’re going to say No! For sure, they don’t want that to happen. Therefore, we have to educate people to understand the difference between what is beneficial for humanity and what is destructive—for the individual and for all. It’s simply a matter of education. Lord Buddha stressed the importance of generating loving kindness for all people irrespective of race, nationality, creed or anything else; he taught that all human beings and even animals were the object of loving kindness. This is the best guarantee against nuclear war, because each individual has to maintain control and take personal responsibility for the welfare of the all beings in the universe. Taking universal responsibility is the guarantee. If each individual doesn’t take personal responsibility for the welfare of all, it won’t work. To bring happiness and peace to earth, we have to eliminate every situation leading to hatred and anger. That means totally eradicating our own hatred and anger. We have to make our own lives peaceful and happy. This is the way to work for peace twenty-four hours a day. If our minds harbor destructive, angry thoughts, any talk of peace is just a joke. It’s merely artificial; there’s no guarantee. The only guarantee is to fertilize our minds with peace and loving kindness towards all; that’s the way we should do it. The question remains, is it possible to spread these ideas throughout the whole world? Can we get everybody in the world to agree to abandon the use of nuclear arms and not to kill any human being? Can you make that determination yourself? We can spread this philosophy or not? What do you think? We’re not using religion in this; we’re not using Buddha, we’re not using Christ, we’re not using religion or non-religion—we’re just concerned for the welfare of all human beings. What do you think? Do you think it’s possible to make this kind of program and reach that point reach or not? I’m not talking nationalistically or making any philosophic argument; I’m just talking about feeling secure, taking care of each other, loving each other, bringing peace and happiness to each other. It’s a very simple thing. Therefore, in our daily lives, each of us should all dedicate ourselves to bringing peace and happiness to all beings, and this determination itself is a powerful way of bringing peace and success into our lives. But this doesn’t mean not to act, either; to just be passive. But when you do act, act with wisdom and without selfishness, hatred or emotional fear. In that way, you will educate yourself and others. Don’t worry. Any talk of nuclear destruction of the earth is still speculation. It’s just a mental projection; it’s not yet reality. Therefore, relax and enjoy the rest of your life as much as possible. Be happy and peaceful, and don’t waste your time with pessimistic thoughts, fear or worry. Thank you so much.

## Alts

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

## Impacts

### Impact – Nuclear War

#### Nuclear war is inevitable absent human solidarity – INNER peace is the only way to transform society

Daisaku 7 - Buddhist philosopher and president of Soka Gokkai International

(Ikeda, “Restoring the Human Connection: The First Step to Global Peace,” http://www.sgi-usa.org/newsandevents/docs/peace2007.pdf)//BB

The challenge of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons is ¶ 8 just such a trial in the quest for world peace, one that cannot be achieved if ¶ we are defeated by a sense of helplessness. The crucial element is to ensure ¶ that any struggle against evil is rooted firmly in a consciousness of the ¶ unity of the human family, something only gained through the mastery of ¶ our own inner contradictions. ¶ It is this kind of reconfiguration of our thinking that will make possible a ¶ skilled and restrained approach to the options of dialogue and pressure. The ¶ stronger our sense of connection as members of the human family, the more ¶ effectively we can reduce to an absolute minimum any application of the ¶ hard power of pressure, while making the greatest possible use of the soft ¶ power of dialogue. Tragically, the weighting in the case of Iraq has been ¶ exactly the reverse. ¶ The need for such a shift has been confirmed by many of the concerned ¶ thinkers I have met. Norman Cousins (1915–90), the writer known as the ¶ “conscience of America” with whom I published a dialogue, stated with ¶ dismay in his work Human Options: “The great failure of education—not ¶ just in the United States but throughout most of the world—is that it has ¶ made people tribe-conscious rather than species-conscious.”8¶ Similarly, when I met with Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the ¶ International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in November of last year, he ¶ declared powerfully: “… we continue to emphasize our differences instead ¶ of what we have in common. We continue to talk about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ ¶ Only when we can start to talk about ‘us’ as including all of humanity will ¶ we truly be at peace….” ¶ In our correspondence, Joseph Rotblat posed the question, “Can we master ¶ the necessary arts of global security and loyalty to the human race?”9¶ Three ¶ months after writing these words to me, Dr. Rotblat passed away. I believe ¶ his choice to leave this most crucial matter in the form of an open question ¶ 9 as an expression of his optimism and his faith in humanity. ¶ When our thinking is reconfigured around loyalty to the human race—our ¶ sense of human solidarity—even the most implacable difficulties will not ¶ cause us to lapse into despair or condone the panicked use of force. It will ¶ be possible to escape the snares of such shortsighted thinking. We will be ¶ empowered to engage in the kind of persistent exertion that Max Weber ¶ viewed as the ideal of political action, and the door will be open to the ¶ formation of consensus and persuasion through dialogue. ¶ The function of anger ¶ When my mentor Josei Toda used the words “a devil incarnate, a fiend, a ¶ monster,” he was referring to a destructiveness inherent in human life. It is ¶ a function of this destructiveness to shred our sense of human solidarity, ¶ sowing the seeds of mistrust and suspicion, conflict and hatred. Those who ¶ would use nuclear weapons capable of instantaneously killing tens of ¶ millions of people exhibit the most desperate symptoms of this pathology. ¶ They have lost all sense of the dignity of life, having fallen prey to their ¶ own inner demons. ¶ Buddhism classifies the underlying destructive impulses that give rise to ¶ such behavior as “the three poisons” (Jpn: san-doku) of greed, anger and ¶ ignorance. “The world of anger” can be thought of as the state of life of ¶ those in whom these forces have been directed outward toward others. ¶ Buddhism analyzes the inner state of human life in terms of the following ¶ ten categories, or “worlds”: Hell, Hunger, Animality, Anger, Humanity, ¶ Rapture, Learning, Realization, Bodhisattva and Buddhahood. Together ¶ these worlds constitute an interpenetrating functional whole, referred to as ¶ the inherent ten worlds. It is the wisdom and compassion of the world of ¶ Buddhahood that bring out the most positive aspect of each of the other ¶ 10 worlds. ¶ In the Buddhist scriptures we find the statement “anger can function for ¶ both good and evil,”10 indicating that just and righteous anger, the kind ¶ essential for countering evil, is the form of the world of anger that creates ¶ positive value. The anger that we must be on guard against is that which is ¶ undirected and unrestrained relative to the other nine worlds. In this case, ¶ anger is a rogue and renegade force, disrupting and destroying all in its ¶ path. ¶ In this form, the world of anger is a condition of “always seeking to surpass, ¶ unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing ¶ oneself.”11 When in the world of anger, we are always engaged in invidious ¶ comparisons with others, always seeking to excel over them. The resulting ¶ distortions prevent us from perceiving the world accurately; we fall easily ¶ into conflict, locking horns with others at the slightest provocation. Under ¶ the sway of such anger, people can commit unimaginable acts of violence ¶ and bloodshed. ¶ Another Buddhist text portrays one in the world of anger as “84,000 ¶ yojanas tall, the waters of the four oceans coming only up to his knees.”12¶ A yojana was a measure of distance used in ancient India; there are various ¶ explanations as to what the specific distance may be, but “84,000 yojanas” ¶ represents an immeasurable enormity. This metaphor indicates how the ¶ self-perception of people in the life-state of anger expands and swells until ¶ the ocean deeps would only lap their knees. ¶ The inner distortions twisting the heart of someone in this state prevent ¶ them from seeing things in their true aspect or making correct judgments. ¶ Everything appears as a means or a tool to the fulfillment of egotistical ¶ desires and impulses. In inverse proportion to the scale of this inflated ¶ arrogance, the existence of others—people, cultures, nature—appears ¶ 11nfinitely small and insignificant. It becomes a matter of no concern to ¶ harm or even kill others trivialized in this way. ¶ It is this state of mind that would countenance the use of nuclear weapons; ¶ it can equally be seen in the psychology of those who would advocate the ¶ use of such hideously cruel weapons as napalm, or, more recently, depleted ¶ uranium and cluster bombs. People in such a state of life are blinded, not ¶ only to the horrific suffering their actions wreak but also to the value of ¶ human life itself. ¶ For the sake of human dignity, we must never succumb to the numbing ¶ dehumanization of the rampant world of anger. When the atomic bomb was ¶ dropped on the city of Hiroshima, not only military personnel but also ¶ many scientists were thrilled by the “success” of this new weapon. ¶ However, the consciences of genuinely great scientists were filled with ¶ anguish. Einstein greeted this news with an agonized cry of woe, while ¶ Rotblat told me he was completely overcome with hopelessness. Their ¶ feelings were no doubt intensely resonant with the sentiments that ¶ motivated Josei Toda to denounce nuclear weapons. ¶ When Toda spoke of “declawing” the demonic nature of nuclear weapons, ¶ he had in mind the struggle to prevent the inner forces of anger from ¶ disrupting the ten worlds and going on an unrestrained rampage. He was ¶ calling for the steady and painstaking work of correctly repositioning and ¶ reconfiguring the function of anger in an inner world where wisdom and ¶ harmony prevail. This is the true meaning of “declawing.” ¶ For SGI members in particular it is thus vital we remember that not only ¶ our specific activities for peace and culture but the movement for “human ¶ revolution” based on the daily endeavor to transform our lives from within ¶ is a consistent and essential aspect of the historic challenge of nuclear ¶ disarmament and abolition. ¶ 12 unless we focus on this inner, personal dimension, we will find ourselves ¶ overwhelmed by the structural momentum of a technological civilization, ¶ which in a certain sense makes inevitable the birth of such demonic ¶ progeny as nuclear weapons.

### Impact – Value to Life

#### Buddhist ethic is key to value to life

Zsolnai 11 - professor and director of the Business Ethics Center at the Corvinus University of Budapest

(Laszlo, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. vi)//BB

Today happiness is a top priority in economic, psychological and sociological research. In the last several decades the GDP doubled or tripled in Western coun- tries but the general level of happiness – the subjective well-being of people – remained the same. Happiness research disclosed evidences, which show that the major determinant of happiness is not the abundance of material goods but the qual- ity of human relationships and a spiritual approach to material welfare. Buddhist countries perform surprisingly well in this respect. There is a growing interest in Bhutan, this small Buddhist kingdom in the Himalayas, where the King of Bhutan introduced the adoption of an alternative index of social progress, the so-called Gross National Happiness (GNH). This mea- sure covers not only the material output of the country but also the performance of education, the development of culture, the preservation of nature and the extension of religious freedom. Experts attribute to the adoption of GNH that while Bhutan’s economy developed, the forestation of the country and well-being of people also increased. Thai Buddhist monk and philosopher, P. A. Payutto once said that one should not be a Buddhist or an economist to be interested in Buddhist economics. Buddhist ethical principles and their applications in economic life offer a way of being and acting, which can help people to live a more ecological and happier life while contributing to the reduction of human and non-human suffering in the world.

#### Our economic market cultivates more desire for materialistic values – DESTROYS value to life

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, Society and Economy , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078) //RM

The prospect theory developed by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky un- ¶ covers the basic empirical features of the value function of decision-makers. The ¶ central finding of prospect theory is that the value function is concave for gains ¶ and convex for losses (Kahneman - Tversky 1979). ¶ A salient characteristic of people's attitudes to changes is that losses loom ¶ larger than gains. "The aggravation that one experiences in losing a sum of money ¶ appears to be greater than the pleasure associated with gaining the same amount. ¶ Indeed, most people find symmetric bets of the form (. x , 0.50; -x, 0.50) distinc- ¶ tively unattractive. Moreover, the aversiveness of symmetrically fair bets gener- ¶ ally increases with the size of the stake. That is, if\* >y > 0, then (y, 0.50; -y, 0.50) ¶ is preferred to (jc, 0.50; -x, 0.50)" {ibid.: 279). ¶ The main statement of prospect theory is that the value function is steeper for ¶ losses than for gains. This means that decision-makers are more sensitive to losses ¶ than to gains. Experiments show that the ratio of the slopes in the domains of ¶ losses and gains, the "loss aversion coefficient", might be estimated as about 2 : 1 ¶ (Tversky - Kahneman 1992). ¶ Since humans (and other sentient beings) display loss sensitivity, it does make ¶ sense trying to reduce losses for oneself and for others rather than trying to in- ¶ crease gains for them. Losses should not be interpreted only in monetary terms or ¶ applied only to humans. The capability of experiencing losses, i.e., suffering, is ¶ universal in the realm of both natural and human kingdoms. Modern Western economics cultivates desires. People are encouraged to develop ¶ new desires for things to acquire and for activities to do. The profit motive of com- ¶ panies requires creating more demand. But psychological research shows that ma- ¶ terialistic value orientation undermines well-being. "People who are highly fo- ¶ cused on materialistic values have lower personal well-being and psychological ¶ health than those who believe that materialistic pursuits are relatively unimpor- ¶ tant. These relationships have been documented in samples of people ranging ¶ from the wealthy to the poor, from teenagers to the elderly, and from Australians ¶ to South Koreans." These studies document that "strong materialistic values are ¶ associated with a pervasive undermining of people's well-being, from low life ¶ satisfaction and happiness, to depression and anxiety, to physical problems such ¶ as headaches, and to personality disorders, narcissism, and antisocial behavior" ¶ (Kasser 2002: 22)

#### Buddhist economics create a shift away from traditional economic theory towards a more holistic understanding of the mind and what truly drives our intentions and actions to achieve happiness

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH

The notion of Gross National Happiness (GNH) – as first conceived by the King of Bhutan - presents a radical paradigm shift in development economics and social theory. GNH can be regarded as the Buddhist equivalent to Gross National Product (GNP), which is the conventional indicator for a nation’s economic performance. But GNH can also be regarded as the next evolution in indicators for sustainable development, going beyond measuring merely material values such as production and consumption, but instead incorporating all values relevant to life on this planet, including the most subtle and profound: happiness. The definition of happiness needs further clarification. In the Buddhist view, which generally corresponds to those of other spiritual traditions, happiness is not simply sensory pleasure, derived from physical comfort. Rather, happiness is an innate state of mind which can be cultivated through spiritual practice, overcoming mental and emotional states which induce suffering. In the Buddhist tradition this is a path of ‘liberation’; other spiritual traditions call it self-transformation. This definition of happiness is absent from conventional western sciences, on which modern economic theory is based. In fact, conventional economics and its indicators such as GNP, deliberately leave human happiness outside its spectrum, tacitly assuming that material development, as measured by GNP growth, is positively correlated to human well-being. Further analysis of the relationship between material development and human psychology has been outside the scope of economic and social theory. Yet this is changing: breakthrough research – in quantum physics, medicine, biology, behavioral science, psychology and cognitive science – is now making the science of the mind relevant to economics. Conversely, as the current discussion on GNH indicates, from within the profession of economics, attempts are made to broaden the scope of economics into the domain of psychology. While this allows us to find a common basis for GDP and GNH, it is important to note that this change constitutes a paradigm shift in our thinking. GNP and GNH are rooted in very different (and even opposing) views we have of the world and ourselves. Once we recognize this, we can embark on a coherent journey finding the possible content and meaning of GNH. So let’s first review the foundations of GNH and GNP, respectively.

### Impact – Ethics

#### Ethical economics are a prior question

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 15) //T.C.

To be ethically sound, economic activity must take place in a way that is not harmful to the individual, society or the natural environment. In other words, economic activity should not cause problems for oneself, agitation in society or degeneration of the ecosystem, but rather enhance well-being in these three spheres. If ethical values were factored into economic analysis, a cheap but nourishing meal would certainly be accorded more value than a bottle of whiskey. Thus, an economics inspired by Buddhism would strive to see and accept the truth of all things. It would cast a wider, more comprehensive eye on the question of ethics. Once ethics has been accepted as a legitimate subject for consideration, ethical questions then become factors to be studied within the whole causal process. But if no account is taken of ethical considerations, economics will be incapable of developing any understanding of the whole causal process, of which ethics forms and integral part. Modern economics has been said to be the most scientific of all the social sciences. Indeed, priding themselves on their scientific methodology, economists take only measurable quantities into consideration. Some even assert that economics is purely a science of numbers, a matter of mathematical equations. In its efforts to be scientific, economics ignores all non-quantifiable, abstract values. But by considering economic activity in isolation from other forms of human activity, modern economists have fallen into the narrow specialization characteristic of the industrial age. In the manner of specialists, economists try to eliminate all non-economic factors from their considerations of human activity and concentrate on a single perspective, that of their own discipline.

### Impact – Root Cause

#### The ego is the root cause

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as delusion is basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the ego instincts in Buddhism is one of the forms of craving. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. The craving for egotistical pursuits has its deeper spring in the dogma of personal immortality. This is the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life. The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. Such annihilationist views may be closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. The ego illusion is not merely an intellectual construction, but is fed by deeper affective processes. Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively may turn out to be more subtle expressions of their ego, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Mindfulness overcomes all suffering

Sivaraksa 98 (Sulak Sivaraksa is an activist, economist, philosopher and the founder and director of the Thai NGO “Sathirakoses-Nagapradeepa Foundation” , “Buddhism and Human Freedom”, Buddhist-Christian Studies , Vol. 18, (1998), pp. 63-68, University of Hawai'i Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1390436>)

If Buddhists understand structural violence and its roots in dosa, hatred, ¶ and learn how to eliminate it mindfully and nonviolently, Buddhism will ¶ not only be relevant to the modern world but also be a source of libera- ¶ tion. In a parallel with structural violence and dosa, consumerism is linked, ¶ directly and indirectly, with lobha, greed, and raga, lust. One can see this ¶ clearly in advertising and the mass media, which exploit women's bodies ¶ to seduce people into attempting to meet artificially created needs. ¶ Again, modern education deals almost exclusively with the heads and ¶ not the hearts of students; cleverness is recognized and rewarded materi- ¶ ally, and generosity or awareness of social evils is not necessary for suc- ¶ cess. Indeed, it may be an impediment. Students are led to pursue wealth ¶ and power, rather than to understand that these do not lead to happiness, ¶ especially where, as in modern society, wealth and power rest on mass ¶ poverty and ecological destruction. This is indeed the fostering of avijja, ¶ ignorance, and moha, delusion, rather than real education.¶ If Buddhists are to make a meaningful contribution to world peace and ¶ liberation of the modern world from violence and oppression, they must ¶ confront these three root causes of evil: greed, hatred, and delusion, not ¶ only in the individual person but also in their social and structural dimen- ¶ sions. All practicing Buddhists, not only specialists, must develop the right ¶ mindfulness that allows them to deal with these issues at their deepest ¶ levels.¶ Bhavana, mindfulness, and samadhi, concentration, indeed bring libera- ¶ tion from the mental sufferings caused by greed, hatred, and delusion, ¶ mental sufferings which corrupt the mind and cause people to commit ¶ all forms of evil. Bhavana can be cultivated at any moment, within any ¶ activity in daily life: breathing, eating, drinking, washing the dishes, gar- ¶ dening, or driving the car (this may be especially useful when driving in ¶ Bangkok traffic). Bhavana and samadhi directly cultivate seeds of peace ¶ within the mind, developing peace and happiness that can then be shared ¶ with others.

#### Solves the root cause of war

Dharmakosajarn 11 (Dr. Phra Dharmakosajarn, Venerable Professor at Mahachulalongkornrajvidyalya University, Chairman at ICDV & IABU, Rector at MCU, Buddhist Virtues in Socio-Economic Development, p.71, May 2011, BG)

The solution for this suffering lies in the practice of spirituality. Buddhists Middle Path¶ balances both spirituality and materialism to lead the contended life on the principles of sharing¶ and caring. Buddhist virtues, precepts and principles focus on establishing peace and harmony through spiritual and socio-economic development in the society. The virtue regulatesthe behavior, strengthens the meditation, meditation in turn develops wisdom. The Virtue tend to elevate the man which all can cultivate irrespective of creed, color, race, or sex, the earth can be transformed into a paradise where all can live in perfect peace and harmony as ideal citizens of one world. The Buddhists four sterling virtues act as building blocks of spiritual and socio-economic development are- Metta, Karuna, Mudita, Upekka, which are collectively termed as Brahamaviharasin Pali are means to develop friendship, harmonious relationship, removing discord, establishing peace within oneself. The first sublime state is universal love (Metta). It is defined as the sincere wish for the welfare and genuine happiness of all living beings without exception (Ven. Narada¶ Thera, 1997). The second virtue is Compassion (Karuna). It is defined as that which makes¶ the hearts of the good quiver when others are subjected to suffering or which dissipates the suffering¶ of others. It removes the woes of others. The third virtue is Sympathetic joy or appreciative joy¶ (Mudita), which tends to destroy jealousy, its direct enemy. The fourth virtue is Equanimity (Upekka).¶ It is discerning rightly, viewing justly or looking impartially, that is without attachment or aversion, without favour or disfavor. These virtues are the foundations of socio-economic development.

#### Mindfulness allows us to shed the ego - this creates a realization of our unity with all living things

Snauwaert 9 - Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education; Chair of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Toledo

(Dale, “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity,” Current Issues in Comparative Education 12.1, Directory of Open Access Journals)//BB

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes:¶ What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” ”reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, the ego is a socially constructed entity, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a prediscursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum-reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is selfrealization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes:¶ I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43)¶ In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

### Impact – Structural Violence

#### Transforming our inner selves reverses the harmful effects of mainstream economics

Tideman 11 - founder and managing partner of Global Leaders Academy in the Netherlands and a Senior Fellow of the Garrison Institute in New York

(Sander, Joel, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 150)//BB

While this may be a distant ideal, we can be inspired by a fact of historic signif- icance: the new emerging scientific paradigm of non-material interconnectedness – everything being an integral part of the larger whole, with human consciousness at its source – is in agreement with central tenets of Buddhism. As Buddha has taught, once we fully understand the implication of the interdependent nature of reality, breakthrough insights will emerge. These will indicate the best way forward for managing our planetary household, which triggers hope for our future. The eco- nomic models of the future will no doubt account for a reality much closer to the totality of the human experience. They will be more aligned with mankind’s deeper aspiration, in which the mind, emotions and other intangible values play such an important role.¶ By being so aligned to the emerging scientific worldview, the philosophy of Buddhism can play an important role in this endeavor. It takes the inner experience as starting point of the inquiry into reality, as opposed to conventional science, which takes outer reality as starting point. The power of the Buddhist approach is that it does not intend to exclude the conventional scientific approach, but expands it. The reverse is more difficult. By expanding the outward oriented approach of sci- ence, and taking a more holistic, inclusive and systemic approach to understanding reality, Buddhism can help defining and explaining a comprehensive understanding of human life, human experience, human motivation and human behavior. In addi- tion, Buddhism has also much to say how we can free ourselves from the systemic, structural violence that mainstream economics is bringing about.

### Impact – Social Justice

#### Buddhist economics are key to social justice and environmental sustainability

Essen 11 – PhD in Cultural Anthropology, Professor @ Soka

(Juliana, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 61)//BB

Ecofeminist Vandana Shiva asks the pointed question: What should be the objec- tive of the global economy: freedom of trade or freedom for survival? If the latter, changes are necessary in our conception of economics. Mainstream economic thought and practice has resulted in widespread socioeconomic disparity and envi- ronmental devastation in all corners of the world, unmitigated by a multi-billion dollar development industry informed by these same economic models. To reverse this trend, the dominant forms of economic thought and practice must be reunited with ethics that are more caring of the human-nature base. Such ethics may be found in alternative economic models based on religious, spiritual, environmental, or fem- inist values. This essay considers one such alternative: Buddhist economics. Though Buddhism is principally concerned with individual enlightenment, it offers guide- lines for householders’ economic activities that give rise to a more environmentally sustainable and socially just way of being in the world.

### Impact- Space Stuff

#### Planetary interdependence uniquely extends into space – the alternative is a shift away from individuation towards a politics of care that recognizes our mutual interdependence

Gál 20 Réka Gál, PhD student at the Faculty of Information and a Fellow at the McLuhan Centre for Culture and Technology, work unites feminist media theory and postcolonial studies with the history of science and environmental studies and explores how technological tools and scientific methods are employed to purportedly solve socio-political problems. B.A American and Media Studies, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, M.A Cultural Studies, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. "Climate Change, COVID-19, and the Space Cabin: A Politics of Care in the Shadow of Space Colonization." mezosfera.org, Oct, 2020, mezosfera.org/climate-change-covid-19-and-the-space-cabin-a-politics-of-care-in-the-shadow-of-space-colonization.

As much as dominant cultural narratives encourage us to entertain the idea that humans stand separate from and above their environments, the planetary crises of climate change and COVID-19 are painful reminders of the ways in which human and nonhuman ecologies are perpetually entangled. It is well-known that industrialized human-nonhuman relations, based on the capitalist extraction of what are considered natural resources, stand at the root of numerous environmental problems that are contributing to climate change. Animal industries – specifically the livestock industry – are one of the largest contributors to deforestation, greenhouse gas emission, and species extinctions.17 COVID-19’s believed origins in the Huanan wild animal markets and its eventual spread to humans is further testament to the ways in which our ecologies are always inseparable, with their intertwined nature here manifesting violently towards humans. Moreover, the spread of the coronavirus lays bare how local exploitation of nature can have global repercussions: the wildlife industry in China exists to this day because wildlife is considered a natural resource owned by the state, and the breeding, domestication, and trading of wildlife is encouraged by law.18

What must be made clear to those who are entertaining the idea that space habitats could provide a solution to such crises is that leaving Earth does not render these entanglements null and void. As much as spacecraft have been positioned as examples of subordinating the rules of nature to human control, their material reality only further consolidates the reciprocity of human and nonhuman, including human-machine, relations. 19 Our dependence on our surroundings intensifies in outer space. The inhospitality of space makes even the most physically fit astronauts dependent on numerous life support systems: oxygen and food supplies, waste management, and humidity control are all technologically operated but require continuous maintenance by humans. As such, ensuring the normal operation of a spacecraft is a relevant analogy for how a relationship of care with the diverse life support systems on Earth could be established.20

However, governments and private companies have been selling people the dream of human spaceflight ever since the Cold War, and the origins of this project in a military enterprise have made a significant mark on its implications for care work. The world of the 1960-70s astronauts was extremely segregated: the popular narrative was that of the hypermasculine astronaut, able to cope with danger and pain without complaint, with a brave wife at home waiting for his return.21 This segregation has had a remarkable impact on the types of work which have been considered “worthy” of these hypermasculine astronauts. In fact, the first American to travel to space, Alan Shepard, explicitly objected to having to learn maintenance techniques. As historian David Mindell put it, “the hottest test pilots didn’t want to be repairmen in space.”22 Similarly, data collected from NASA’s Skylab and the International Space Station’s 4-8 expeditions reveal that the time needed to complete maintenance activities on the Environmental Control and Life Support Systems was vastly underestimated, and in some cases even completely left out of operations plans.23 Even as late as the 2000s, the gendered view of care activities aboard spacecraft persisted: regarding the first female commander of a Space Shuttle, Eileen Collins, NASA made sure that her public persona was level-headed but also “pleasing.” She was referred to as “nice.” She took care of her fellow astronauts on board, taking on emotional labor by “providing support in ways that ease[d] the long hours and tension of training.” Her Air Force nickname was Mom.24

When this article calls for a feminist critique of outer space colonization, the argument is not that banishing technology and returning to a “pristine” nature or some other type of utopian primitivism is going to solve our planetary crises. Nor is it the point that more women need to be hired. What is being critiqued here is what Debbie Chachra has pointed out as a masculinist-capitalist obsession with progress and technological innovation that casts all maintenance, repair, and care work as inferior to creation.25 Much as our current experience of physical isolation during COVID-19 has exhibited, only during breakdowns are such taken-for-granted services made visible anew.26 The privileging of production obscures the societal understanding of the very real relationality of living, and the ongoing care and maintenance work required to keep human life running smoothly both on Earth and in outer space.

Therefore, the problem with extraplanetary colonization is not solely that this escape reinforces an enduring gendered opposition between exit and care, privileging the former over the latter, but also that machines only give the illusion of providing humans with independence from care work. Orsolya Ferencz, the Hungarian Secretary of Space Affairs, claims that Hungarian machines in outer space do not break down27 but the truth is that machines, just like our “natural” environments, do repeatedly break down. They require maintenance. Humans whose lives are intimately intertwined with technology are all too aware of this. Social scientist Laura Forlano writes about her experience as a diabetic who uses various technologies to monitor and maintain her blood glucose levels: “With respect to my insulin pump and glucose monitor, often, I am not really sure whether I am taking care of them, or they are taking care of me.”28 This interdependence additionally applies to the care for “natural” environments which can be regularly observed, for example, in the relationship of Indigenous communities to the environment. In the Hā’ena community in Hawaii, for instance, not only do they always return some of the fish caught to the water as a way of thanking the ocean, but they also managed to impose a ten-year fishing moratorium around their island in 2019, which will both help the renewal of the ecosystem and the recovery of the immediate environment, allowing future generations to fish sustainably.29 With this moratorium, the Hā’ena are providing care-based, restorative justice: the ocean ecosystem has fallen victim to injustice (overfishing), and remedying this ought to help heal the party wounded by the injustice, which is in this case the ocean.30

The extractive industry practices deeply embedded within Western social systems clearly propel us toward unsustainable development. Escaping Earth will not solve these problems. Rather, the solution requires a fundamental onto-epistemological shift, one that will enable us to move away from the exploitative Western-colonialist worldview and towards one that prioritizes care and sustainability. The works of feminist and Indigenous thinkers can inspire us to imagine and understand such a worldview. Numerous pre-colonial Indigenous cultures were sustainability-centric: the acceptance of the reciprocity between humans and their environment and the enforcing of the ethics of care in all areas of life were essential parts of several nations’ worldviews. Indigenous epistemologies see humans and nature as members of an ecological family in which humans, the nonhuman beings around them (for example, badgers, antelopes) and materials (for example, water, clay) all form part of their kinship structures.31 In Indigenous cultures that have survived colonization, such teachings and ethical approaches are passed down to this day.32 Research by Potawatomi scholar Kyle P. Whyte and Chris Cuomo demonstrate that Indigenous conceptions of care emphasize the importance of recognizing that humans, nonhumans (animals) and collectives (e.g. forests) exist in networks of interdependence. Indigenous care ethics manifest also in the fact that mutual responsibility is seen as the moral basis of relationships.33 An important part of this mutual responsibility is that care-based justice is not punishment-centered but recovery-centered: as in the example of the fishing moratorium of the Hā’ena, it seeks to promote restorative justice for those wounded by injustice. This restoration is aimed not only at people and communities, but also at nature.34 Similarly, an ethics of care in feminist philosophy treats the state of interdependence of human and nonhuman beings as a moral foundation.35

Since all infrastructures break, they require continuous maintenance. Information scientist Steven Jackson therefore proposes that the starting point to our thinking on the human relationship to technology has to be a contemplation of “erosion, breakdown, and decay, rather than novelty, growth, and progress.”36 If we accept that our world is “always-almost-falling-apart,”37 then instead of simply focusing on technological innovation as the vessel of our salvation,38 we need to look at the ways in which the world is constantly fixed, cared for, and maintained. This, of course, does not only translate to humans’ relationship to machines, but also to our relationship to our environment –in fact, feminist scholars have already made this point about dealing with our environmental problems: historian of science Donna Haraway’s concept of “staying with the trouble”39 explicitly pleads for the foregrounding of the inherent interconnectedness and interdependence of living, and for working on restoring our broken systems. What we are looking at here is a promising paradigm shift in human-machine and human-nature relations that promotes the recognition that the processes of care and maintenance are foundational to the way humanity relates to our biotic and abiotic environments.40

Both life during the social isolation of COVID-19 and life in the space cabin highlight our perpetual interdependence with our environments. Our life support systems are in a state of continuous decay, but the solution to this is not building more and more invasive risk-mitigation machines based on individualization, isolation and an imperative of absolute, one-directional control. Instead, a better, safer, more sustainable future starts with acknowledging one’s place in a web of interdependent relationships.41 Among other steps, this means that instead of acting as though our biotic and abiotic infrastructures can endlessly care for us, we need to care for them in return. This entails not only planting new forests and cleaning up shorelines, but also policy decisions such as the fishing moratorium mentioned above. As anthropologist Gökçe Günel indicates, even the technologies used for the harvesting of renewable energies require maintenance: solar panels, for example, need to be wiped clean of dust and sand regularly.42 Thinking through the lens of maintenance and care also means providing infrastructures for effectively repairing machines as opposed to producing e-waste and continuously buying new ones which are thrown away once a smarter version is released. Additionally, it means respecting and paying theworkers who are cleaning our hospitals, nursing our sick and harvesting food – most of them immigrants, predominantly women43 – better, as they are the reason we have clean hospitals, transport, and food on our tables, even during a global pandemic.44

### Impact- Solves psycho shit

#### The alternative solves their theory of the psyche – you can vote neg to re-think their psychoanalytic deconstruction via the lens of Buddhism to refuse their Western insistence on speaking thru the self

Loy, 96. (‘Wisdom Cloud’ David Loy, American Author and Professor in the Sanbo Kyodan Japanese Zen Buddhism, MA in Asian Philosophy from Univ of Hawaii, PhD in Philosophy, Senior Teacher in Phil Department of Singapore Univ, Professor of Philosophy and Religion @ Bunkyo University, and Besl Chair of Ethics/Religion & Society with Xavier University. “Beyond Good and Evil? A Buddhist Critique of Nietzsche” Asian Philosophy, Volume 6, No 1. March 96. [KevC])

Existential psychologists such as Ernest Becker believe that our primary repression is not sexual wishes, as Freud thought, but the awareness that we are going to die. [[4]](http://ccbs.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-ENG/loy1.htm" \l "4) This is closer to Buddhism, yet the anatman doctrine implies a subtle although significant distinction between fear of death and dread of the void: our worst problem is not death, a fear which still keeps the feared thing at a distance by projecting it into the future, but the more immediate and terrifying (and quite valid) suspicion each of us has that 'I' am not real right now.

 Sakyamuni Buddha did not use psychoanalytic terms, yet in trying to understand the Buddhist denial of self we can benefit from the concept of repression and the return of the repressed in symbolic form. If something (a mental wish, according to Freud) makes me uncomfortable, I can ignore or 'forget' it. This allows me to concentrate on something else, but what is not consciously admitted into awareness tends to irrupt in obsessive ways -- as symptoms -- that affect consciousness with precisely those qualities it strives to exclude. What does this imply about anatman?

    Buddhism analyses the sense-of-self into sets of impersonal mental and physical phenomena, whose interaction creates the illusion of self-consciousness, i.e. that consciousness characterises a self distinct from the world it is conscious of. The death-repression emphasised by existential psychology transforms Freud's Oedipal complex into what Norman Brown calls an Oedipal project -- the attempt to become father of oneself, i.e. one's own origin. The child wants to conquer death by becoming the creator and sustainer of its own life. [[5]](http://ccbs.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-ENG/loy1.htm" \l "5) Buddhism shifts the emphasis: the Oedipal project is better understood as the attempt of the developing sense-of-self to attain autonomy, like Descartes' supposedly self-sufficient consciousness. It is the quest to deny one's groundlessness by becoming one's own ground: the ground (socially conditioned and maintained yet nonetheless illusory) we know as being an independent, individual subject.

    If so, the Oedipal project derives from our intuition that self-consciousness is not something 'self-existing' but a mental construct. As with Nietzsche, consciousness is more like the surface of the sea: dependent on unknown depths that it cannot grasp because it is a manifestation of them. The problem arises when this conditioned consciousness wants to ground itself, i.e. to make itself real. If the sense-of-self is a

 construct, it can realise itself only by objectifying itself in some way in the world. The ego-self is this never-ending project to objectify oneself, something consciousness can no more do than a hand can grasp itself or an eye see itself.

    The consequence of this perpetual failure is that the sense-of-self has, as its inescapable shadow, a sense-of-lack, which it always tries to escape. In deconstructive terms, the ineluctable trace of nothingness in our non-self-present being is a feeling of lack. The return of the repressed in the distorted form of a symptom shows us how to link this basic yet hopeless project with the symbolic ways we try to make ourselves real in the world. We experience this deep sense of lack as the feeling that 'there is something wrong with me,' but of course that feeling manifests, and we respond to it, in many different ways. In its 'purer' forms lack appears as an anxiety that gnaws on one's very core. For that reason such anxiety is eager to objectify into fear of something, because then we have ways to defend ourselves against feared things.

The problem with objectifications, however, is that no object can ever satisfy if it is not really an object we want. When we do not understand what is actually motivating us -- because what we think we want is only a symptom of something else (our desire to become real, according to my interpretation of Buddhism) -- we end up compulsive. Then the neurotic's anguish and despair are less the result of symptoms than their source; those symptoms are necessary to shield him from the tragedies that 'normal' people are better at repressing: death, meaninglessness, groundlessness.

The ultimate problem is not guilt but the incapacity to live. The illusion of guilt is necessary for an animal that cannot enjoy life, in order to organise a life of non-enjoyment. [[6]](http://ccbs.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-ENG/loy1.htm" \l "6)

# 2NR

## EXT

Extend the theory of power- the universe is an infinite set of compounding individualities that form the coherent conscious​​ness- the root of all suffering is the local level ignorance of this reality- that creates the wrong mindset and pulls us away from the middle path.

The affirmative is a manifestation of this ignorance

[Insert Links]

The alternative is the politics of mindfulness- that means we integrate the practice of mindfulness as a way to deconstruct ignorance of the way of the universe into our political and social institutions- that unifies the mind and the body and lets us escape the present and join the timeless.

## Frontlines

### A2 Perm

#### Every act is always either liberatory or counterliberatory- no room for the perm bozos

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

# Card Dump

#### Economics Links

E. F. Schumacher, 69, Buddhist Economics, Schumacher Center for New Economics, 8-13-1969, DOA: 12-27-2021, https://centerforneweconomics.org/publications/buddhist-economics/, r0w@n

“Right Livelihood” is one of the requirements of the Buddha’s Noble Eightfold Path. It is clear, therefore, that there must be such a thing as Buddhist economics. Buddhist countries have often stated that they wish to remain faithful to their heritage. So Burma: “The New Burma sees no conflict between religious values and economic progress. Spiritual health and material well-being are not enemies: they are natural allies.”1 Or: “We can blend successfully the religious and spiritual values of our heritage with the benefits of modern technology.”2 Or: “We Burmans have a sacred duty to conform both our dreams and our acts to our faith. This we shall ever do.”3 All the same, such countries invariably assume that they can model their economic development plans in accordance with modern economics, and they call upon modern economists from so-called advanced countries to advise them, to formulate the policies to be pursued, and to construct the grand design for development, the Five-Year Plan or whatever it may be called. No one seems to think that a Buddhist way of life would call for Buddhist economics, just as the modern materialist way of life has brought forth modern economics. Economists themselves, like most specialists, normally suffer from a kind of metaphysical blindness, assuming that theirs is a science of absolute and invariable truths, without any presuppositions. Some go as far as to claim that economic laws are as free from “metaphysics” or “values” as the law of gravitation. We need not, however, get involved in arguments of methodology. Instead, let us take some fundamentals and see what they look like when viewed by a modern economist and a Buddhist economist. There is universal agreement that a fundamental source of wealth is human labour. Now, the modern economist has been brought up to consider “labour” or work as little more than a necessary evil. From the point of view of the employer, it is in any case simply an item of cost, to be reduced to a minimum if it can not be eliminated altogether, say, by automation. From the point of view of the workman, it is a “disutility”; to work is to make a sacrifice of one’s leisure and comfort, and wages are a kind of compensation for the sacrifice. Hence the ideal from the point of view of the employer is to have output without employees, and the ideal from the point of view of the employee is to have income without employment. The consequences of these attitudes both in theory and in practice are, of course, extremely far-reaching. If the ideal with regard to work is to get rid of it, every method that “reduces the work load” is a good thing. The most potent method, short of automation, is the so-called “division of labour” and the classical example is the pin factory eulogised in Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations.4 Here it is not a matter of ordinary specialisation, which mankind has practiced from time immemorial, but of dividing up every complete process of production into minute parts, so that the final product can be produced at great speed without anyone having had to contribute more than a totally insignificant and, in most cases, unskilled movement of his limbs. The Buddhist point of view takes the function of work to be at least threefold: to give man a chance to utilise and develop his faculties; to enable him to overcome his ego-centredness by joining with other people in a common task; and to bring forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence. Again, the consequences that flow from this view are endless. To organise work in such a manner that it becomes meaningless, boring, stultifying, or nerve-racking for the worker would be little short of criminal; it would indicate a greater concern with goods than with people, an evil lack of compassion and a soul-destroying degree of attachment to the most primitive side of this worldly existence. Equally, to strive for leisure as an alternative to work would be considered a complete misunderstanding of one of the basic truths of human existence, namely that work and leisure are complementary parts of the same living process and cannot be separated without destroying the joy of work and the bliss of leisure. From the Buddhist point of view, there are therefore two types of mechanisation which must be clearly distinguished: one that enhances a man’s skill and power and one that turns the work of man over to a mechanical slave, leaving man in a position of having to serve the slave. How to tell the one from the other? “The craftsman himself,” says Ananda Coomaraswamy, a man equally competent to talk about the modern West as the ancient East, “can always, if allowed to, draw the delicate distinction between the machine and the tool. The carpet loom is a tool, a contrivance for holding warp threads at a stretch for the pile to be woven round them by the craftsmen’s fingers; but the power loom is a machine, and its significance as a destroyer of culture lies in the fact that it does the essentially human part of the work.”5 It is clear, therefore, that Buddhist economics must be very different from the economics of modern materialism, since the Buddhist sees the essence of civilisation not in a multiplication of wants but in the purification of human character. Character, at the same time, is formed primarily by a man’s work. And work, properly conducted in conditions of human dignity and freedom, blesses those who do it and equally their products. The Indian philosopher and economist J. C. Kumarappa sums the matter up as follows: If the nature of the work is properly appreciated and applied, it will stand in the same relation to the higher faculties as food is to the physical body. It nourishes and enlivens the higher man and urges him to produce the best he is capable of. It directs his free will along the proper course and disciplines the animal in him into progressive channels. It furnishes an excellent background for man to display his scale of values and develop his personality.6 If a man has no chance of obtaining work he is in a desperate position, not simply because he lacks an income but because he lacks this nourishing and enlivening factor of disciplined work which nothing can replace. A modern economist may engage in highly sophisticated calculations on whether full employment “pays” or whether it might be more “economic” to run an economy at less than full employment so as to insure a greater mobility of labour, a better stability of wages, and so forth. His fundamental criterion of success is simply the total quantity of goods produced during a given period of time. “If the marginal urgency of goods is low,” says Professor Galbraith in The Affluent Society, “then so is the urgency of employing the last man or the last million men in the labour force.”7 And again: “If . . . we can afford some unemployment in the interest of stability—a proposition, incidentally, of impeccably conservative antecedents—then we can afford to give those who are unemployed the goods that enable them to sustain their accustomed standard of living.” From a Buddhist point of view, this is standing the truth on its head by considering goods as more important than people and consumption as more important than creative activity. It means shifting the emphasis from the worker to the product of work, that is, from the human to the subhuman, a surrender to the forces of evil. The very start of Buddhist economic planning would be a planning for full employment, and the primary purpose of this would in fact be employment for everyone who needs an “outside” job: it would not be the maximisation of employment nor the maximisation of production. Women, on the whole, do not need an “outside” job, and the large-scale employment of women in offices or factories would be considered a sign of serious economic failure. In particular, to let mothers of young children work in factories while the children run wild would be as uneconomic in the eyes of a Buddhist economist as the employment of a skilled worker as a soldier in the eyes of a modern economist. While the materialist is mainly interested in goods, the Buddhist is mainly interested in liberation. But Buddhism is “The Middle Way” and therefore in no way antagonistic to physical well-being. It is not wealth that stands in the way of liberation but the attachment to wealth; not the enjoyment of pleasurable things but the craving for them. The keynote of Buddhist economics, therefore, is simplicity and non-violence. From an economist’s point of view, the marvel of the Buddhist way of life is the utter rationality of its pattern—amazingly small means leading to extraordinarily satisfactory results. For the modern economist this is very difficult to understand. He is used to measuring the “standard of living” by the amount of annual consumption, assuming all the time that a man who consumes more is “better off” than a man who consumes less. A Buddhist economist would consider this approach excessively irrational: since consumption is merely a means to human well-being, the aim should be to obtain the maximum of well-being with the minimum of consumption. Thus, if the purpose of clothing is a certain amount of temperature comfort and an attractive appearance, the task is to attain this purpose with the smallest possible effort, that is, with the smallest annual destruction of cloth and with the help of designs that involve the smallest possible input of toil. The less toil there is, the more time and strength is left for artistic creativity. It would be highly uneconomic, for instance, to go in for complicated tailoring, like the modern West, when a much more beautiful effect can be achieved by the skillful draping of uncut material. It would be the height of folly to make material so that it should wear out quickly and the height of barbarity to make anything ugly, shabby, or mean. What has just been said about clothing applies equally to all other human requirements. The ownership and the consumption of goods is a means to an end, and Buddhist economics is the systematic study of how to attain given ends with the minimum means. Modern economics, on the other hand, considers consumption to be the sole end and purpose of all economic activity, taking the factors of production—and, labour, and capital—as the means. The former, in short, tries to maximise human satisfactions by the optimal pattern of consumption, while the latter tries to maximise consumption by the optimal pattern of productive effort. It is easy to see that the effort needed to sustain a way of life which seeks to attain the optimal pattern of consumption is likely to be much smaller than the effort needed to sustain a drive for maximum consumption. We need not be surprised, therefore, that the pressure and strain of living is very much less in say, Burma, than it is in the United States, in spite of the fact that the amount of labour-saving machinery used in the former country is only a minute fraction of the amount used in the latter. Simplicity and non-violence are obviously closely related. The optimal pattern of consumption, producing a high degree of human satisfaction by means of a relatively low rate of consumption, allows people to live without great pressure and strain and to fulfill the primary injunction of Buddhist teaching: “Cease to do evil; try to do good.” As physical resources are everywhere limited, people satisfying their needs by means of a modest use of resources are obviously less likely to be at each other’s throats than people depending upon a high rate of use. Equally, people who live in highly self-sufficient local communities are less likely to get involved in large-scale violence than people whose existence depends on world-wide systems of trade. From the point of view of Buddhist economics, therefore, production from local resources for local needs is the most rational way of economic life, while dependence on imports from afar and the consequent need to produce for export to unknown and distant peoples is highly uneconomic and justifiable only in exceptional cases and on a small scale. Just as the modern economist would admit that a high rate of consumption of transport services between a man’s home and his place of work signifies a misfortune and not a high standard of life, so the Buddhist would hold that to satisfy human wants from faraway sources rather than from sources nearby signifies failure rather than success. The former tends to take statistics showing an increase in the number of ton/miles per head of the population carried by a country’s transport system as proof of economic progress, while to the latter—the Buddhist economist—the same statistics would indicate a highly undesirable deterioration in the pattern of consumption. Another striking difference between modern economics and Buddhist economics arises over the use of natural resources. Bertrand de Jouvenel, the eminent French political philosopher, has characterised “Western man” in words which may be taken as a fair description of the modern economist: He tends to count nothing as an expenditure, other than human effort; he does not seem to mind how much mineral matter he wastes and, far worse, how much living matter he destroys. He does not seem to realize at all that human life is a dependent part of an ecosystem of many different forms of life. As the world is ruled from towns where men are cut off from any form of life other than human, the feeling of belonging to an ecosystem is not revived. This results in a harsh and improvident treatment of things upon which we ultimately depend, such as water and trees.8 The teaching of the Buddha, on the other hand, enjoins a reverent and non-violent attitude not only to all sentient beings but also, with great emphasis, to trees. Every follower of the Buddha ought to plant a tree every few years and look after it until it is safely established, and the Buddhist economist can demonstrate without difficulty that the universal observation of this rule would result in a high rate of genuine economic development independent of any foreign aid. Much of the economic decay of southeast Asia (as of many other parts of the world) is undoubtedly due to a heedless and shameful neglect of trees. Modern economics does not distinguish between renewable and non-renewable materials, as its very method is to equalise and quantify everything by means of a money price. Thus, taking various alternative fuels, like coal, oil, wood, or water-power: the only difference between them recognised by modern economics is relative cost per equivalent unit. The cheapest is automatically the one to be preferred, as to do otherwise would be irrational and “uneconomic.” From a Buddhist point of view, of course, this will not do; the essential difference between non-renewable fuels like coal and oil on the one hand and renewable fuels like wood and water-power on the other cannot be simply overlooked. Non-renewable goods must be used only if they are indispensable, and then only with the greatest care and the most meticulous concern for conservation. To use them heedlessly or extravagantly is an act of violence, and while complete non-violence may not be attainable on this earth, there is nonetheless an ineluctable duty on man to aim at the ideal of non-violence in all he does. Just as a modern European economist would not consider it a great achievement if all European art treasures were sold to America at attractive prices, so the Buddhist economist would insist that a population basing its economic life on non-renewable fuels is living parasitically, on capital instead of income. Such a way of life could have no permanence and could therefore be justified only as a purely temporary expedient. As the world’s resources of non-renewable fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas—are exceedingly unevenly distributed over the globe and undoubtedly limited in quantity, it is clear that their exploitation at an ever-increasing rate is an act of violence against nature which must almost inevitably lead to violence between men. This fact alone might give food for thought even to those people in Buddhist countries who care nothing for the religious and spiritual values of their heritage and ardently desire to embrace the materialism of modern economics at the fastest possible speed. Before they dismiss Buddhist economics as nothing better than a nostalgic dream, they might wish to consider whether the path of economic development outlined by modern economics is likely to lead them to places where they really want to be. Towards the end of his courageous book The Challenge of Man’s Future, Professor Harrison Brown of the California Institute of Technology gives the following appraisal: Thus we see that, just as industrial society is fundamentally unstable and subject to reversion to agrarian existence, so within it the conditions which offer individual freedom are unstable in their ability to avoid the conditions which impose rigid organization and totalitarian control. Indeed, when we examine all the foreseeable difficulties which threaten the survival of industrial civilization, it is difficult to see how the achievement of stability and the maintenance of individual liberty can be made compatible.9 Even if this were dismissed as a long-term view there is the immediate question of whether “modernization,” as currently practiced without regard to religious and spiritual values, is actually producing agreeable results. As far as the masses are concerned, the results appear to be disastrous—a collapse of the rural economy, a rising tide of unemployment in town and country, and the growth of a city proletariat without nourishment for either body or soul. It is in the light of both immediate experience and long term prospects that the study of Buddhist economics could be recommended even to those who believe that economic growth is more important than any spiritual or religious values. For it is not a question of choosing between “modern growth” and “traditional stagnation.” It is a question of finding the right path of development, the Middle Way between materialist heedlessness and traditionalist immobility, in short, of finding “Right Livelihood.”
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This chapter outlines doctrinal Buddhist political and economic theory including its notions about interstate relations, which are based on its unique understanding of the nature of reality. Some readers may be surprised to hear that there exists a theory of politics in Buddha’s teachings. But in fact, Buddha spoke extensively about politics, contrary to the assertion of Max Weber who famously asserted that Buddhism was “a specifically a-political and anti-political status religion.” Although the overriding goal of Buddha’s teachings is the liberation of individuals from pervasive suffering, Buddha considered politics as important, not so much for its intrinsic value, but because it created an external environment that can facilitate or impede an individual’s pursuit of happiness, defined as spiritual advancement and achievement of wisdom about the true nature of oneself and the world. Although best understood as an extension of his teachings on human liberation, Buddha was also an original social and a significant political philosopher. Buddha’s social teachings parallel modern democratic thought, mixed market economics, and cosmopolitan internationalism in the West. This chapter outlines Buddha’s political and economic theory, including his thoughts about statecraft and the possibilities for international order. Keywords Buddhist politics Buddhist economics Buddhist statecraft Download chapter PDF Buddha on Politics1 Early Buddhist literature2 addresses several political, economic, and international issues. While the primary purpose of Buddha’s teachings is the liberation of individuals from pervasive suffering, his teachings also acknowledge the interdependence of the individual with society, polity, and economy. Buddha’s teachings sought to mediate these relationships constructively. Although largely unknown in the West, Buddha was an original and important social, political, and economic philosopher, and a rationalistic, humanistic, and democratic one at that (Ling 1981). What are the essential elements of Buddha’s normative vision for politics? Buddha saw politics not as an end in itself but as an instrument that could either provide favorable conditions or create harmful obstructions for individuals’ personal advancement. Buddha recognized that government is necessary to provide social order and welfare and that its values, content, and processes should be consistent with the “dharma.” “Dharma” (dhamma in Pāli) has many meanings but here refers to the teachings of Buddha and their realization, which are offered as universal or natural laws—such as the law of dependent arising and the suffering that results from ignorance of this basic truth. These laws are not created by Buddha, they operate with or without him, but Buddha revealed these laws and recommended that we examine them and act accordingly; not through blind faith, but through a process of rational human assessment.3 A political system organized consistent with these basic truths could minimize the manifest forms of suffering for all members of society—especially for the least fortunate whose visible suffering is greatest—and play a positive role in an individual’s attainment of higher forms of well-being. What does it mean to say that political practices must be consistent with the dharma for their legitimacy? A fundamental principle of the dharma relevant to politics is the equality and dignity of all individuals. Buddha stressed that all human beings have an inherent worth and capacity for enlightenment, so-called, “Buddha nature.”4 In contrast to the prevailing Brahmin teachings, Buddha rejected the caste system and argued that virtues were distributed equally, not hierarchically, across society. Buddha states: “Now since both dark and bright qualities, which are blamed and praised by the wise, are scattered indiscriminately among the four castes, the wise do not recognize the claim about the Brahmin caste being the highest … [anyone can] become emancipated … by virtue of dharma” (DN, 27, 2012 at p. 408). The dharma applies equally to everyone regardless of class, social status, or economic circumstance. Because citizen and ruler alike are equal under the law of dharma, political institutions should reflect this basic truth. For it’s time these were truly groundbreaking social insights. Buddha’s teachings also reflect the principle of equality when he prescribes that monarchy, the dominant form of government during his lifetime, should be based on popular consent (not divine right), conducted in consultation with the governed, even-handed in the application of justice, and conform to the dharma. Democracy, however, is the form of government where equality is paramount, and Buddha’s own political creation, the sangha (the order of monks and nuns in Pāli and Sanskrit), is governed by strict equality in its rules for admission, participation, administration, and dispute resolution. Because of the equality and ultimate goodness of every individual (and because they all suffer), Buddha taught that they are each worthy of our compassion and, at a minimum, should not be harmed by the state. Nonviolence or non-harm (ahimsa in Sanskrit and Pāli) is a natural corollary to Buddha’s teachings on the equality of human potential and the basis of the protection of individual rights.5 Perhaps the most direct example of this principle to politics is Buddha’s repeated admonition that a righteous ruler must follow the ethical precepts of no killing, no stealing, no lying, etc. More affirmatively, the successful leader must demonstrate compassion and care through the practices of kindness, equanimity, patience, and generosity. Nonviolence and equality are the bedrocks of Buddhist social justice, and good government requires moral and legal protection against the arbitrary use of power. Buddha, like America’s founding fathers, was concerned about the danger of tyranny. The third feature of Buddha’s political teachings is a tolerance for different political configurations and a pragmatic and non-doctrinaire (“liberal” or “pluralistic” in this sense) approach to political questions. Rather than overtly endorsing a particular form of government, Buddha, in befriending and advising republics and monarchs alike, implies that good governance can take more than one form but must allow for the maximization of individual happiness of its citizens (defined in a way that goes beyond mere sensual enjoyment to include self-realization) and that minimizes their suffering, allowing them to cultivate compassion, patience, generosity, meditative concentration, and wisdom while discouraging greed, hatred, and ignorance. Buddha did not explicitly advocate for a single form of government, and, at one level, recognized that different types of regimes could be considered legitimate if the spirit of the ruler and the ruled was in accordance with the dharma. Nonetheless, Buddha indicated a preference for democratic and representative forms of government. In his teachings and prescriptions, Buddha endorsed democratic principles such as citizen participation and free expression of opinion; deliberation, consultation, and consensus-building; voting and respect for popular consent; transparency via face-to-face meetings and public debate; primacy of the rule of law and limited government. We see these predilections in Buddha’s endorsement of republican principles in the sūtras and the incorporation of democratic principles into the rules governing Buddha’s own society of monks and nuns in the vinaya. Buddha’s teachings are directly relevant to contemporary politics and are compatible with the governance of a modern democratic state. Buddha’s political thinking parallels Western liberal-democratic thought with its emphasis on equal rights, protection against tyranny via equality before the law, and participatory and deliberative governance. The most important distinction between “dharmic” democracy and Western liberal democracy is Buddhism’s emphasis on one’s individual duties to others as much as one’s individual rights, duties that exceed compliance with the law. Where liberal democracy has little to say about the moral qualities of what constitutes good governance beyond the values of equality of opportunity and protection of individual choice and instead focuses on the process of good governance not the substance (Garfield 2001), “dharmic democracy” delineates a clear duty of care owed to others and to the natural world as well. Fundamentally, in dharmic democracy individuals have a duty not only to avoid abridging other’s freedoms, but to strive to develop a sense of universal responsibility and concern for all human beings and the natural world. Although this duty is everyone’s responsibility, political institutions and their leaders should reflect these principles, and policy should encourage their inculcation and practice. The emphasis on responsibilities as well as rights follows directly from Buddhism’s underlying ontology of dependent origination and a theory of causation that maintains our lives are not separate but deeply interdependent. Contemporary Buddhist writer and monk, Thich Nhat Hanh, captured this difference in the context of the United States when he remarked: “We have the Statute of Liberty on the East Coast. I think we have to make a Statute of Responsibility on the West Coast to counterbalance Liberty. Liberty without responsibility is not real liberty” (Hanh 2006 at p. 137). “Freedom” in Buddhist thought means freedom from the chains of self-grasping ignorance, not the unbridled pursuit of “self” interest. Buddha on Economics Just as Buddha had important things to say about politics, he offered numerous profound and practical insights on economic matters throughout the sūtras. These teachings provide guidance on how spiritual advancement and material well-being could be compatible and mutually supportive. The purpose of economic activity in Buddhism is to provide the necessary material basis for individuals to enjoy a comfortable life, thus freeing them to pursue higher forms of well-being. Production, consumption, and distribution of material goods should reduce suffering and provide sustainable welfare and dignified work for all members of society through the wise use of scarce resources. This view of economic activity as a means toward higher ends contrasts with classical or neoclassical Western economics where the focus is on material well-being alone and production, consumption, and distribution are designed to maximize an individual’s “utility” or “welfare” through ever-increasing material production and consumption, in the aggregate, to grow Gross Domestic Product (GDP), under resource constraints. Like politics, Buddhism treats economic life as part of living in accordance with the dharma and therefore views it as part of a larger ethical framework from which it cannot be separated.6 By virtue of the doctrine of radical interdependence, economic activity is necessarily part of a larger whole, an important part, but only a part, and it must be kept in harmony with familial, social, environmental, and spiritual aspects of life. In Buddhist economics, there are no “externalities.” Economic progress, for oneself or society, is not an end in itself but part of broader process of personal and social advancement. Nonetheless, Buddha warned against ignoring physical needs and eschewing material pursuits, and recommended balanced progress in material and spiritual well-being—a so-called “Middle Way” between physically destructive asceticism and soul-crushing material indulgence as the way to happiness. The goal of Buddhist economics is to provide material security and economic stability for individuals and society and sustainable growth. The state must guarantee the physical needs of individuals in the form of the “four essentials”: food, clothing, shelter, and medicine, as these constitute the foundation for other pursuits such as moral development and the acquisition of wisdom. Buddha’s economic teachings are not anti-wealth. He taught that no suffering arises from experiencing or enjoying objects of the senses. The problem with material wealth arises from our pervasive delusion that misapprehends the real nature of phenomena in our samsaric existence as discussed in Chapter 2. That is, we forget the impermanent nature of material pleasures and are misled into thinking they are a true source of lasting happiness. It is our craving and grasping at evanescent objects (and ourselves) based on fear, greed, and the underlying ignorance of the nature of reality that leads to suffering. The problem lies neither with the objects of the senses nor the enjoyment derived from them, but from misperception of their impermanent nature and the pursuit of material objects as the supreme source of happiness for a self that also ultimately does not exist. Wealth, then, does not stand in the way of liberation, but the attachment to wealth does. For laypeople, Buddha recommended the acquisition of wealth and material prosperity through industry, frugality, entrepreneurship, and resourcefulness, but he also advocated for values such as concern and care for others, non-harm, generosity, and, eventually, nonattachment to wealth given its impermanence and inability to provide lasting happiness. To be nonattached “is to possess and use material things but not be possessed or used by them” (Sizemore and Swearer 1993 at p. 1). Consumption, like wealth, is not discouraged by Buddha, but one should remain mindful of its associated risks.7 Because humankind has virtually unlimited desires, Buddha encouraged moderation in consumption that can distinguish material needs and wants.8 As guidance in making this distinction between needs and wants, Buddha listed the following things money should be spent on: food, clothing, and shelter; attending to parents; treating relatives and guests; alms in memory of the departed; religious offerings; and payments to the state (AN, 3:45, 2012). In short, for individuals, Buddha advised a balanced life, free from the sufferings of both poverty and indulgence and guided by wisdom, discernment, and right view. This approach can lead to a deeper sense of contentment, which Buddha said is “the highest form of wealth” (Dhp. 204, 2007). In Buddhism, it is one’s attitudes and actions about wealth, not the level of wealth, that is important. Nonattachment is the appropriate attitude toward wealth, which can be cultivated by acquiring wealth through righteous means, consuming it with moderation, and developing contentment and sharing wealth generously, but wisely (SN, 99, 2000). For the state, poverty is the primary threat to individual and societal advancement and providing sufficiency in the four material requisites for all is the first purpose of a political-economic system. Both the individual and the state have a duty to protect and promote the welfare of all citizens. For the individual, this duty of care for others flows from the development of higher states of mind such as generosity and compassion and an appreciation for the equality and dignity of all human beings. But charity alone will not fully address the problem. The challenge of poverty must be dealt with systematically, necessarily involving government policy that can fully utilize the productive resources of society (DN, 5, 2012). If the state fails to care for its citizens it could lose its legitimacy and create social pathologies and unrest. The state must also prevent economic injustice, eliminate corruption, and protect the environment and consumers from exploitation. Thus, Buddha’s teaching envisions a somewhat greater role for the state in economic affairs than in most traditional liberal economic models, but his prescription is not too different from the welfare liberalism found in many advanced market economies. As for the private sector, Buddha acknowledges that possession of private property by the laity is a pragmatic response to our egocentric tendencies and an efficient means for creating incentives for work and productivity (DN, 27, 2012).9 He recognized commerce and profitmaking as legitimate and necessary economic activities. Buddhist economics is in no way anti-business. The sūtras encourage economic freedom and entrepreneurship if pursued righteously, without harm to others, and without excessive greed. At various points throughout the canon, Buddha encourages business people to be energetic, mindful, pure in deed, self-controlled, considerate, right living, and heedful. Indeed, the merchant classes were among the first proponents of Buddhist philosophy and carried Buddhism throughout Asia. Traders are advised to act with wisdom, acumen, and reliability and should know what is an appropriate profit margin for their goods (AN, 1:116, 2012). Profits are essential and necessary if they are obtained honestly and without fraud or cheating. Business people are encouraged to work hard and avoid laziness and managerial efficiency is praised. One writer described the tenor of Buddha’s economic advice contained in the sūtras as “unmistakably bourgeois” (Reynolds 1993 at p. 71), another as reflecting “merchant type” values (Ornatowski 1996 at p. 206). Profitmaking should not be the only concern of producers and traders, however, as they have responsibilities to their employees,10 society, and the natural world too. And trading in certain goods is explicitly prohibited, namely trade in weapons, living beings (slave trade), butchering, intoxicants, and poisons (AN, III: 209, 2012). With regard to the relationship between economic activity and the environment, Buddha was one of the first thinkers to advocate for environmentally sustainable economics as an essential social principle. Because of our deep interdependence and our ethical responsibilities, which extend beyond humans to all sentient beings and the natural world in this and future lives, Buddha advised maintaining a proper relationship between productive activities and the environment. Buddha asserted that in amassing wealth humankind must treat nature as a bee collects pollen in that the bee harms neither the beauty of the flower nor its fragrance and ensures its future fruition. Analogously, economic production must not harm the natural environment or impair the well-being of future generations by destroying nature’s regenerative powers or its beauty (Dhp. 2007 at p. 49). Buddhism does not view the environment as a divine creation for human exploitation, nor is it seen as “external” to the production process. It too must be treated with care and without harm as humans and nature are interdependent. Buddhist economics differs from dominant Western models in several important dimensions and yet is not fundamentally estranged from Western thinking. At a fundamental level, the most important difference is that whereas liberal market economics view the material world as real and permanent and the source of happiness, in Buddhist economics material reality is seen as impermanent, and if treated wisely, as the source of lesser happiness and prerequisite to higher forms of well-being. Liberal economics is concerned with satisfying the ever-expanding needs and wants of the self, and Buddhist economics is a means to assist individuals in transcending the self and controlling the negative emotions underlying our untamed desires through the development of moderation, contentment, and wisdom (of the nature of reality). Buddha’s approach emphasizes right view: understanding the true nature of our existence, and right livelihood, working, acquiring wealth, and consuming consistently with this view. With right view, one recognizes the ultimate impermanence and insubstantiality of ourselves and all phenomena and understands that material things are not the source of true happiness and that clinging to them will only perpetuate our suffering. Finally, from a Buddhist perspective, it follows that increasing output and consumption is not necessarily an accurate measure of improvements in the well-being of society or its members. Measuring societal well-being as synonymous with the expansion of GDP is flawed and must be replaced with more holistic metrics that consider a much broader range of factors important to human flourishing and that examine the quality and sustainability of growth. Many international organizations are moving in this direction,11 and in Chapter 5 we will see the application of these economic principles in Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness (GNH) development policies. Like Buddha’s thoughts on politics, his economic teachings do not mandate a single economic system, but are broadly compatible with a modern, mixed market economy. By mixed market, I mean the belief that while markets do many things well, they are not the answer to all economic problems, and that the government has some responsibility to uphold in the economic sphere societal values that exceed liberty and legal competition to include a duty of care for others and the environment. So, despite the differences between Buddhist and liberal economics, these approaches have much in common and a meaningful discussion is possible between the two philosophies regarding important contemporary economic issues such as poverty and income inequality, sustainability, business–government relations, and the role of the state among others (Daniels 2005). Importantly, both Buddhist economics and liberal market capitalism share a rational and pragmatic approach to economic issues that recognizes a role both for the public and private sector. Much like Buddha on politics, Buddhist economics is not doctrinaire and suggests that economic systems must be flexible and culturally appropriate for a particular time and place (Welford 2007). This adaptability also opens the door to a consideration of the possible contemporary relevance of Buddha’s economic teachings to modern life. Buddha on International Relations and Statecraft The Buddhist conception of politics as serving the common good extends to the international realm where our humanity and fundamental interdependence ultimately transcend national, racial, and other barriers, which are, at most, only conventional distinctions. This is not to say that the state must wither away in Buddhism. States, like our conventional designation of our “selves” as distinctive individual entities, can function effectively as long as one recognizes their nominal, transactional, and dependent nature and avoids grasping at them as inherently real. States can serve an important function by equitably supplying public goods. Likewise, a system of such like-minded states can “exist” and function effectively, if one recognizes and does not lose sight of the deeper, interconnected nature of all things. Thus, Buddhist statecraft is an international extension of Buddhist political and economic principles of equality, harmony, social welfare, nonviolence, conciliation, and mutually beneficial commercial exchange what has been summed up above as ruling in accord with the dharma, sometimes called “righteousness” in the Buddhist cannon.12 Buddha discusses statecraft mostly in parables,13 introducing the concept of world-ruler (cakkavatti in Pali, cakravartin in Sanskrit), who would provide exemplary leadership for states in the international system. The cakkavatti is a lesser or worldly Buddha that provides for the material welfare (more than the spiritual welfare) of mankind.14 By example and generosity (not violent conquest), this ruler (either a single individual or a representative body) establishes an ideal government with the consent of the governed which is followed by a series of similar democratic and constitutional states based on shared principles. This loose network of ideal states would constitute an international political system that served the interests of worldwide peace and prosperity. One can see certain parallels here with Kant’s vision of perpetual peace among like-minded representative states and with democratic peace theory and notions of an “international society” and cosmopolitanism in modern Western IR writings. Buddhist IR begins with the establishment of a righteous state, ruled by consent of the governed with policies consistent with the dharma. This government would work for the interest of its people with care, impartial justice, tolerance, and the equal promotion of material and spiritual welfare of society’s members. In modern parlance, the exemplar would be an enlightened democratic welfare state guaranteeing freedom and economic security and promoting equality, tolerance, and care for its citizens (Jayatilleke 1967). In time, this model would extend naturally and infectiously or “travel” to other parts of the world, via the Buddhist metaphor of a rolling “Wheel of Dharma,” much like Buddha’s initial teaching after his enlightenment set in motion a wheel of spiritual guidance. These other countries, in turn, would establish similar states with analogous governing principles and constitutions. The international system would not be centralized empire, but a loose constellation of states revolving around an archetypal entity (Tambiah 1976). In relating with other states, hostility and aggression is forbidden and the cultivation of friendliness and neighborliness and mutually beneficial commerce is endorsed, both to conform with the dharma and on grounds of expediency and efficacy, that is, aggression does not serve one’s self-interest in the long run. Buddha counseled, “Hatred never ceases by hatred in this world. Hatred ceases by love—this is the ancient law” (Dhp. 2007 at p. 105).15 A state could retain its army for defensive purposes but nonviolence is thought to be the higher ideal and Buddha counseled against the resort to war as a means of settling international disputes (King 2013).16 The first ethical principle in Buddhism is to refrain from killing or injuring any sentient being. There is little or no support for “just war” in Buddhism (Jerryson 2013; Jayasuriya 2009). Buddha said that wars only perpetuate future conflict. As noted, he also spoke out against the trading in weapons as “wrong livelihood.” In sum, in foreign affairs, the state has the obligation not to commit aggression and to cooperate with other states in a spirit of friendliness and equality for the common good of mankind. Like all Buddha’s advice, this admonition was offered for its practical benefits—it strengthened both the individual state and encouraged common bond of humanity that would bear fruit in international peace and prosperity. Buddha’s political doctrine of equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, and political institutions that serve the common good materially and spiritually find their ultimate fulfillment in a worldwide network of states each acting according to these principles. Hence, in Buddhism, states may exist, but they are artifacts that endure for the benefit of a broader humanity. Empirical Referents for Buddhist Statecraft: Aśoka’s Mauryan Empire and Contemporary Bhutan Buddhism has shaped many cultures throughout Asia and, more recently, has become influential in the West. Buddhism’s political impact has been more muted, however, in part, because from the start the Buddhist order, the democratic sangha, was to remain apart, although not wholly separate, from politics.17 The devoted practitioners of the sangha were to be considered a source of advice and example to the wider society and polity, but refrain from participating directly in the political process. So, there are few instances where one can find an empirical example of a political system founded truly on Buddhist principles or practicing what might be called Buddhist statecraft. This is not to say that Buddhism has not been used by politicians past and present to cloak their actions in Buddhist rhetoric, much as other religious traditions have been used, only that an authentic effort to align Buddhist principles with political practice is quite rare. I offer two possible cases of Buddhist statecraft—one ancient and one modern (an alpha and omega)—for consideration. The ancient case is the Mauryan Empire of King Aśoka, the first ruler of a Buddhist state, and the modern case is contemporary Bhutan—the only extant example of a democratic state that is rooted constitutionally, politically, and economically in Buddhism.18

#### Impermanence, f2 falsifiability

Pradeep P. Gokhale, 21, Buddhist Approaches to Impermanence: Phenomenal and Naumenal, MDPI, 12-8-2021, DOA: 12-28-2021, https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/12/12/1081/htm, r0w@n

The doctrine of impermanence can be called the most salient feature of the Buddha’s teaching. The significant presence of the doctrine can be observed from the first sermon to his last message before Parinibbāṇa. The first sermon of the Buddha centers on the problem of suffering and the middle path. However, interestingly, as is said in the Dhammacakkappavattanasutta, immediately after the Buddha’s first sermon, one of the disciples, Koṇḍañña, got an insight, which he expressed as, “Whatever has the nature of arising, has the nature of cessation”.1 In the second sermon (Anattalakkhaṇasutta), the Buddha argued that the notions of ‘I’, ‘mine’, or ‘self (attā)’ cannot be attributed to the five aggregates. Impermanence of all the five aggregates is one of the grounds of the argument there. The argument has the following form: Given any aggregate, it is impermanent. Whatever is impermanent is unsatisfactory. What is impermanent and unsatisfactory, is not fit to be regarded thus: ‘This is mine; this is I; this is my self’ In fact, it can be said that among the three characteristics of things (‘tilakkhaṇa’ (Pali), ‘trilakṣaṇa’ (Sanskrit)), namely impermanence (anicca), soullessness/non-substantiality (anatta), and un-satisfactoriness (dukkha), which the Buddha talked about, impermanence is the basis of the other two characteristics. According to Vinaya, what Assaji told to Sāriputta and the latter to Moggalāna as the essence of the Buddha’s teaching was the following: The Tathāgata has expounded the causes Of whatever be the phenomena that arise from causes. He has also expounded their cessation; This is what the great recluse has said.2 The last words of the Buddha before his Parinibbāṇa were as follows: “Now, monks, I exhort you, All conditioned things are subject to decay! Strive with diligence!”3 2.1. Three Contexts of Impermanence The doctrine of impermanence in early Buddhism can be studied in four different but interrelated contexts: The context of empiricism; The context of conditioned/constituted objects; The context of causes and conditions: Dependent arising; The practical context of suffering and emancipation. 2.1.1. The Context of Empiricism The Buddha was concerned with the nature of dhammas, that is, phenomena or empirical objects.4 When the Buddha was talking about ‘all’ in the context of the three characteristics, he was talking about the five aggregates. The five aggregates are nothing but material and mental aspects of a living being which are experiential in nature. Hence, Buddha’s talk of impermanence had this context of empirical world and life. The Buddha was critical about the transcendental metaphysics of Upaniṣads, which accepted eternal brahman as the ultimate reality. His main objection was that nobody has seen Brahman face to face, but still the Upaniṣadic thinkers accept its existence dogmatically. The Buddha was also critical about the transcendental dogmatic beliefs of other schools, such as Jainism and Ājīvakas.5 His insistence on the empirical world is also reflected in his deliberate silence over the metaphysical issues put forward by his disciples, such as Vacchagotta and Māluṅkyaputta. 2.1.2. The Context of Conditioned/Constituted Objects Different formulae of the Buddha’s doctrine of impermanence indicate that he was talking about the regular relation between origination and destruction. ‘Udaya-vyaya’, ‘utpāda (Pāli: uppāda)-vyaya) are the pairs often found described as the characteristics of phenomena. “Whatever has the nature of arising, has the nature of cessation” (‘yaṃ samudyadhammaṃ taṃ nirodhadhammaṃ’) and “All conditioned objects are impermanent” (‘sabbe saṅkhārā aniccā’) are some of the major formulations of the doctrine of impermanence. These formulae come as the general rules based on observation and inductive generalization. 2.1.3. The Context of Causes and Conditions: Dependent Arising An important contextual framework in which the Buddha presented his doctrine of impermanence is the framework of causes and conditions. The same framework also becomes a part of a larger framework of the doctrine of dependent arising. According to this framework, things arise as a part of a causal process. A thing/phenomenon arises from its causes and conditions (hetu-paccaya) and it ceases when they cease. The model of causation is a model of dependence. ‘A thing arises from its causes’ means that the existence of the thing depends on the causes. Moreover, because existence of the thing is dependent on its causes, it does not stay permanently; it ceases when the causes cease. The Buddha applies this model to the problem of suffering. Suffering arises from its cause, namely craving, and it will cease to exist when craving ceases. Hence, the Buddha presented the twelve-linked chain of causes and effects (dvādaśa-nidāna) in both forward (anuloma) and backward (pratiloma) direction. It explains how suffering arises and also how it ceases.6 This brings us to the practical context of the doctrine of impermanence. 2.1.4. The Practical Context of Suffering and Emancipation The Buddhist doctrine of impermanence is not only an empirical and factual doctrine, but it has practical relevance for the issue of suffering and emancipation. We have seen that according to the Buddha’s doctrine of three characteristics, the phenomena are impermanent, non-substantial and unsatisfactory and that impermanence is the basis of the other two features. Though the phenomena are in fact impermanent, due to avijjā (ignorance or misconception) we think them to be permanent and develop craving (attachment or hatred) towards them and this causes suffering. In order to get rid of suffering one has to be free from misconception. It means developing right vision, which implies understanding things as they are, that is understanding them to be impermanent, non-substantial and unsatisfactory. Hence, realization of impermanence becomes an important part of the Buddhist meditation, particularly mindfulness meditation or insight meditation.

#### Attachment and greed create systems of suffering- only though mindset change can we create meaningful material reform

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

The term ‘ironic affinities’ is one which I have borrowed from Kevin Brien’s (2004) work toward this very end. The irony here is that a system of religious thought which is focused on the internal sources of disharmony and suffering can be reconciled with a philosophical and economic system which is both critical of the influence of religion and focused on external causes of human suffering. The means to this reconciliation, as Brien points out, lies in the Buddhist understanding of the interconnectedness of reality through the philosophy of dependent origination and the training of wisdom as embodied through the practices of Right Thought and Right Understanding. It bears repeating at this point that a cornerstone of these teachings is summed up by the sentiment “With your thoughts you make the world.” The extrapolation that this forces us to make is not an illogical one; that individuals, who themselves are subject to suffering through the influence of greed, attachment, and craving, would in turn establish larger systems which can do little else but perpetuate suffering. Brien explains: Once again my suggestion is that, were the historical Buddha alive at the present time, and were he fully aware of the humanistic-Marxist perspective on social reality, he would quite naturally extend his notion of dependent coorigination to take account of the various mutually interconnected, and mutually interdependent, external factors operating in a given situation – the sort of factors that generate the various forms of human suffering and of alienation that Marx himself was so concerned to understand. […] Thus if the historical Buddha, with Marx’s bodhisattvic help, he could have identified the specific external factors that functioned to generate and sustain specific forms of suffering and alienation, he would quite naturally have seen that, when these 25 specific external factors arise, this specific type of suffering and alienation arises; and that if these factors were to cease operating, this suffering would also cease (2004:51). In this context the Marxist concern with identifying and understanding these external sources of suffering can be seen as a function of the collision of dependent origination and Marx’s own historical materialism. It reflects a social and economic reality that is the result of historical influence on our creation of self which acknowledges the internal sources of the root of suffering itself; and like the traditional Buddhist formulation as defined in the Third Noble Truth, it should be understood as an optimistic undertaking, to ultimately serve as an impetus for change. This formulation of a basic philosophical convergence between Buddhism and Marxism should fly in the face of the criticisms of fatalism which have been leveled at both philosophies. It provides the foundation for a liberatory praxis which seeks the cessation of suffering through the exercise of supreme agency across all levels of human organization. It is also rooted in a similar understanding of human nature, the second major interaction between Buddhism and Marxism which is essential to the creation of a Buddhist critical social theory. Human Nature in Marxism and Buddhism

#### Doing good things is an inherent condition of the subject- people are comprised of actions, not just adjectives

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have come to understand it, naturally shares Marxism’s concern with human suffering. It can also be said to share the viewpoint that man is, through one means or another, especially susceptible to suffering because of his specific nature. From a Marxist perspective this suffering is the result of acquisitiveness, greed, possessiveness, and exploitation; precisely the individual traits which are condemned in the teachings of the Buddha (de Silva, 2002). However, these initial similarities must be understood as part of the larger Buddhist view of human nature which I will address in a similar manner in which Marxism has been addressed above. While the fundamental teachings of Buddhism, unlike many Western philosophies, do not explicitly address a natural state of humanity other than one which is subject to dukkha, larger doctrinal teachings have been used in recent scholarship to develop a clearer picture of the state-in-nature of humanity. According to Soka philosophy, human nature is best understood in response to the question of man as essentially good or evil. However, as they point out, the principle of dependent origination makes such dichotomous thinking inherently flawed. Good for a Buddhist is not simply an opposition to evil. It is a reflection of an absolute good, however with the caveat that the realm of humanity represents a battleground between good and evil set against this larger cosmic context. It is in this context that humanity is said to take on the character of the subjective human being (Matsuoka, 2005). This subjectivity is not to be understood as a kind of moral relativism but rather the result of the unique ability of human beings to actively express and engage the teachings of the Buddha to manifest this cosmic good through compassion and the performance of good deeds. In terms which might appeal to the Marxist sensibility this perspective acknowledges subjective compassionate action as the fulfilment of human nature for a Buddhist. 28 As with the Marxist view of ideal human activity, Buddhist subjective compassionate action is rooted in an understanding of humanity as intrinsically interconnected; the result of the philosophy of dependent origination. This symbiosis, while not identical to Marx’s species-being, is analogous in its resistance to an alienating individualist approach to human nature. While liberation can be seen as an individual pursuit, it cannot be sought through individualist means. One must cultivate good karma through the fulfillment of the natural drive to manifest positive deeds and in doing so will influence others in their search for liberation. To succinctly combine the two perspectives, man is then best understood as a creature which is driven to deliberate and collectively liberatory action.

#### Karma creates revolution, mindset prereqs revolution/material improvements, thinking in new contexts gives Buddhism power, individuals serve cap rn

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

While ‘social karma’ as it has been developed reflects the traditional Marxist concern with large-scale changes to social and economic institutions, it is purely the collective result of individual transformation through the continual process of rebirth. This however does not 33 mitigate its potential for large-scale struggle and liberation. In fact, this very issue has previously been addressed within Marxist critical theory making use of the very form of human agency developed above. In Marcuse’s An Essay on Liberation, revolution is understood to be primarily a personal endeavor, in which people choose to abandon the values and ideology of capitalism and begin to move toward larger class struggle. This personal change is crucial as each individual under capitalism, willingly or not, becomes “an agent of capitalist social control and ideological conformity”(Agger, 1979). As Agger sums up: “Thus, to Marcuse, the first level of socialist praxis is the struggle to transform the need and value patterns of the individual as a prelude – but only as a prelude – to new class formation.” As these transformed values begin to reflect the drive for liberation, the collective influence of an increasingly enlightened population will begin to re-write the existing ‘social karma’ of the society resulting in material changes which can be built upon as more individuals take up the revolutionary cause. This in turn allows humanity to fully realize its drive for productive work outside of the exploited and alienated conditions of capitalism; the nature of this work naturally being open to debate. What is clear is that this liberated state first requires the capacity of individuals to undergo an internal change which has an immediate karmic effect. The social expression of the liberated work instinct is cooperation, which, grounded in solidarity, directs the organization of the realm of necessity and the development of the realm of freedom. And there is an answer to the question which troubles the minds of so many men of good will: what are the people in a free society going to do? The answer which, I believe, strikes at the heart of the matter was given by a young black girl. She said: for the first time in our life, we shall be free to think about what we are going to do (Marcuse, 1969:63). It is this freedom to think in a radically new context that is the primary tool of Buddhism in its search for liberation. Thought freed from greed and the accumulation of negativity across generations is the only means for individual transformation and the only hope for liberating changes throughout larger social and political structures. The upcoming chapter seeks to bring clarity to the specific manner in which a Buddhist critical social theory might assist in bringing about such changes.

#### Every act is always either liberatory or counterliberatory- no room for the perm bozos

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

#### Embracing skandha means rejecting the ego, the self, and static time- only though aligning with continuous rebirth that suppresses the ego can we create sustainable social movements

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

The result of this enumerated understanding of skandha is both the negation of the existence of a permanent self and the elimination of the need for such an entity. It is this ‘self’ which when embraced, as it so clearly has been throughout many cultures, results in the manifestation of greed, desire, and a mode of living driven almost exclusively by the unquenchable ego. While it is only through embracing the impermanence of self can one’s life be seen as a result of the skandha, it is critical to understand these five aggregates as themselves in constant flux and subject to impermanence. It is in this understanding that we are then able to rectify the metaphysical rebirth of Buddhism with a traditional materialist worldview which would otherwise have difficulty with such a doctrine. As with many religious doctrines, the cycle of rebirth in Buddhism is subject to many competing interpretations depending on which school one finds themselves a part of. Here again Watts in his experience with cultivating a Western affinity for Buddhism is particularly useful. Many Buddhists understand the Round of birth-and-death quite literally as a process of reincarnation…But in Zen, and in other schools of the Mahayana, it is often taken in a more figurative way, as that the process of rebirth is from moment to moment, so that one is being reborn so long as one identifies himself with a continuing ego which reincarnates itself afresh at each moment of time. Thus the validity and interest of the doctrine does not require acceptance of a special theory of survival. Its importance is rather that it exemplifies the whole problem of action in vicious circles and its resolution… (Watts, 1957:49). This interpretation of rebirth outside of the metaphysical doctrine builds on the concept of ‘social karma’ by situating the human agency to affect change expressly within the present. While this can be interpreted in many ways, it is the argument of this work that a firm situation in the present moment is the hallmark of a revolutionary Buddhist critical social theory as it is a clear indictment of the gradualist approach to social and economic change.

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

For the better part of the last two-thousand years the people of the Western world have been conditioned to view our existence in terms of our history; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of the apocalyptic worldview; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged, the response to this uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview. In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs, they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes detrimental to the possibility of legitimate public discourse and engagement. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, we also run the risk of dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form, if not the language, of traditional prophetic warnings. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly it is exploited at every turn by news media and politicians to reinforce public support for existing power structures, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, the creation of a Buddhist worldview in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

#### Mindset shift to Tathata- solves destructive development

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Another way of understanding the Buddhist apocalypse as allegory is in its situation within the three asankha kalpas, or great eons during which it is said that the Buddha himself struggled for enlightenment. This cycle of birth, existence, and suffering is understood not as a literal series of uncountable eternities after which one may gain enlightenment, but rather an analogy for the three poisoned states of mind; greed, anger, and delusion. Those who are able to overcome these three poisons are said to have passed through these great kalpas and cultivated the three sets of limitless virtues which manifest as countless good thoughts within the mind (Red Pine, 1987). The fulfillment of the maha kalpa, the Buddhist apocalypse, is in this way an act of creation and liberation, not destruction. It is precisely in the act of destruction that the folly of the apocalyptic worldview is best understood. For the West in this mindset, destruction is a symptom of desire itself. We destroy 39 so as to create a more desirable (read profitable, exploitable) product, which in turn we are more than willing to destroy when that product has exceeded its usefulness. All means of environmental destruction have their roots in this desire for a useful product over the sustenance of natural resources. We actively accept the negative externalities of industrial activity for the promise of economic growth and the hope that the environmental impact of these activities can be mitigated in the future. In this instance however, it is likely that this future will never come as the greed which drives such development will never subside, only create more suffering. For a Buddhist this drive to destructive development is alleviated by shifting one’s perspective to the present; to see things as they are not as they should be. This state of mind, known as Tathata or Thusness, drive us away from the active destruction and recreation of the world and toward a way of living in the world which imposes no singular view of a potential idealized future of which there is no certainty. As we cannot actively mitigate worldly conditions as they unfold, the uncertainty of the future results in a holding pattern of inaction as we sit, hopeful that our vision will be realized. Our lives become a kind of lottery in which we may only hope that fortune shines down on us and gives us the exact results which we have imagined (Spellmeyer, 2010). The Blue Cliff Record, a key Zen text, compares this hope to a starving man waiting for a rabbit to crash into a stump so he can cook it for dinner. If he continues to wait expectantly, the man will surely die. And while he is waiting for an event that might never take place at all, a tree could be dropping fruit a few feet away. (2010:61) This condition of hopefulness can be understood as a secondary reality which, having been synthesized through possibility, is inherently false. There is only one reality with two perspectives; an enlightened perspective in which one realizes that time cannot be constrained to march toward particular ends, where hope becomes meaningless, and the unenlightened perspective which seeks control and focuses on the past and future to the detriment of the present.

#### Action first- Tathata requires action, not deliberation

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

The political impact of this lack of focus on the present is a similar mode of inactivity. When mired in the back and forth of political discourse between parties working toward disparate, albeit similarly apocalyptic, ends, the result is often to do nothing, assuming that given enough time a solution will emerge which adheres to the perspective of at least a majority of those concerned. This is of course just waiting for a different rabbit to hit a different stump. It would further seem that the more pressing an issue, the more politicized it becomes, fueling the divisive fires of hopefulness and moving humanity further away from even attempting to act. The obvious example of such an issue is climate change. Despite overwhelming academic consensus on the matter, the social and political response has been largely one of inaction. This inaction is the result of multiple manifestations of the apocalyptic worldview. Across the spectrum we have seen a lack of response justified in many ways; the Christian belief that God ultimately controls all things and therefore we have no agency to intervene, the argument that the economic costs of responding to climate change are not justified due to a particular interpretation of scientific data, the claim that the science itself is entirely faulty, and the belief that if incentivized enough the free market will address the issue itself. Even within more progressive circles conflict is perpetuated between those who support cap-and-trade and those who would like to see a carbon tax. Each of these points of view, as well as the innumerable others, carries with it the hopeful fantasy that it represents a solution, if not the solution, to the issue of climate change. What results is a universal hesitancy to act at all in any manner which might prove successful. This situation parallels the Buddhist tale of Zen Master Nansen: Nansen saw the monks of the eastern and western halls fighting over a cat. He seized the cat and told the monks: "If any of you say a good word, you can save the cat." No one answered. So Nansen boldly cut the cat in two pieces. That evening Joshu returned and Nansen told him about this. Joshu removed his sandals and, placing them on his head, walked out. Nansen said: "If you had been there, you could have saved the cat." (Ekai, 1934) This story is a demonstration of the Buddhist mind oriented in the present. The lesson being that an action taken in the present, toward the preservation of good, in this case the life of the 41 cat and Nansen’s karma, is far superior to inaction. Joshu obviously would have had no way of knowing that his response would have saved the cat’s life, but his ability to demonstrate that he would have acted in that moment to attempt a resolution is what sets his enlightened mind apart from the unenlightened minds of the bickering monks. He is not concerned with taking the ‘right’ path but rather in connecting with the world without hesitation. This is the mindset which facilitates the sudden action of liberation for the self and in turn all beings. It is the heart of a revolutionary critical Buddhism

#### Right intent comes first- otherwise work gets overtaken and is meaningless

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### Jargon bad- public spaces good!

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Just as important as the purpose behind one’s work is the way in which the work is performed. There is no singular manner in which critical inquiry should be performed. Each theorist is appropriately free to develop their own style as it reflects their foundations and priorities, however if their ultimate goal is to promote public discourse and the alleviation of suffering by the masses their work must be accessible and, at least to some degree, actionable. As Jacoby (2000) points out in The Last Intellectuals, the process of professionalization and academization of intellectual work has replaced the public audience with an academic one. In doing so it has also encouraged the proliferation of discipline specific jargon and the use of additionally overcomplicated language and styles throughout academic work. This obscurantist inclination serves the purpose of drawing a line in the sand between popular inquiry and academic work. As a result, the nature of the public intellectual has fundamentally changed. These figures who were once rooted in literary and social criticism are now primarily concerned 44 with economics and political science (Drezner, 2008). Even attempts at provoking public dialogue on the part of critically inclined social scientist and humanities oriented academics through blogs and other similarly informal publications has had little impact on the accessibility of truly reasoned work, but instead reflects the personal interests and opinions of the theorist; being more akin to “…private journals with megaphones than reasoned contributions to public life…” (Jacoby, in Drezner, 2008). This however does not have to be the case. Means of facilitating a public interaction with rigorous academic inquiry, such as blogs and other informal public outlets, can be exploited to begin to reverse the impact of the vitriolic and divisive agenda-driven discourse that permeates popular culture. This can be seen as yet another example of the way that the apocalyptic worldview is spread, carrying with it the paralyzing effects of indecision and politicization. It is central to the performance of critical inquiry that one eschews obscurantism and isolation within academic circles if there is to be any chance at all of engaging the public towards the goal of liberation.

#### Mindfulness- fundamental elements- it’s about ignoring desire

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

#### Mindfulness impacts- spec to politics

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

First, what have advocates of using mindfulness in politics themselves said? Jon Kabat-Zinn emphasizes thatmindfulness practice could influence politics primarily by helping individuals to become less reactive, less stressed, and less caught up in self-righteousness: Cultivating greater mindfulness in our lives does not imply that we would fall into one set of ideological views and opinions or another, but that we might see more freshly for ourselves, with eyes of wholeness, moment by moment. But what mindfulness can do for us, and it is a very important function, is reveal our opinions, and all opinions, as opinions, so that we will know them for what they are and perhaps not be so caught by them and blinded by them, whatever their content...40 Similarly, Tim Ryan, who identifies Kabat-Zinn and his work as an inspiration, mostly focuses on what we might call emotional and process benefits that might arise from applying mindfulness to politics: We may see the humor in our mistakes and be able to laugh at ourselves more. We may be just a little less critical of others, and of ourselves. Or we may deal with our mistakes more quickly and with a more sincere and kind heart. We may more easily forgive the people who have hurt us. We may sit down and have civil political conversations with those who strongly disagree with us.41 Both Kabat-Zinn and Ryan see mindfulness as a process of self-investigation, and envision its impact on politics as arising from how it changes the people who engage in politics. Their analysis also suggests that we might expect to see changes in two main areas: practitioners’ dispositions and their beliefs. Thus, Ryan suggests that if we practice mindfulness, our dispositions may change by becoming less critical, more humble, and more open, and Kabat-Zinn suggests that we might see changes in the contents of our beliefs and/or in how we hold them. Their comments on what changes might occur, and 38Alex Seitz-Wald, “Meet the ‘Mindfulness’ Caucus: Politicians Who Meditate!,” Salon.com, available online at: . 39Ed Halliwell, “Can Mindfulness Transform Politics?,” Mindful, available online at: . 40Kabat-Zinn, Coming to Our Senses, pp. 508–509. 41Ryan, A Mindful Nation, p. 167. how likely they might be, are intriguing but preliminary. In this section, I examine them in greater depth. First, it is important to notice that people have some beliefs and dispositions that are directly related to politics, and others that are general and not directly concerned with politics. On this view, non-political beliefs are descriptive beliefs about the world with no obvious (direct) connection to politics, government, or policy choices. Such beliefs might touch on the questions of the nature of identity (am I an atomistic self or a manifestation of a greater, holistic something?), the functioning of causality, the existence of an afterlife, and similar topics. Non-political disposition refers to one's general approach to life, problems, conflict, decisions, and so on, without direct reference to politics. Thus, if one is generally rational or emotional, happy or sad, confident or uncertain, social or solitary, all count as parts of one's non-political disposition. In contrast, one's political disposition is how one is inclined to act in specifically political contexts. For example, we can easily imagine someone who is congenial and conciliatory at home but pugnacious and partisan at a town-hall meeting, or when discussing certain political topics. Finally, one's political beliefs are all those beliefs either about or directly relevant to politics, including one's normative beliefs generally, because many of one's normative beliefs will be directly relevant to political questions. Thus, political beliefs could include things such as the belief that members of a particular political party are scoundrels and knaves as well as the belief that violence of any kind is deeply morally wrong. What effects might mindfulness practice have on these four aspects of personality? It certainly seems possible that mindfulness practice might lead someone to change their non-political, non-normative beliefs. Mindfulness practitioners frequently report that their practice leads them to see personal identity as more porous and unstable than they previously thought, or to come to believe that every phenomenon is both the result of innumerable previous causes and a partial cause of innumerable future phenomena, such that the universe is united in a complex web of interdependence.42 Such changes in belief might, in turn, affect one's non-political disposition, for example by making one happier, less anxious, or less afraid of death. It also seems possible that changes in one's non-political disposition might lead to changes in one's political disposition. Such changes might be due to changes in one's beliefs (as above), or they might be their own independent phenomenon: for example, perhaps mindfulness practice leads me to become happier or less stressed, and that leads me to be more tolerant of disappointment and frustration. Would such changes be likely to change one's political dispositions? We have to consider two possibilities. In the first, the person in question does not make any distinction between political and non-political contexts, such that their disposition is always the same. In that case, their behavior in political contexts will change if their overall disposition changes. That seems like a reasonable conclusion: if mindfulness makes people nicer, for example, then it seems reasonable to think that it should make them nicer in all contexts. In the second possibility, the practitioner does distinguish between the two contexts, and they have different dispositions when they act politically and when they act non-politically. In that case, while it seems plausible, even likely, that changes to their non-political disposition would affect their political behavior in some way, there is no reason to think that mindfulness practice would lead them to modify or abandon the political/non-political distinction, and 42For example, see Ethan Nichtern, One City: A Declaration of Interdependence (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2007). there is no reason to think that changes to their non-political disposition would change their political behavior in different ways than it would change their non-political behavior. Thus, they might be nicer to everyone, but there is no reason to think that they would be even nicer to people who had previously been their political opponents, nor conversely that they would be nicer to everyone except them. Similarly, if previously they had had the disposition that it was good to be agreeable except when important political issues were at stake, there is no reason to think that their new attitude would erase that distinction, though it might make them more agreeable, to different degrees, in both kinds of situations. Thus, changes to one’s non-political disposition might lead to changes in one’s political disposition, but the two dispositions seem likely to remain distinct if they started out that way. Is it likely that mindfulness practice would lead directly to changes in one’s political disposition (assuming that one has one distinct from one’s non-political disposition)? To distinguish this question from the issues already considered, here, the question is whether one’s political disposition would change independently of changes to one’s non-political beliefs or non-political disposition. Thus, for example, I would have to become disposed to be more trusting of my political opponents but not because I had become disposed to be more trusting of everyone, nor because I changed my beliefs about, for example, human nature. Here, I think, it seems completely plausible that mindfulness practice might change my disposition. Perhaps, mindfulness will helpme realize that I am especiallyinflexible in political contexts because I am afraid that the power of government will be used against me**.** It is a familiar experience that recognizing and being able to articulate a fear often results in the fear becoming less powerful. Thus, I might become less fearful, and consequently less inflexible. Obviously, this change does not arise because my fear is related to politics but rather because mindfulness may be especially helpful at teaching us to recognize and cope with fear, and my particular fear happens to arise in the context of politics. To summarize the argument so far, it seems reasonable to think that mindfulness practice might lead to changes in our non-political beliefs, non-political disposition, and political disposition, either directly or by inciting changes in one area (non-political disposition) that spread to another (political disposition). But, now we get to what I think is the hardest question: is mindfulness likely to change one’s political (and normative) beliefs? Here, I think the answer depends on what those beliefs rest upon. Thus, we can imagine that some beliefs ultimately rest on personal feelings or habits, some upon factual beliefs, and some upon what for the moment I want to call existentially basic beliefs. For example, I might believe (more or less consciously) that members of a particular social group are generally good and trustworthy people primarily because I have had pleasant experiences with some members of that group, and those experiences have given the group a positive emotional valence in my mind. In contrast, I might believe that members of some social group are unusually likely to be engaged in criminal activity because of what (I think) I know about arrest and conviction statistics. Finally, I might believe that members of some socially disfavored group deserve greater respect and/or equality because I am committed as a matter of principle to treating all people as equally worthy of respect and as deserving a chance to flourish. (The distinction among emotional, factual, and existential beliefs is intended to be illustrative rather than categorical; presumably most of our beliefs in fact blend all three elements together and include various unconscious and non-discursive elements as well.) Given those distinctions, it seems plausible that mindfulness practice could affect beliefs rooted in emotion, primarily by making the basis of the beliefs more accessible to conscious 281 recognition and evaluation. That does not necessarily mean that such beliefs would change, but only that it seems plausible that they might change. In contrast, it seems less likely that mindfulness practice would affect beliefs based on factual information. Indeed, if anything, it seems more likely that mindfulness would reinforce fact-based beliefs, by encouraging conscious recognition of and reflection on the underlying facts and their relationship to the belief**.** To the extent that the facts are false, or that our understanding of the facts is influenced by emotion, then change becomes more likely, but beliefs rooted in true facts whose recognition is relatively free of emotional distortion seem unlikely to be affected. By “existentially basic” I mean normative beliefs fundamental to our understanding of the world. (There are also non-normative beliefs that are existentially basic, but for our purposes they are included in the non-political beliefs category). Although such beliefs are obviously influenced by emotions and facts, they are not logically derived from them. For example, following David Hume (and G.E. Moore),43 the wrongness of murder does not appear to depend logically either on our feelings about murder or on any facts about murder (that it makes others deeply unhappy, that it is socially disruptive, and so on). Even in a case in which the facts or the feelings were different, most people are inclined to say, murder would still be wrong. It seems very unlikely that mindfulness practice would affect such existentially basic beliefs. On the one hand, such beliefs are foundational to our understanding of the moral universe. Changing them would require a significant reorganization of our moral personalities, which experience suggests is rare (if not impossible). On the other hand, because such beliefs are not logically dependent on other, non-fundamental beliefs or feelings, changes to our other beliefs, or to our disposition, seem unlikely to change our existentially basic beliefs. Indeed, it seems more likely that mindfulness practice would deepen and strengthen our commitment to our existentially basic beliefs. Paying careful attention to our experience, and learning to distinguish between transient emotions and more durable beliefs, seems likely to make the beliefs relatively more important. Obviously, this is not to say that no changes to our existentially basic beliefs ever happen, nor to deny that they might sometimes happen as a result of mindfulness practice, but only to argue that there is no reason to think that mindfulness practice is likely to result in such changes. Earlier I emphasized that Kabat-Zinn and Ryan are focused on mindfulness as an experience of oneself. From that perspective, mindfulness is a phenomenological practice— it examines our experience as experience, but does not make claims about connections between our experience and experience-independent reality. Thus, I may learn that I believe some things very strongly, or that those beliefs have a strong influence on my attitudes or behavior, but neither insight tells me whether my beliefs are true.

#### The alternative is to submit to Black Buddhist meditation – in the face of the affirmative, we only offer silence.

Vesely-Flad ’19 [Rima; May 13; Ph.D. Director of Peace and Justice Studies at Warren Wilson College; *Buddhism and Whiteness: Critical Reflections*, *Philosophy of Race*, “Chapter 5,” p. 85-86] // Re-Cut Justin

Lovingkindness practices toward the self, alongside personal interpretations of the **Four Noble Truths** and the Eightfold Noble Path, guide many **Black Buddhist** practitioners who have suffered **generational trauma** and **racist degradation** in our contemporary moment. Valerie Mason-John, also known as Vimalasara, an African-Canadian teacher in the Nichiren tradition, speaks of the importance of the Four Noble Truths for people of African descent in particular. The **First Noble Truth** is that suffering is a **universal** experience. Mason-John states, “We of African descent know what **suffering** is. It’s in our DNA.”20 The **Second Noble Truth** states that suffering is a result of ignorant craving. For many Black Buddhists, the interpretations of the causes of suffering are greatly expanded into teachings of **white myopia**, the desire to exist in **delusion**, and the **collective ego** of the **dominant white culture**. The **Third Noble Truth** is that there is a path to **end suffering**. The very promise of **liberation** is enticing for people of African descent. The **Fourth Noble Truth** describes the path of liberation, known as the Noble Eightfold Path. In this path, “Right Concentration,” which leads to **settling the mind**, is a particularly compelling practice. Manuel writes in The Way of Tenderness: Only in the **deep silence** of meditation did I begin to **disbelieve** that I was born **only to suffer**. Eventually after many years of sitting meditation, I recognized the root of my self-hatred, both external and internal, as a personal and collective denial or denigration of the body I inhabited. Her reflections are echoed by Owens’s reflections on silence: “silence became the medium in which I was reborn into a sense of **happiness** and contentment. But overall, it ushered me into a period of thriving and **flourishing** in my life.”22 In **meditation**, practitioners cultivate their ability to confront the **suffering** wrought by their **mental constructs** rather than avoid pain. They seek to heal the damage wrought by racism and to rearticulate profound teachings that are rooted in concentration practices. In-depth interviews with **Black Buddhist** teachers and practitioners illuminate a progression in the process of **acknowledging** one’s **racial identity** and embracing teachings of **non-self**. The progression begins with claiming and rearticulating Blackness as part of the social self, and in so doing, embracing African ancestry. For many, the next step is entering into an experience of **silence** that facilitates a recognition of the truth of **non-self**. Finally, **Black Buddhist** teachers and long-term practitioners integrate **embodiment** with the **psychologically liberating** practice of silence. The ten **Black Buddhist** teachers and long-term practitioners interviewed for this chapter emphasized four primary themes in their articulation of embodiment and Anatta: (1) Being visible in **social spaces**; (2) Claiming African **ancestral lineages**; (3) Embracing the two truths of relative and absolute **existence**; and (4) Liberating the self and the **community**.

#### Human mindsets and relationships controls everything

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

#### Faith in modern economics relies on impersonality and distance from others – meditation is key to releasement

Nelson 11 – PhD in Economics, Professor of Economics @ UC-Davis, most known for her application of feminist theory to questions of the definition of the discipline of economics, and its models and methodology

(Julie, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 24)//BB

Many Buddhist writers on economic issues begin with the experience of meditation, of getting beyond the dualities of self and no-self, and speak a message of radical interdependence, peace, compassion and engagement. The energy of this discussion is open-hearted, immediate and joyful. But when the conversation turns to economic systems, it is repeatedly asserted that the contemporary economic system is radically impersonal and non-relational. It is claimed that economies are things entirely set apart from societies, and from the sorts of ethical norms and behaviors relevant to social life. The sort of system envisaged is not an organic system encompassing change, impermanence, and evolution, but rather a locked-up system, that – once set in motion – runs along automatically according to its own rules.¶ One can see this belief reflected in the frequent use of imagery of machines, engines and physics-like logic, laws or calculations. “Undeniably, the fuel that keeps the capitalist engine running is profit”, writes Sivaraksa (2002, 135, empha- sis added). “Large corporations are new forms of impersonal collective self”, writes Loy (2008, 88, emphasis in original). “Profitability and growth are becoming increasingly important as the engine of the world’s economic activity”, he contin- ues, and “the system has attained a life of its own” (2008, 88, 90, emphasis added). Jones, in a section on transnational corporations, describes capitalism as a structure or system driven by “the logic of the market” (2003, 162), while Santikaro refers to “the calculations of the market” (2005, 206).¶ The assumption of non-relationality is also reflected in metaphors of territory, whereby social or religious life is said to belong to one sphere, while economic life belongs to another realm, set off by “boundaries” or “confines” (Santikaro 2005, 204, 206). Personification is often used as well, treating capitalism as a distinct and permanent entity that acts on the world on its own behalf, and which possesses an essential “nature” (Aitken 1984, 29).

#### Wanting less is a necessary corrective to western economics

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, *Society and Economy* , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078)

In his paper "Towards a Progressive Buddhist Economics", Simon Zadek asks ¶ the important question of whether Buddhist economics is able to penetrate the ¶ modern economy to prevent it from driving us along a materially unsustainable ¶ path, and to uproot its growing hold on our psychological conditions. And he con- ¶ cludes that we have no choice but to engage in modernisation in an attempt to redi- ¶ rect it or at least reduce its negative effects (Zadek 1997). ¶ Today's dominating business models are based on and cultivates narrow ¶ self-centeredness. Buddhist economics points out that emphasising individuality ¶ and promoting the greatest fulfilment of the desires of the individual conjointly ¶ lead to destruction. ¶ Happiness research convincingly shows that not material wealth but the rich- ¶ ness of personal relationships determines happiness. Not things but people make ¶ people happy (Lane 1998). Western economics tries to provide people with happi ness by supplying enormous quantities of things. But what people need are caring relationships and generous love. Buddhist economics makes these values accessible by direct provision. ¶ Peace can be achieved in non-violent ways. Wanting less can substantially ¶ contribute to this endeavour and make it happen easier. ¶ Permanence, or ecological sustainability, requires a drastic cutback in the pres- ¶ ent level of consumption and production globally. This reduction should not be an ¶ inconvenient exercise of self-sacrifice. In the noble ethos of reducing suffering it ¶ can be a positive development path for humanity.

#### The affirmative’s faith in market economics is inherently marginalizing

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, Society and Economy , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078)//RM

Karl Polanyi refers to the whole process of marketisation as "The Great Trans- ¶ formation", by which spheres of society became subordinated to the market ¶ mechanism (Polanyi 1946). In the age of globalisation we can experience this ¶ marketisation process on a much larger scale and in a speedier way than ever. ¶ The market is a powerful institution. It can provide goods and services in a ¶ flexible and productive way; however, it has its own limitations. Limitations of ¶ the market come from non-represented stakeholders, underrepresented stake- ¶ holders, and myopic stakeholders. ¶ Primordial stakeholders such as nature and future generations are simply not ¶ represented in the market because they do not have a "vote" in terms of purchas- ¶ ing power. They cannot represent their interests in the language of supply and de- ¶ mand. Other stakeholders such as the poor and marginalised people are under- ¶ represented because they do not have enough purchasing power to signal their ¶ preferences in the market. Finally, stakeholders who are well represented in the ¶ market, because they have enough purchasing power, often behave in a myopic ¶ way; that is, they heavily discount values in space and time. Market prices usually ¶ reflect the values of the strongest stakeholders and favour preferences here and ¶ now. Because of these inherent limitations the market cannot give a complete, un- ¶ biased direction for guiding economic activities (Zsolnai - Gasparski 2002).

#### Economics drives environmental destruction and social injustice

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 7) //T.C.

Ideally, the sciences should provide solutions to the complex, interrelated problems that face humanity, but cut off as it is from other disciplines and the larger sphere of human activity, economics can do little to ease the ethical, social and environmental problems that face us today. And given the tremendous influence it exerts on our market-driven societies, narrow economic thinking may, in fact, be the primary cause of some of our most pressing social and environmental troubles.

#### Modern economics ignores ethical and social externalities for supposedly objective and rational thought

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 7) //T.C.

Like other sciences, economics strives for objectivity. In the process, however, subjective values, such as ethics, are excluded. With no consideration of subjective, moral values, an economist may say, for instance, that a bottle of whiskey and a Chinese dinner have the same economic value, or that drinking in a night club contributes more to the economy than listening to a religious talk or volunteering for humanitarian work. These are truths according to economics. But the objectivity of economics is shortsighted. Economists look at just one short phase of the natural causal process and single out the part that interests them, ignoring the wider ramifications. Thus, modern economists take no account of the ethical consequences of economic activity. Neither the vices associated with the frequenting of night clubs, nor the wisdom arising from listening to a religious teaching, are its concern.

#### The AFF makes assumptions based on economic theories which are rooted in a misconception of reality – creates policy failure. Also, alternative solves.

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH

Buddhism and in fact all spiritual traditions have long described reality in rather different terms than traditional economic theory. While the latter are primarily concerned with a fragment of human behavior, namely "economic" actions defined as those which can be quantified in terms of money, the former approach reality holistically, incorporating all actions -and even thoughts - that make up our being and society. While Newton, Descartes and classical economics define the world in things, of separate building blocks, spiritual teachings point out there is really no independent thing there, and that the focus on things will miss the relations and the whole context that make the thing possible. In economic textbooks human beings are isolated consumers and producers interacting at markets driven by monetary gains. In spiritual traditions humans are viewed as being part of a larger whole with which they can communicate by opening up their hearts and minds. This holistic viewpoint is lent credence by modern physics, which postulate that the universe consists of unified patterns of energy. According to one of Einstein's favorite epigrams, the field generates the object, not vice verse. That is, whole systems give rise to specific things, not the other way around. While in the Cartesian worldview we can only know reality by knowing specific parts, Einstein discovered that in order to know things, we need to know the whole from which they originate. In other words, we are not isolated hard and fast physical things but more like “light beings” or “energy-flows” continuously interrelating and changing. Thus, we are more like “intangibles” - exactly that which cannot be measured in classic economic models. The new understanding of reality is a systemic understanding, which means that it is based not only on the analysis of material structures, but also on the analysis of patterns of relationships among these structures and of the specific processes underlying their formation. This is evident not only in modern physics, but also in biology, psychology and social sciences. The understanding of modern biology is that the process of life essentially is the spontaneous and self-organizing emergence of new order, which is the basis of life's inherent abundance and creativity. Moreover, the life processes are associated with the cognitive dimension of life, and the emergence of new order includes the emergence of language and consciousness. Most economic strategies are built around the possession of material things such as land, labor and capital. What counts is how much real estate we own, how much money we have and how many hours we work. The ideal for many people is to own enough land and capital, so we don't have to sell our time. This strategy, which no doubt will be recognized by many of us in developed countries, is based on the assumption that land, labor and capital is all there is, that the real world is a closed end system. Spiritual traditions and modern sciences claim the opposite. They recognize the unlimited potential in every sentient being - the potential to be whole and enlightened. Our minds create and pervade everything, hence physical reality is open for the spiritual. The concept of scarcity has also been refuted by modern discoveries. Nuclear energy is based on breaking the seemingly closed-end system of the atom and the universe has been found to continuously expand. Like the expanding limits of outer space, the modern business of cyber space and Internet, has created unexpected opportunities and amounts of new wealth. Another example, while being rightfully concerned about the limited availability of the planet's fossil fuel deposits, there is no shortage of energy in our solar system. In fact, we are surrounded by abundant energy sources: sun and wind, as well as the earth's heat, motion and magnetism. But most renewable energy resources are not available to us, not because they don't exits, but because we don't have the know how to tap them. The key in the modern knowledge economy is that what counts here is not merely material possession, but know how and creativity, the domain of the mind. As many of the new e-commerce companies have found out, a company cannot "own" the knowledge that resides in the heads of the employees. Research has shown that most successful business strategies focus less on things but more on how to manage them. It is commonly accepted that all technical and social innovation is based on what is now phrased as 'intellectual capital'. And unlike ordinary capital, intellectual capital is not subject to physical limits. So what does all this tell us? Clearly, the 19th century mechanistic ‘matter only’ worldview has been turned on its head. And thus we should revise long held axioms. First, the traditional concept that we are simply competitive beings chasing scarce material resources is incorrect. Second, intangible values are equally important for our well-being. These intangibles are stored in the mind, free from physical constraints and therefore potentially of unlimited supply. Third, happiness is not merely determined by what we have, how much we consume, but also by what we know, how we can manage and how we can be creative, ultimately by who we are - so not by having, but by being. We are human beings after all. How do measure this reality? How do we account for ‘self generation’, ‘spontaneity’ and ‘consciousness’ in our economic worldview? Deterministic logic is no longer sufficient. New ways of measuring are required to embrace this new reality

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC “solutions” and reflect personally and collectively on karma and interdependence

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program , degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

Hers hock it is a great — and. Indeed, humbling - honour to be able to open the academic sessions of the “Third International Conference on Gross National Happiness: Worldviews Make a Difference: Towards Global Transformatlon. Although the comparison is not at all warranted. It Is hard for me not to recall the opening remark of the 9th century Chan Buddhist master, Linji. when he was invited by the provincial governor to speak before an audience of several hundred people about the meaning of Buddhist enlightenment: As soon as I open my mouth. I will have made a mistake.” Like Linji. however. I am obliged to speak. As I understand it. ours Is a gathering that seeks to shed practical light on the means-to and meaning-of happiness, where happiness is understood not only as a matter of subjective well being, but also as a distinctive quality and direction of relatIonships - a quality and direction of our interdependence and Interpenetration. The hope expressed In the title of this conference and In the efforts we haire been expending in coming together is. I think, not at all misplaced For the most part, humanity is getting things right. Globally, we now produce enough food to feed every person on the planet. We have realised living conditions and developed medical Practices that allow us collectively to enjoy the longest life expectancies in history. Literacy is at an historical high. Tflrnunlcatjon takes place at the speed of light. World-class rare are available to anyone with Internet access, and the range of choices exercjsj in pursuit of lives worth leading by the ever nearly seven billion people Is wider and deeper than it has Unjve’ — a pursuit globally recognised as a basic and rsal human right. The devil, as the saying goes. “is In the details”. More than 800 million people today are chronically hungry. One out of every five people currently live in what the World Bank terms ‘absolute poverty’ — condItions so degraded and degrading that they do not afford even the hope of a dignified life. One billion people do not have access to clean drinking water, and 2.6 billion live without adequate sanitation. One out of every seven people in the world are illiterate two out of every three of these being women or girls), and functional illiteracy affects nearly one out of every four people living In many of even the most highly developed countries. For tragically large numbers of people, the fact that they ‘possess’ universal human rights does little to offset the effects of systematically perpetrated human wrongs. The fact that humanity Is mostly getting things right Is scant consolation to those living in absolute poverty or to those surviving on less than whet $2 a day might buy In the United States today, a population that Is now equal to that of every man. woman and child alive in 1965. What must be done to open spaces of hope for these mothers, fathers, sons and daughters? How do we avaIt out fnsn present conditions, as they have come to be. to realise - at a bare mInimum - dignIfied lives for all? One place to begin. I think, Is to reflect personally and collectively on a key implication of the Buddhist teachings of karma and interdependence; all experienced realities imply responsibility. We are all in some degree compilcit with the inequity and suffering that are no less a part of the contemporary world than are Ita many wonders. Fortunately, 55 the Buddha insisted. it is precisely because of karma that we are able to realise lives dedicated to the liberating resolution of all trouble and suffering. By changing the complexion of our values-intentions-actions, we can change the patterns of outcome/opportunity that shape our personal and public experiences. Indeed, the degree that we heed the Buddhist Injunction to see all things as Impermanent. It is clear that there really is no question about whether change is possible. Change is already continuously underway. The only real question Is: change by what means and with what meaning? Or to turn the question around: since change is ongoing. why does it seem to be heading us In the direction of greater Inequity end greater suffering for greater numbers? How do we go about effectively changing the usoy things are changing’ A unifying aim of the various sessions of this conference is to reflect on., how best to answer the question just posed about opening spaces of hope and dignity for all, and about orienting change towards greater equity and happiness. As a prelude to theta let tir oiler a few thoughts of my own. mt, it is my own conviction, that truly dignified lives cannot be lived by any unless dignity is a reality for all. It Is my further conviction that all will not enjoy dignified lives until the differences of each are enabled to make a difference for all.

#### The affirmative is problem-solution oriented this means they will never be able to resolve their harms, only through the alternative framing of predicament-resolution can real change occur

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program, degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

For most of us, having been educated to a global modern standard, it Is natural to assume that It is only through moving In the direction of greater universalIty and equality that lnequtiy can be overcome, poverty reduced, and dignity made possible kir all. That Is. we believe that It Is through our eonuixnialtty - not our dIfferences — that we will find a happy rente to global tranafonnatlon. M I understand it, the main tille of this conference, Woridvtews Make s Dllfererice. in.’itsts otherwise. And I would like to take a few moments to press the point that global transformation for greater equity, dignity asid happiness will not come abon I through deepening our sense of coinnionafity alone, but only to the degree that we also activate our diflërences as the basic condition for nuituol confrthutfrwr it Is a cantraJ tenet of Buddhist Qdjtis - but one that I believe Is shared by all systems of effective religious, social and political peaetlee - that meaningful change can only be Initiated and sustained on the basis of present circumstances, as they have corne to be. In the present era, the any things have come to be is very much a function of the interlocking array of pence-ses that we refer to as ‘globalisation’. Let me mention three key siflcts of these Processes, each of them in large measure both driven by and driving sclenupæ ap techookigical advances. ¡ and most notably perhaps. Is accelerattp,g and Intenslfy change. Globalisation la bringing not only nave thenge traire rapidly, but alan the advent of qualitatively distinct kinds of change Of particular Importance is the phenomenon kflOWi1 ‘emergence’. stnicturaliy significant changes occurring ¡ in con1pie, syst that in principle could not have been nucipe, but that after the fact do make pertaci sense.Second are homogenislng effects that led many early cnc globalisation to fear the Westernisation or Me nialdisation world, but that In fact have fostered truly global forms of pul culture and, more Importantly, patterns of convergence that. for example. allow credit cards to be used the world over and are beginning to enable students to take advantage of virtually borderleas higher education. Third arr pluralizing effects that hase taken the form of resurgent national and ethnic Identities, but also niche global production networks, and such acutely uneven geography of development that the top 2% of the world’s people now own of global wealth while the bottom 50% own less than 1%. As a combined result. we are not only in an era of change. but a change of eras. More specifically, I would submit that we are in the midst of a transition from an era dominated by problem-solution to one dominated by predicament-resolution. Problems arise when changing circumstances make evident the laihire of existing practices for meeting abiding needs and interests. Solving problems Involves developing new or improved means for arriving at ends we fully intend to continue pursuing. For example, gas/electric hybrid automobile engines solve the problem’ of rising fuel costs. Predicaments occur when changing circumstances lead to or make us aware of conflicts competition among our own values. Intereata. development sitas, and constructions of meaning. Predicaments cannot be solved- They can only be resolved through sustaining detailed attention to situational dynamics and realising both enhanced clarity and more thoroughly and deeply coordinated commitments. World hunger Is not a problem. Enough food is grown to supply adequate nutrition for all, What Is lacking Is the resolve to bring our economic. social and political values, Intentions and practices into alignment with doing so. World hunger is a predicament. And an increasingly significant part of the reason that we make so little headway In addressing It and other apparently intractable issues like global climate change, illiteracy and mounting economic inequity is because we persist in thinking about them as problems awaiting technical solution, rather than as predicaments commanding sustained and ever deepening resolve. In sum 21st centuiy patterns of globalisation are raising crucial questions about the owa arid riwwung difference, presenting u with a poradoxicaJ Impasse ur axnia On the other hand, we need to more fully recognize and respect difference, going beyond tolerating differences from and among others to enable differences to matter more, not less. On the Other hand, we nerd to engage In more robust collective action and global common cause. ,omtrng differences within shared find deepening To Ignore our differences now is to fail resolving current predicaments and to foster conditions for more, and more Intense, predicaments in the future.

#### Globalization forces ontological estrangement – creates forms of greed and consumerism that preclude individual liberation

Sivaraksa 2 (Sulak Sivaraksa is known in the West as one of the fathers of the International Network of Engaged Buddhists (INEB), 2002, “Economic Aspects of Social and Environmental Violence from a Buddhist Perspective,” http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/buddhist-christian\_studies/v022/22.1sivaraksa.html) //RM

As the culture of economic globalization, consumerism directly nourishes the unlimited greed of soulless transnational corporations. It will take quite a talent to miss this observation; markets dependent on consumption and controlled by powerful corporations cannot do otherwise. The consumers cannot be expected to know what they want; the demand must be manipulated or generated. The Unconscious of the consumer must be "told" what to purchase. Therefore, whereas the political and economic dimensions of globalization are marginalizing many people worldwide, particularly the poor, consumerism seeks the active participation of all classes. As a form of greed, consumerism obscures the path to personal liberation.¶ ¶ In many respects, consumerism is able to dominate much of contemporary society because individuals have become alienated from their culture and from each other. The sense of community that led people to share scarce resources and work cooperatively has been supplanted by the vile maxims of the masters of mankind, by an anger or competitiveness that causes people to seek acquisitions at the expense of their neighbors. In sum, consumerism is a consequence of using greed and violence to regulate socioeconomic relations.¶ ¶ At the most profound level, consumerism owes its vitality to the delusion of the autonomous individualized self; a self that exists independently of social relations and of human relations with nature: a human person is thrown into the world. For the Buddha, it was clear that the "self" constituted only a pattern of persistently changing experiences that had no more substance or permanence than those experiences.¶ ¶ We are deluded into seeking some transcendental subject, something that defines experience yet lies beyond the experience. We are exhorted to know ourselves and yet the "self" in this dualistic system remains unknowable. For the Buddhists, this delusion is the fundamental cause of suffering. Ontologically, we become estranged aspects of our experiences of others and ourselves. Hence we are precluded from any meaningful conception of identity.¶ ¶ Consumerism provides an artificial means of defining our existence by suggesting [End Page 53] that identity is realized through the process of acquisition. Put differently, consumerism is a perverse corollary of the Cartesian proof of personal existence: "I shop, therefore I am."¶ ¶ I have often referred to consumerism as a demonic religion because of the manner in which individuals become mired in a cycle of behavior that is fundamentally self-defeating: the insatiable desire for goods ultimately leads to despair or boredom.¶ ¶ However, the Buddhist practice of mindfulness may help the individual to realize gradually that "I breathe, therefore I am." In other words, bhavana will help us synchronize our heads with our hearts. The primary result will not be greater intellectual power, which is amoral and compartmentalized. Rather, we will achieve real understanding, or prajna. The less selfish we are, the more our prajna will merge with karuna, or compassion. Prajna and karuna are important for leading an alternative lifestyle, for overcoming consumerism. The two foster spirituality, which goes hand in hand with the engendering of harmony within ourselves, our society, and our natural habitat. In turn, this would help bring about social justice, fraternity, and ecological balance.

#### Competitiveness is irrationally derived from selfishness – rethinking is key to avert negative externalities of economic self-preservation

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 5) //T.C.

If we are to honestly discuss economics, we must admit that emotional factors - fear and desire and the irrationality they generate - have a very powerful influence on the market place. Economic decisions about production, consumption and distribution - are made by people in their struggle to survive and prosper. For the most part, these decisions are motivated by an emotional urge for self-preservation fear and desire drive us to our worst economic excesses. The forces of greed, exploitation and over-consumption seem to have overwhelmed our economies in recent decades. Our materialistic societies offer us little choice but to exploit and compete for survival in today's dog-eat-dog world. But at the same time, it is obvious that these forces are damaging our societies and ravaging our environment.

Link – Fear

#### The affirmative actions is rooted in fear and desire, emotions which are based on ignorance, and a misconception of reality limiting the potential for happiness and true understanding of the world

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, <http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH>

\*we do not support the gendered language this author uses

Several modern scientific disciplines, such as biology, psychology and medical science, have started to study the effects of empathy on the human mind, body, health and relationships. Not surprisingly, they have ascertained that compassion is of tremendous help to our well-being. A compassionate frame of mind has a positive effect on our mental and physical health, as well as on our social life, while the lack of empathy has been found to cause or aggravate serious social, psychological and even physical disorders18. Recent research on stress shows that people who only seek short term pleasure, are more prone to stress than those who seek a higher purpose, who seek meaning rather than pleasure.19 Meaning generally is derived from values such as serving others, going beyond short term selfish needs. The fact that disregarding short term selfish needs is actually a source of longer term happiness, turns the classical economic notion of selfish individualism upside down. As economist Stanislav Menchikov observes: The standard, neoclassical model is actually in conflict with human nature. It does not reflect prevailing patterns of human behavior. [..] If you look around carefully, you will see that most people are not really maximizers, but instead what you might call ‘satisfyers’: they want to satisfy their needs, and that means being in equilibrium with oneself, with other people, with society and with nature. This is reflected in families, where people spent most of their time, and where relations are mostly based on altruism and compassion. So most of our lifetime we are actually altruists and compassionate What does all this mean for our economy? Here we are entering unchartered territory, as is always the case in a paradigm shift. But some things are clear. The debate is not simply on government versus markets. As noted earlier, I believe it is about deeper, spiritual issues. Economic thinking is primarily focussed on creating systems of arranging matter for optimal intake of consumption. It assumes that the main human impulses are competition and consumption, and it has sidestepped spiritual and moral issues because it would involve a qualitative judgment on values and other intangibles that go beyond its initial premises. But by assuming that the more we consume, the happier we are, economists have overlooked the intricate working of the human mind. At the root of this belief in the market lies a very fundamental misconception. That is, we have not really understood what makes us happy. Blind faith in economics has led us to believe that the market will bring us all the things that we want. We cling to the notion that contentment is obtained by the senses, by sensual experiences derived from consuming material goods. This feeds an emotion of sensual desire. At the same time, we are led to believe that others are our competitors who are longing after the same, limited resources as we are. Hence we experience fear, the fear of losing out, the fear that our desire will not be satisfied. So we can observe that the whole machine of expanding capitalism is fuelled by two very strong emotions: desire and fear. They are so strong that they appear to be permanent features of our condition. Yet Buddha taught that since these emotions are based on ignorance, a misconception of reality, they can be removed by the understanding of reality, which is the prime object of Buddhist practice. According to Buddhism, happiness is an inner experience, available to anyone, regardless of wealth or poverty. Further, fundamentally there is nothing that we lack. By developing the mind, our inner qualities, we can experience perfect wholeness and contentment. Finally, if we share with others, we will find that we are not surrounded by competitors. Others depend on us as we depend on them. I believe that if Buddha would be alive today, he would probably recreate economic theory based on a correct and complete understanding of what is a human being and what makes him happy. As long as economics is based on a partial or wrong image of ~~man~~ and his reality, it will not produce the results we need.

#### Anxiety and fear preclude inner peace

Yeshe 83 – Lama Thubten Yeshe

(“Anxiety in the Nuclear Age,” http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=128)//BB

What’s the good of worrying about things twenty-four hours a day, disturbing your mind and preventing yourself from having a peaceful and joyful life? It’s a waste of time. Nothing’s going to change just because you’re worrying about it. If something’s already broken, it’s broken. Worrying won’t fix it. This earth has always been destructive by nature, nuclear age or not. There’s always blood flowing someplace or another. Look at world history. It’s always been like this. Buddhism calls this interdependent origination, and that’s how the human mind works. Take America’s war in Vietnam, for example. That brought people together in a movement for peace. That’s also interdependent. Some people saw the horrible suffering, confusion, misery and destruction wrought by others, so they went the other way, thinking, “That’s not right,” and despite the difficulties, created a movement of peace and love. But the right way to eliminate harm from this earth is to first free your mind from the emotional disturbances that cause irrational fear of destruction, and then educate yourself and others in how to bring peace to the world. The first thing you must do is to control your own mind and commit yourself: “From now on, no matter what happens, I’m never going to use weapons to kill any human being.” That’s where world peace starts. Human beings can control their minds and actions such that they will never kill others; people can learn to see that harming others destroys not only the others’ pleasure and happiness but their own as well. Through this kind of education, we can prevent nuclear energy from destroying the world. We can’t just campaign for the complete abolition of nuclear energy. Like electricity, nuclear energy is useful if employed the right way. If you’re careless with electricity, it can kill you too, can’t it? With right knowledge and method, we should campaign to ensure that everybody on earth determines, “I will never use nuclear weapons to kill human beings.” If that happened, a nuclear conflagration could never occur. Not that it matters, but personally, I don’t believe that nuclear energy is going to destroy the earth. I do believe, however, that human beings are capable of making a program to ensure that people everywhere, irrespective of whether they live in communist or capitalist societies, determine not to use nuclear weapons to kill other human beings. If we were to undertake such an effort to educate people, I think we could achieve our aim within ten years. Here, I’m not talking from a Buddhist point of view; I’m not talking from any religion’s point of view. I’m talking from a humanist point of view, a realistic point of view. If people’s minds are out of control, they’re going to use nuclear weapons. But irrespective of whether people are religious or non-religious, communist or non-communist, believers or non-believers, I believe every human being is capable of understanding the difference between harmful and non-harmful actions and the benefit of everybody’s being peaceful and happy. Since it’s a universal reality, we can educate people to see it. With respect to fear and worry, the Buddha’s solution is to analyze the object of fear and worry. If you do this correctly, you’ll be able to recognize that you’re seeing the object as fundamentally permanent, which has nothing to do with its reality. Look at it and ask yourself, “Is this really worth worrying about? Is worry a solution or not?” Analyze the object: is it permanent or changeable? As the great saints have said, “If it’s changeable, why worry? If it’s not, what’s the use of worrying?” When you’re afraid, analyze the object of your fears. Particularly when you’re emotionally disturbed and anxious, you’ll find that there’s a concept of concreteness in your mind, which causes you to project a concrete object externally. Neither concept has anything to do with reality. Buddhism asserts that the mind of fear and worry always either overestimates or underestimates its object and never sees its reality. If you can perceive the fundamental, universal reality of your object of fear and worry, it will become like a cloud—it comes; it goes. When you are overcome with worry, you sometimes say, “It’s always like this.” That’s not true. Things never stay the same; they always come and go—that’s the reality. Also, when you’re occupied by anxiety and fear, you might mean well, but you automatically have a tendency to generate hatred. Hatred has nothing to do with peace and happiness, does it? Buddhist psychology teaches that fear and anxiety tend to produce anger, aversion and hatred. You say you want peace and happiness but your very mental state causes hatred. It’s contradictory. People who demonstrate for peace and other causes have to watch out for this, but you have to judge for yourself how far you can go without generating hatred. Everybody’s different. Let’s say we’re out there campaigning for peace but then the president says something with which we disagree. Should we get angry? Should we hate the president? I don’t believe so; that would be a mistake. If our concern for peace and happiness makes us angry, there’s something wrong. The president is a human being. He, too, wants peace and happiness. At the bottom of his heart, he wants to be happy; he doesn’t want to be miserable. This is the universal reality. Therefore, all of us in the peace movement should make sure that we don’t hate any human being. This is the most important thing. When we demonstrate, we should be true to our word. Being a politician is not easy. Even being a wife or a husband is not easy. Most situations come with responsibility and obligation. We can look outside and blindly criticize people who work as administrators and so forth, but realistically, their position can be very difficult. To be successful, the peace movement should be selfless. If we who campaign for peace are coming from a place of selfishness, a basic concern for, “Me, me, me,” we have little chance of success. If, instead, we have a broad view based on concern for all human beings—understanding that everybody wants happiness and nobody wants to be miserable—and can educate others to see this, if we work towards this goal continuously, ultimately we’ll achieve it. There are many meditations you can do to eliminate anxiety. But meditation doesn’t mean going off to the mountains. You have the key to change your mind at any time, wherever you are. You can learn to switch your mind from emotion to peace and, each time you get distracted, gently bring it back to peace again. Practice this over and over again. You can do this; it’s human nature. You have to realize what you’re capable of. Check your own life, from the time you were born up to now—how many times have you changed your mind? Who changed it for you? Buddha didn’t change it. Jesus didn’t change it. Who changed your mind? Analyze this for yourself. That is the beauty of being human. We have the capacity for liberation within us; we come with that ability. If we utilize our energy and intelligence correctly, we can discover that liberation and happiness are already there, within us. The fundamental principle of Buddhism is not to kill. As Buddhists, this is our main obligation. I think most of you could promise never to kill another human being. That makes me very happy. We all have same aim; we think alike. Even though I’m a Tibetan monk, an uneducated mountain man, and you’re educated people from industrialized, capitalist societies, we have the same understanding. We don’t know each other, but we can still work together. That’s the most beautiful thing about being human. We can communicate with others. We should try to educate people all over the world to the point where everybody says, “For the rest of my life, I will never kill another human being.” If every human being on earth could agree to that, what would there be to worry about? Who could possibly be paranoid? In one way, the peace movement is beautiful, and if we act according to its ideas, there’ll be no more racism, no more nationalism. We’ll be equally concerned for all people. There’ll be no more fanatical religious concerns; we won’t even care if people are religious or not. Our only concern will be peace. All that will matter will be that people everywhere love and take care of each other. Who cares who’s communist or non-communist? What’s in the human heart is what’s important, not whether people are communist or capitalist. If we talk to each other, we can change the human heart. At present, we might be located in a non-communist country, but we shouldn’t project that communists want kill people who aren’t. That’s not true. People in communist countries are ladies and gentlemen, too. Like us, they want to be happy and desire not to be miserable. Therefore, together we can reach conclusions without involving the dogma of philosophy, the dogma of religion, the dogma of nationality, the dogma of racism; we can come together without any kind of dogma. That is beautiful. That is the beauty of the human being—to bring human unity and understanding without being blinded by categories. If you go to Russia and ask people, “Do you want to be killed by nuclear missiles?” they’re going to say No! For sure, they don’t want that to happen. Therefore, we have to educate people to understand the difference between what is beneficial for humanity and what is destructive—for the individual and for all. It’s simply a matter of education. Lord Buddha stressed the importance of generating loving kindness for all people irrespective of race, nationality, creed or anything else; he taught that all human beings and even animals were the object of loving kindness. This is the best guarantee against nuclear war, because each individual has to maintain control and take personal responsibility for the welfare of the all beings in the universe. Taking universal responsibility is the guarantee. If each individual doesn’t take personal responsibility for the welfare of all, it won’t work. To bring happiness and peace to earth, we have to eliminate every situation leading to hatred and anger. That means totally eradicating our own hatred and anger. We have to make our own lives peaceful and happy. This is the way to work for peace twenty-four hours a day. If our minds harbor destructive, angry thoughts, any talk of peace is just a joke. It’s merely artificial; there’s no guarantee. The only guarantee is to fertilize our minds with peace and loving kindness towards all; that’s the way we should do it. The question remains, is it possible to spread these ideas throughout the whole world? Can we get everybody in the world to agree to abandon the use of nuclear arms and not to kill any human being? Can you make that determination yourself? We can spread this philosophy or not? What do you think? We’re not using religion in this; we’re not using Buddha, we’re not using Christ, we’re not using religion or non-religion—we’re just concerned for the welfare of all human beings. What do you think? Do you think it’s possible to make this kind of program and reach that point reach or not? I’m not talking nationalistically or making any philosophic argument; I’m just talking about feeling secure, taking care of each other, loving each other, bringing peace and happiness to each other. It’s a very simple thing. Therefore, in our daily lives, each of us should all dedicate ourselves to bringing peace and happiness to all beings, and this determination itself is a powerful way of bringing peace and success into our lives. But this doesn’t mean not to act, either; to just be passive. But when you do act, act with wisdom and without selfishness, hatred or emotional fear. In that way, you will educate yourself and others. Don’t worry. Any talk of nuclear destruction of the earth is still speculation. It’s just a mental projection; it’s not yet reality. Therefore, relax and enjoy the rest of your life as much as possible. Be happy and peaceful, and don’t waste your time with pessimistic thoughts, fear or worry. Thank you so much.

#### Only an infusion of Buddhist economics solves extinction

Zsolnai 11 - professor and director of the Business Ethics Center at the Corvinus University of Budapest

(Laszlo, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. v)//BB

This book presents new insights of Buddhist ethics applied to economics and business. Buddhism suggests an approach to economic life, which is radically different from what mainstream Western economics offers. Buddhism promotes want negation and selfless service of others for achieving happiness, peace and permanence. These ideas might seem irrational or at least naïve for the Western mind which is preoccupied by cultivating desires and the instrumental use of the world. However, the deep ecological and financial crisis of our era renders alternative solutions worthy for consideration. The economic crisis of 2008–2010 produced financial losses of billions of USD in the form of poisoned debts, decline of stock prices and value depreciation of properties. Formerly fast growing economies such as Ireland, Spain, Singapore and Taiwan experienced 5–10% decline in their GDP. The fundamental cause of the crisis is the avarice of investors fueled by irresponsible financial institutions. The prospect of future economic growth supposed to be the guarantor of the indebted- ness of households, companies and economies. Today we experience a considerable downscaling of our economic activities. The present scale of economic activities of humankind is ecologically unsustainable. The so-called ecological footprint calculations clearly show this. The ecological footprint of a person is equal with the land and water that is required to support his or her activities indefinitely using prevailing technology. The sustainable ecological footprint – also called “earthshare” – is the average amount of ecologically productive land and sea available globally per capita. According to the latest available data the ecological footprint of humankind exceeds the ecological capacity of the Earth by 200–250%. It means that we would need 2–2.5 Earths for continuing our present lifestyle. The ecological footprints of the most industrialized countries are shocking. These countries are ecologically overshot by 250–600% (See Table 1). Ecological economists argue that the material throughput of the economy should be drastically reduced in the industrialized countries and also globally. We need to undertake an “economic diet” by introducing more frugal production and consumption patterns. Frugality, that is, reduced material activities, is crucial for our survival.

#### Realizing nonduality will prevent extinction.

Loy 10 ( David R. Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism, 2010, “Healing Ecology,” Journal of Buddhist Ethics, Volume 17, <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/05/Loy-Healing-Ecology1.pdf>) //RM

¶ Does this solution involve “returning to nature”? That would be ¶ like getting rid of the self: something neither desirable nor possible. We ¶ cannot return to nature because we have never left it. Look around yourself: even if you’re inside a windowless room, everything you see is derived from nature: not only wood from trees, but plastic from oil and ¶ concrete from sand and stone. The environment is not merely an “environment”—that is, not only the place where we happen to be located. ¶ Rather, the biosphere is the ground from which and within which we ¶ arise. The earth is not only our home, it is our mother. In fact, our relationship is even more intimate, because we can never cut the umbilical ¶ cord. The air in my lungs, like the water and food that enter my mouth ¶ and pass through my digestive system, is part of a greater holistic system ¶ that circulates through me. My life is a dissipative process that depends ¶ upon and contributes to that never-ending circulation. The same is true ¶ collectively. Our waste products do not disappear when we find somewhere else to dump them. The world is big enough that we may be able to ignore such problems for a while, but what goes around eventually ¶ comes around. If we befoul our own nest, there is nowhere else to go. ¶ According to this understanding, the problem is not technology ¶ itself but the obsessive ways that we have been motivated to exploit it. ¶ Without those motivations, we would be able to evaluate our technologies better, in light of the ecological problems to which they have contributed, as well as the ecological solutions to which they might ¶ contribute. Given all the long-term risks associated with nuclear power, ¶ for example, I cannot see that as anything but a short-sighted solution to ¶ our energy needs. In place of fossil fuels, the answer will have to be renewable sources of natural power (solar, wind, and so forth), along with ¶ a reduced need for energy. As long as we assume the necessity of continuous economic and technological expansion, the prospect of a steep ¶ reduction in our energy needs is impossible, but a new understanding of ¶ our basic situation opens up other possibilities. This points to a very ¶ simple (although not necessarily easy) solution to our energy problems: ¶ instead of asking “how can we get all the energy we need?” I propose ¶ that we turn that around by determining how much renewable energy is ¶ available and restructuring human civilization accordingly. But - this is my last point—how does such an understanding resolve the ¶ basic anxiety that haunts us now, when we must create our own meaning in a world where God has died? Like it or not, today our individual ¶ and collective self-consciousness distances us from pre-modern ¶ worldviews and the “natural” meaning-of-life they provided. Nor would ¶ we want to return to such constrictive worldviews—often maintained by ¶ force—even if we could. But what other alternatives are possible for us? ¶ This is really to ask what collective parallel might correspond to ¶ the individual awakening that Buddhism promotes. “The Buddha attained individual awakening. Now we need a collective enlightenment to ¶ stop the course of destruction” (Thich Nhat Hanh). I conclude with some ¶ reflections on what a collective enlightenment might mean. ¶ ¶ Perhaps the important issue is how we understand evolution, ¶ which seems quite compatible with Buddhist emphasis on impermanence (process), insubstantiality, and interdependence. If religions are to ¶ remain relevant today, they need to stop denying (or ignoring, or minimizing) evolution and instead refocus their messages on its meaning. According to Brian Swimme the greatest scientific discovery of all time is ¶ that if you leave hydrogen gas alone (for fourteen billion years, plus or ¶ minus a few hundred million years) “it turns into rosebushes, giraffes, ¶ and humans.” I believe that is also an important spiritual discovery, and ¶ furthermore it seems to me that even fourteen billion years is a short ¶ period of time [!] for the cosmos to develop from the Big Bang to a Buddha or an Einstein—unless hydrogen gas is something quite different from ¶ the reductionistic way it is usually understood. ¶ What we normally think of as evolution is only one of three progressive processes: the fusion of Big Bang particles into higher elements ¶ (in the cores of stars and supernovas), followed by the origination of selfreplicating life and the evolution of plant and animal species, and last ¶ but not least the cultural developments necessary to produce highlyevolved human beings such as Śākyamuni Buddha and Einstein. The later ¶ (“higher”?) processes depend upon the earlier ones: life as we know it ¶ requires elements such as carbon and oxygen, and of course human culture is the development of a particular species that depends upon many ¶ other species to survive and thrive.¶ How shall we understand these three “nested” processes? Theists ¶ tend to see a Being outside these processes who is directing them. Many ¶ scientists see these developments as haphazard, including the evolution ¶ of life due to random DNA mutations. Is there a third alternative? According to the evolutionary biologist Theodore Dobzhansky, evolution is ¶ neither random nor determined but creative. Of what? The tendency towards increasing complexity is hard to overlook, and greater complexity ¶ seems to be associated with greater awareness. From a Buddhist perspective, this opens up interesting possibilities. Can we understand this groping self-organization as the universe struggling to become more selfaware? Is my desire to awaken (“the Buddha” means “the awakened ¶ one”) the urge of the cosmos to become aware of itself, in and as me? ¶ In The Universe Story Brian Swimme and Thomas Berry offer a similar claim: “The mind that searches for contact with the Milky Way is the ¶ very mind of the Milky Way galaxy in search of its inner depths.” What ¶ does this imply about Walt Whitman, for example, admiring a beautiful ¶ sunset? “Walt Whitman is a space the Milky Way fashioned to feel its ¶ own grandeur.” Is that how Buddhist enlightenment should be understood today? What did Śākyamuni Buddha realize when he looked up and ¶ saw the morning star? How did Dogen describe his own awakening? “I ¶ came to realize clearly that mind is no other than mountains and rivers and the ¶ great wide earth, the sun and the moon and the stars.”¶ Every species is an experiment of the biosphere, and according to ¶ biologists less than one percent of all species that have ever appeared on ¶ earth still survive today. Our super-sized cortex enables us to be cocreators (“created in the image of God”), and with us new types of “species” have become possible: knives and cities, poetry and world wars, ¶ cathedrals and concentration camps, symphonies and nuclear bombs. As ¶ these examples suggest, however, there is a problem with our hyperrationality. Nietzsche’s Zarathustra says that “man is a rope across an ¶ abyss”: are we a transitional species? Must we evolve further in order to ¶ survive at all? In Thank God for Evolution Michael Dowd describes our collective problem as “systemic sin”: “The fundamental immaturity of the ¶ human species at this time in history is that our systems of governance and economics not only permit but actually encourage subsets of the ¶ whole (individuals and corporations) to benefit at the expense of the ¶ whole.” Again, we bump up against the delusion of separate selves that ¶ pursue their own benefit at the cost of the whole. In Buddhist terms, I ¶ wonder if such delusions are haunted by too much dukkha dis-ease, ¶ which motivates us (both individually and collectively) to do too many ¶ self-destructive things.¶ Perhaps figures like the Buddha and Gandhi are harbingers of ¶ how our species needs to develop, in which case the cultural evolution ¶ that is most needed today involves spiritual practices that address the ¶ fiction of a separate self whose own well-being is distinguishable from ¶ the well-being of “others.”†¶ Perhaps our basic problem is not self-love but a profound misunderstanding of what one’s self really is. Without ¶ the compassion that arises when we realize our nonduality—empathy ¶ not only with other humans but with the whole biosphere—it is becoming likely that civilization as we know it will not survive the next few ¶ centuries. Nor would it deserve to. If my speculations are valid, it remains to be seen whether the Homo sapiens experiment will be a successful vehicle for the cosmic evolutionary process.¶ To conclude, does this give us another perspective on our collective relationship with the biosphere? Is the eco-crisis a spiritual challenge that calls upon us to realize our nonduality with the earth?¶ Remember what was said earlier about the bodhisattva path. Although living beings are innumerable, the bodhisattva vows to save them ¶ all. This commitment flows naturally from realizing that none of those ¶ beings is separate from oneself.¶ This suggests a final parallel between the individual and the collective. Will our species become the collective bodhisattva of the biosphere? Today humanity is challenged to discover the meaning and role it ¶ seeks in the ongoing, long-term task of repairing the rupture between us ¶ and mother earth. That healing will transform us as much as the biosphere.

#### Only by confronting our ‘self’ away from outside solutions can we realize our role in the world, preventing inevitable ecological destruction.

Loy 10 ( David R. Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism, 2010, “Healing Ecology,” Journal of Buddhist Ethics, Volume 17, <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/05/Loy-Healing-Ecology1.pdf>) //RM

In other words, part of the rich cultural legacy that the Greeks ¶ bequeathed to the West—for better and worse—is an increasing anxiety ¶ about who we are and what it means to be human. Loss (or reduction) of ¶ faith in God has left us rudderless, collectively as well as individually. ¶ Thanks to ever more powerful technologies, it seems like we can accomplish almost anything we want to do—yet we don’t know what our role ¶ is, what we should do. What sort of world do we want to live in? What ¶ kind of society should we have? If we cannot depend on God or godlike ¶ rulers to tell us, we are thrown back upon ourselves, and the lack of any ¶ grounding greater than ourselves is a profound source of dukkha, collective as well as individual.¶ To sum up, our modern sense of separation from the natural ¶ world has become an ongoing source of alienation and frustration. (This ¶ corresponds to points one through three, above.) What has been our collective response to this predicament?¶ Remember how we usually react to our individual predicament. I ¶ try to make my anxious sense of self “inside” more real by becoming attached to (identifying with) things in the “outside” world, such as money, fame, and power. No matter how much of them I may acquire, ¶ however, I never seem to have enough, because they cannot allay the ¶ basic anxiety, which stems from the inherent insecurity of my constructed sense of self. Believing that something outside myself is the solution to my sense of lack is the fundamental delusion. Such “solutions” ¶ actually reinforce the problem, which is the sense of separation or distance between myself and others. Is there a collective parallel to these ¶ sorts of compulsions? When we ask the question in this way, I believe that the answer ¶ becomes apparent: it’s our obsession with never-ending “progress” and ¶ growth. What motivates our attitude towards economic and technological development? When will our Gross National Product be large ¶ enough? When will we collectively consume enough? When will we have ¶ all the technology we need? Why is more always better if it can never be ¶ enough?¶ My point is that technology and economic growth in themselves ¶ cannot resolve the basic human problem about what it means to be human. They may be a good means to accomplish something but they are ¶ not good as ends-in-themselves. Since we are not sure how else to solve ¶ that problem, however, they have become a collective substitute, in effect: forms of secular salvation that we seek but never quite attain. Since ¶ we don’t really know where we want to go, or what we should value, we ¶ have become demonically obsessed with ever-increasing power and control. ¶ Notice the parallel with one’s individual predicament: lacking the ¶ security that comes from knowing our place and role in the cosmos, we ¶ have been trying to create our own security. Modern technology, in particular, has become our collective attempt to fully control the conditions ¶ of our existence on this planet. In effect, we have been trying to remold ¶ the earth so that it is completely adapted to serve our purposes, until ¶ everything becomes subject to our will, a “resource” we can use. This is ¶ despite the fact, or rather because of the fact, that we do not know what ¶ those purposes should be. Ironically, if predictably, this has not been ¶ providing the sense of security and meaning that we seek. We have become more anxious and confused, not less. ¶ If these parallels are valid—if they are an accurate description of ¶ our collective situation—something like the ecological crisis is inevitable. Sooner or later (now?) we must bump up against the limits of this compulsive project of endless growth and never-enough control. And if ¶ our increasing reliance on technology as the solution to such problems is ¶ itself a symptom of this larger problem, the ecological crisis requires ¶ more than a technological response (although technological developments are certainly necessary, of course—for example, more efficient ¶ solar panels). Increasing dependence on sophisticated, ever more powerful technologies tends to aggravate our sense of separation from the ¶ natural world, whereas any successful solution (if the parallel still holds) ¶ must involve recognizing that we are an integral part of the natural ¶ world. That also means embracing our responsibility for the welfare of ¶ the biosphere, because its well-being ultimately cannot be distinguished ¶ from our own well-being. Understood properly, then, humanity’s taking ¶ care of the earth’s rainforests is like me taking care of my own leg. ¶ (Sound familiar?)¶

#### Nuclear war is inevitable absent human solidarity – INNER peace is the only way to transform society

Daisaku 7 - Buddhist philosopher and president of Soka Gokkai International

(Ikeda, “Restoring the Human Connection: The First Step to Global Peace,” http://www.sgi-usa.org/newsandevents/docs/peace2007.pdf)//BB

The challenge of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons is ¶ 8 just such a trial in the quest for world peace, one that cannot be achieved if ¶ we are defeated by a sense of helplessness. The crucial element is to ensure ¶ that any struggle against evil is rooted firmly in a consciousness of the ¶ unity of the human family, something only gained through the mastery of ¶ our own inner contradictions. ¶ It is this kind of reconfiguration of our thinking that will make possible a ¶ skilled and restrained approach to the options of dialogue and pressure. The ¶ stronger our sense of connection as members of the human family, the more ¶ effectively we can reduce to an absolute minimum any application of the ¶ hard power of pressure, while making the greatest possible use of the soft ¶ power of dialogue. Tragically, the weighting in the case of Iraq has been ¶ exactly the reverse. ¶ The need for such a shift has been confirmed by many of the concerned ¶ thinkers I have met. Norman Cousins (1915–90), the writer known as the ¶ “conscience of America” with whom I published a dialogue, stated with ¶ dismay in his work Human Options: “The great failure of education—not ¶ just in the United States but throughout most of the world—is that it has ¶ made people tribe-conscious rather than species-conscious.”8¶ Similarly, when I met with Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the ¶ International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in November of last year, he ¶ declared powerfully: “… we continue to emphasize our differences instead ¶ of what we have in common. We continue to talk about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ ¶ Only when we can start to talk about ‘us’ as including all of humanity will ¶ we truly be at peace….” ¶ In our correspondence, Joseph Rotblat posed the question, “Can we master ¶ the necessary arts of global security and loyalty to the human race?”9¶ Three ¶ months after writing these words to me, Dr. Rotblat passed away. I believe ¶ his choice to leave this most crucial matter in the form of an open question ¶ 9 as an expression of his optimism and his faith in humanity. ¶ When our thinking is reconfigured around loyalty to the human race—our ¶ sense of human solidarity—even the most implacable difficulties will not ¶ cause us to lapse into despair or condone the panicked use of force. It will ¶ be possible to escape the snares of such shortsighted thinking. We will be ¶ empowered to engage in the kind of persistent exertion that Max Weber ¶ viewed as the ideal of political action, and the door will be open to the ¶ formation of consensus and persuasion through dialogue. ¶ The function of anger ¶ When my mentor Josei Toda used the words “a devil incarnate, a fiend, a ¶ monster,” he was referring to a destructiveness inherent in human life. It is ¶ a function of this destructiveness to shred our sense of human solidarity, ¶ sowing the seeds of mistrust and suspicion, conflict and hatred. Those who ¶ would use nuclear weapons capable of instantaneously killing tens of ¶ millions of people exhibit the most desperate symptoms of this pathology. ¶ They have lost all sense of the dignity of life, having fallen prey to their ¶ own inner demons. ¶ Buddhism classifies the underlying destructive impulses that give rise to ¶ such behavior as “the three poisons” (Jpn: san-doku) of greed, anger and ¶ ignorance. “The world of anger” can be thought of as the state of life of ¶ those in whom these forces have been directed outward toward others. ¶ Buddhism analyzes the inner state of human life in terms of the following ¶ ten categories, or “worlds”: Hell, Hunger, Animality, Anger, Humanity, ¶ Rapture, Learning, Realization, Bodhisattva and Buddhahood. Together ¶ these worlds constitute an interpenetrating functional whole, referred to as ¶ the inherent ten worlds. It is the wisdom and compassion of the world of ¶ Buddhahood that bring out the most positive aspect of each of the other ¶ 10 worlds. ¶ In the Buddhist scriptures we find the statement “anger can function for ¶ both good and evil,”10 indicating that just and righteous anger, the kind ¶ essential for countering evil, is the form of the world of anger that creates ¶ positive value. The anger that we must be on guard against is that which is ¶ undirected and unrestrained relative to the other nine worlds. In this case, ¶ anger is a rogue and renegade force, disrupting and destroying all in its ¶ path. ¶ In this form, the world of anger is a condition of “always seeking to surpass, ¶ unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing ¶ oneself.”11 When in the world of anger, we are always engaged in invidious ¶ comparisons with others, always seeking to excel over them. The resulting ¶ distortions prevent us from perceiving the world accurately; we fall easily ¶ into conflict, locking horns with others at the slightest provocation. Under ¶ the sway of such anger, people can commit unimaginable acts of violence ¶ and bloodshed. ¶ Another Buddhist text portrays one in the world of anger as “84,000 ¶ yojanas tall, the waters of the four oceans coming only up to his knees.”12¶ A yojana was a measure of distance used in ancient India; there are various ¶ explanations as to what the specific distance may be, but “84,000 yojanas” ¶ represents an immeasurable enormity. This metaphor indicates how the ¶ self-perception of people in the life-state of anger expands and swells until ¶ the ocean deeps would only lap their knees. ¶ The inner distortions twisting the heart of someone in this state prevent ¶ them from seeing things in their true aspect or making correct judgments. ¶ Everything appears as a means or a tool to the fulfillment of egotistical ¶ desires and impulses. In inverse proportion to the scale of this inflated ¶ arrogance, the existence of others—people, cultures, nature—appears ¶ 11nfinitely small and insignificant. It becomes a matter of no concern to ¶ harm or even kill others trivialized in this way. ¶ It is this state of mind that would countenance the use of nuclear weapons; ¶ it can equally be seen in the psychology of those who would advocate the ¶ use of such hideously cruel weapons as napalm, or, more recently, depleted ¶ uranium and cluster bombs. People in such a state of life are blinded, not ¶ only to the horrific suffering their actions wreak but also to the value of ¶ human life itself. ¶ For the sake of human dignity, we must never succumb to the numbing ¶ dehumanization of the rampant world of anger. When the atomic bomb was ¶ dropped on the city of Hiroshima, not only military personnel but also ¶ many scientists were thrilled by the “success” of this new weapon. ¶ However, the consciences of genuinely great scientists were filled with ¶ anguish. Einstein greeted this news with an agonized cry of woe, while ¶ Rotblat told me he was completely overcome with hopelessness. Their ¶ feelings were no doubt intensely resonant with the sentiments that ¶ motivated Josei Toda to denounce nuclear weapons. ¶ When Toda spoke of “declawing” the demonic nature of nuclear weapons, ¶ he had in mind the struggle to prevent the inner forces of anger from ¶ disrupting the ten worlds and going on an unrestrained rampage. He was ¶ calling for the steady and painstaking work of correctly repositioning and ¶ reconfiguring the function of anger in an inner world where wisdom and ¶ harmony prevail. This is the true meaning of “declawing.” ¶ For SGI members in particular it is thus vital we remember that not only ¶ our specific activities for peace and culture but the movement for “human ¶ revolution” based on the daily endeavor to transform our lives from within ¶ is a consistent and essential aspect of the historic challenge of nuclear ¶ disarmament and abolition. ¶ 12 unless we focus on this inner, personal dimension, we will find ourselves ¶ overwhelmed by the structural momentum of a technological civilization, ¶ which in a certain sense makes inevitable the birth of such demonic ¶ progeny as nuclear weapons.

#### Buddhist ethic is key to value to life

Zsolnai 11 - professor and director of the Business Ethics Center at the Corvinus University of Budapest

(Laszlo, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. vi)//BB

Today happiness is a top priority in economic, psychological and sociological research. In the last several decades the GDP doubled or tripled in Western coun- tries but the general level of happiness – the subjective well-being of people – remained the same. Happiness research disclosed evidences, which show that the major determinant of happiness is not the abundance of material goods but the qual- ity of human relationships and a spiritual approach to material welfare. Buddhist countries perform surprisingly well in this respect. There is a growing interest in Bhutan, this small Buddhist kingdom in the Himalayas, where the King of Bhutan introduced the adoption of an alternative index of social progress, the so-called Gross National Happiness (GNH). This mea- sure covers not only the material output of the country but also the performance of education, the development of culture, the preservation of nature and the extension of religious freedom. Experts attribute to the adoption of GNH that while Bhutan’s economy developed, the forestation of the country and well-being of people also increased. Thai Buddhist monk and philosopher, P. A. Payutto once said that one should not be a Buddhist or an economist to be interested in Buddhist economics. Buddhist ethical principles and their applications in economic life offer a way of being and acting, which can help people to live a more ecological and happier life while contributing to the reduction of human and non-human suffering in the world.

#### Our economic market cultivates more desire for materialistic values – DESTROYS value to life

Zsolnai 7 (Laszlo Zsolnai is a professor of business ethics and director of the Business Ethics Center [1] at Corvinus University of Budapest, Society and Economy , Vol. 29, No. 2, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUFFICIENCY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN A BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVE (August 2007), pp. 145-153, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41472078) //RM

The prospect theory developed by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky un- ¶ covers the basic empirical features of the value function of decision-makers. The ¶ central finding of prospect theory is that the value function is concave for gains ¶ and convex for losses (Kahneman - Tversky 1979). ¶ A salient characteristic of people's attitudes to changes is that losses loom ¶ larger than gains. "The aggravation that one experiences in losing a sum of money ¶ appears to be greater than the pleasure associated with gaining the same amount. ¶ Indeed, most people find symmetric bets of the form (. x , 0.50; -x, 0.50) distinc- ¶ tively unattractive. Moreover, the aversiveness of symmetrically fair bets gener- ¶ ally increases with the size of the stake. That is, if\* >y > 0, then (y, 0.50; -y, 0.50) ¶ is preferred to (jc, 0.50; -x, 0.50)" {ibid.: 279). ¶ The main statement of prospect theory is that the value function is steeper for ¶ losses than for gains. This means that decision-makers are more sensitive to losses ¶ than to gains. Experiments show that the ratio of the slopes in the domains of ¶ losses and gains, the "loss aversion coefficient", might be estimated as about 2 : 1 ¶ (Tversky - Kahneman 1992). ¶ Since humans (and other sentient beings) display loss sensitivity, it does make ¶ sense trying to reduce losses for oneself and for others rather than trying to in- ¶ crease gains for them. Losses should not be interpreted only in monetary terms or ¶ applied only to humans. The capability of experiencing losses, i.e., suffering, is ¶ universal in the realm of both natural and human kingdoms. Modern Western economics cultivates desires. People are encouraged to develop ¶ new desires for things to acquire and for activities to do. The profit motive of com- ¶ panies requires creating more demand. But psychological research shows that ma- ¶ terialistic value orientation undermines well-being. "People who are highly fo- ¶ cused on materialistic values have lower personal well-being and psychological ¶ health than those who believe that materialistic pursuits are relatively unimpor- ¶ tant. These relationships have been documented in samples of people ranging ¶ from the wealthy to the poor, from teenagers to the elderly, and from Australians ¶ to South Koreans." These studies document that "strong materialistic values are ¶ associated with a pervasive undermining of people's well-being, from low life ¶ satisfaction and happiness, to depression and anxiety, to physical problems such ¶ as headaches, and to personality disorders, narcissism, and antisocial behavior" ¶ (Kasser 2002: 22)

#### Buddhist economics create a shift away from traditional economic theory towards a more holistic understanding of the mind and what truly drives our intentions and actions to achieve happiness

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH

The notion of Gross National Happiness (GNH) – as first conceived by the King of Bhutan - presents a radical paradigm shift in development economics and social theory. GNH can be regarded as the Buddhist equivalent to Gross National Product (GNP), which is the conventional indicator for a nation’s economic performance. But GNH can also be regarded as the next evolution in indicators for sustainable development, going beyond measuring merely material values such as production and consumption, but instead incorporating all values relevant to life on this planet, including the most subtle and profound: happiness. The definition of happiness needs further clarification. In the Buddhist view, which generally corresponds to those of other spiritual traditions, happiness is not simply sensory pleasure, derived from physical comfort. Rather, happiness is an innate state of mind which can be cultivated through spiritual practice, overcoming mental and emotional states which induce suffering. In the Buddhist tradition this is a path of ‘liberation’; other spiritual traditions call it self-transformation. This definition of happiness is absent from conventional western sciences, on which modern economic theory is based. In fact, conventional economics and its indicators such as GNP, deliberately leave human happiness outside its spectrum, tacitly assuming that material development, as measured by GNP growth, is positively correlated to human well-being. Further analysis of the relationship between material development and human psychology has been outside the scope of economic and social theory. Yet this is changing: breakthrough research – in quantum physics, medicine, biology, behavioral science, psychology and cognitive science – is now making the science of the mind relevant to economics. Conversely, as the current discussion on GNH indicates, from within the profession of economics, attempts are made to broaden the scope of economics into the domain of psychology. While this allows us to find a common basis for GDP and GNH, it is important to note that this change constitutes a paradigm shift in our thinking. GNP and GNH are rooted in very different (and even opposing) views we have of the world and ourselves. Once we recognize this, we can embark on a coherent journey finding the possible content and meaning of GNH. So let’s first review the foundations of GNH and GNP, respectively.

#### Ethical economics are a prior question

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 15) //T.C.

To be ethically sound, economic activity must take place in a way that is not harmful to the individual, society or the natural environment. In other words, economic activity should not cause problems for oneself, agitation in society or degeneration of the ecosystem, but rather enhance well-being in these three spheres. If ethical values were factored into economic analysis, a cheap but nourishing meal would certainly be accorded more value than a bottle of whiskey. Thus, an economics inspired by Buddhism would strive to see and accept the truth of all things. It would cast a wider, more comprehensive eye on the question of ethics. Once ethics has been accepted as a legitimate subject for consideration, ethical questions then become factors to be studied within the whole causal process. But if no account is taken of ethical considerations, economics will be incapable of developing any understanding of the whole causal process, of which ethics forms and integral part. Modern economics has been said to be the most scientific of all the social sciences. Indeed, priding themselves on their scientific methodology, economists take only measurable quantities into consideration. Some even assert that economics is purely a science of numbers, a matter of mathematical equations. In its efforts to be scientific, economics ignores all non-quantifiable, abstract values. But by considering economic activity in isolation from other forms of human activity, modern economists have fallen into the narrow specialization characteristic of the industrial age. In the manner of specialists, economists try to eliminate all non-economic factors from their considerations of human activity and concentrate on a single perspective, that of their own discipline.

#### The ego is the root cause

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as delusion is basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the ego instincts in Buddhism is one of the forms of craving. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. The craving for egotistical pursuits has its deeper spring in the dogma of personal immortality. This is the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life. The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. Such annihilationist views may be closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. The ego illusion is not merely an intellectual construction, but is fed by deeper affective processes. Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively may turn out to be more subtle expressions of their ego, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Mindfulness overcomes all suffering

Sivaraksa 98 (Sulak Sivaraksa is an activist, economist, philosopher and the founder and director of the Thai NGO “Sathirakoses-Nagapradeepa Foundation” , “Buddhism and Human Freedom”, Buddhist-Christian Studies , Vol. 18, (1998), pp. 63-68, University of Hawai'i Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1390436>)

If Buddhists understand structural violence and its roots in dosa, hatred, ¶ and learn how to eliminate it mindfully and nonviolently, Buddhism will ¶ not only be relevant to the modern world but also be a source of libera- ¶ tion. In a parallel with structural violence and dosa, consumerism is linked, ¶ directly and indirectly, with lobha, greed, and raga, lust. One can see this ¶ clearly in advertising and the mass media, which exploit women's bodies ¶ to seduce people into attempting to meet artificially created needs. ¶ Again, modern education deals almost exclusively with the heads and ¶ not the hearts of students; cleverness is recognized and rewarded materi- ¶ ally, and generosity or awareness of social evils is not necessary for suc- ¶ cess. Indeed, it may be an impediment. Students are led to pursue wealth ¶ and power, rather than to understand that these do not lead to happiness, ¶ especially where, as in modern society, wealth and power rest on mass ¶ poverty and ecological destruction. This is indeed the fostering of avijja, ¶ ignorance, and moha, delusion, rather than real education.¶ If Buddhists are to make a meaningful contribution to world peace and ¶ liberation of the modern world from violence and oppression, they must ¶ confront these three root causes of evil: greed, hatred, and delusion, not ¶ only in the individual person but also in their social and structural dimen- ¶ sions. All practicing Buddhists, not only specialists, must develop the right ¶ mindfulness that allows them to deal with these issues at their deepest ¶ levels.¶ Bhavana, mindfulness, and samadhi, concentration, indeed bring libera- ¶ tion from the mental sufferings caused by greed, hatred, and delusion, ¶ mental sufferings which corrupt the mind and cause people to commit ¶ all forms of evil. Bhavana can be cultivated at any moment, within any ¶ activity in daily life: breathing, eating, drinking, washing the dishes, gar- ¶ dening, or driving the car (this may be especially useful when driving in ¶ Bangkok traffic). Bhavana and samadhi directly cultivate seeds of peace ¶ within the mind, developing peace and happiness that can then be shared ¶ with others.

#### Solves the root cause of war

Dharmakosajarn 11 (Dr. Phra Dharmakosajarn, Venerable Professor at Mahachulalongkornrajvidyalya University, Chairman at ICDV & IABU, Rector at MCU, Buddhist Virtues in Socio-Economic Development, p.71, May 2011, BG)

The solution for this suffering lies in the practice of spirituality. Buddhists Middle Path¶ balances both spirituality and materialism to lead the contended life on the principles of sharing¶ and caring. Buddhist virtues, precepts and principles focus on establishing peace and harmony through spiritual and socio-economic development in the society. The virtue regulatesthe behavior, strengthens the meditation, meditation in turn develops wisdom. The Virtue tend to elevate the man which all can cultivate irrespective of creed, color, race, or sex, the earth can be transformed into a paradise where all can live in perfect peace and harmony as ideal citizens of one world. The Buddhists four sterling virtues act as building blocks of spiritual and socio-economic development are- Metta, Karuna, Mudita, Upekka, which are collectively termed as Brahamaviharasin Pali are means to develop friendship, harmonious relationship, removing discord, establishing peace within oneself. The first sublime state is universal love (Metta). It is defined as the sincere wish for the welfare and genuine happiness of all living beings without exception (Ven. Narada¶ Thera, 1997). The second virtue is Compassion (Karuna). It is defined as that which makes¶ the hearts of the good quiver when others are subjected to suffering or which dissipates the suffering¶ of others. It removes the woes of others. The third virtue is Sympathetic joy or appreciative joy¶ (Mudita), which tends to destroy jealousy, its direct enemy. The fourth virtue is Equanimity (Upekka).¶ It is discerning rightly, viewing justly or looking impartially, that is without attachment or aversion, without favour or disfavor. These virtues are the foundations of socio-economic development.

#### Transforming our inner selves reverses the harmful effects of mainstream economics

Tideman 11 - founder and managing partner of Global Leaders Academy in the Netherlands and a Senior Fellow of the Garrison Institute in New York

(Sander, Joel, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 150)//BB

While this may be a distant ideal, we can be inspired by a fact of historic signif- icance: the new emerging scientific paradigm of non-material interconnectedness – everything being an integral part of the larger whole, with human consciousness at its source – is in agreement with central tenets of Buddhism. As Buddha has taught, once we fully understand the implication of the interdependent nature of reality, breakthrough insights will emerge. These will indicate the best way forward for managing our planetary household, which triggers hope for our future. The eco- nomic models of the future will no doubt account for a reality much closer to the totality of the human experience. They will be more aligned with mankind’s deeper aspiration, in which the mind, emotions and other intangible values play such an important role.¶ By being so aligned to the emerging scientific worldview, the philosophy of Buddhism can play an important role in this endeavor. It takes the inner experience as starting point of the inquiry into reality, as opposed to conventional science, which takes outer reality as starting point. The power of the Buddhist approach is that it does not intend to exclude the conventional scientific approach, but expands it. The reverse is more difficult. By expanding the outward oriented approach of sci- ence, and taking a more holistic, inclusive and systemic approach to understanding reality, Buddhism can help defining and explaining a comprehensive understanding of human life, human experience, human motivation and human behavior. In addi- tion, Buddhism has also much to say how we can free ourselves from the systemic, structural violence that mainstream economics is bringing about.

#### Buddhist economics are key to social justice and environmental sustainability

Essen 11 – PhD in Cultural Anthropology, Professor @ Soka

(Juliana, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 61)//BB

Ecofeminist Vandana Shiva asks the pointed question: What should be the objec- tive of the global economy: freedom of trade or freedom for survival? If the latter, changes are necessary in our conception of economics. Mainstream economic thought and practice has resulted in widespread socioeconomic disparity and envi- ronmental devastation in all corners of the world, unmitigated by a multi-billion dollar development industry informed by these same economic models. To reverse this trend, the dominant forms of economic thought and practice must be reunited with ethics that are more caring of the human-nature base. Such ethics may be found in alternative economic models based on religious, spiritual, environmental, or fem- inist values. This essay considers one such alternative: Buddhist economics. Though Buddhism is principally concerned with individual enlightenment, it offers guide- lines for householders’ economic activities that give rise to a more environmentally sustainable and socially just way of being in the world.

#### INDIVIDUAL and LOCAL decisions to embrace mindful economics spill up

Magnuson 11 – PhD in Economics, Professor @ PCC

(Joel, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 100)//BB

Our vision of a mindful economy is not rooted in revolutionary ideology. It is practically inconceivable that a massive $11 trillion dollar economy can be fun- damentally altered in a peaceful or meaningful way through a sudden revolutionary catharsis. Bringing our vision of a mindful economy to reality will also require much hard work and patience. What is more conceivable and practical than cathartic rev- olution is a process of implementing real economic change in small steps beginning with the development of locally-based alternative institutions.¶ Capitalism and all other major economic systems that have existed historically were originally small and localized systems. In a mindful economy, smaller-scale local economic systems are not enclaves of economic utopias or communes, they are merely the starting places from which a broader and more comprehensive system can evolve and grow.

#### Citizen compassion drastically transforms economic systems – their belief that economics runs OUTSIDE of personal decisions is a new link

Nelson 11 – PhD in Economics, Professor of Economics @ UC-Davis, most known for her application of feminist theory to questions of the definition of the discipline of economics, and its models and methodology

(Julie, “Ethical Principles and Economic Transformation – A Buddhist Approach,” p. 28)//BB

If we take off the blinders of mechanical thinking and look at economic life as it is actually lived, we can see that – far from being “locked-up” – it provides numerous interstices for wise and compassionate response. The sorts of gaps or flexible areas in the functioning of actual businesses that allow some CEOs to take excessive compensation out of profits, for example, also create the space for other CEOs to make authentic movements towards better labor or environmental standards – to be the “good and honest businessperson” mentioned by the Dalai Lama (2002, 133). The opportunity to sell can be an opportunity to meet needs; the opportunity to buy can be an opportunity to support worthy ventures; the opportunity to work can be an opportunity to right livelihood. The system can also be shaped through citizen action and cultural mores: the capitalism of France, Japan or Sweden, for example, is quite different from the capitalism of the United States or the United Kingdom, and capi- talism of one era is different from that of another. Commerce has the potential to be “an act of participation and compassion” (Fischer 2005, 221–222).

#### Alt solves – Movements that begin on the personal level spillover onto the global scale

Ariyaratne, 98 (Dr. Sri Lankabhimanya Ahangamage Tudor Ariyaratne, Doctor of Lit from Vidyodaya University and leader of the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement an experiment in Buddhist Economics, “Schumacher Lectures on Buddhist Economics”, pg. 21)//DH

The central concept of Development as conceived, accepted and implemented by Sarvodaya is based on Buddhist spirit. Yet it has within its follower’s people of all religious faiths. Sarvodaya is not opposed to any religion. On the contrary in the same Buddhist spirit Sarvodaya respects all religions. According to Sarvodaya, Development is an awakening process. This awakening process should begin with human personalities and extend to families, peer groups, village and urban communities, national communities and the world community. As the idea spreads and the movement expands each of these awakening processes enhances the others slowly building up a critical mass which is needed for a real social transformation. So we put down the Objective of the Sarvodaya Movement as follows: ¶ To generate a non-violent total revolution towards the creation of a Sarvodaya Social Order, which will ensure the total awakening of: - Human Personalities (Purna Paurushodaya), Human Families (Kutumbodaya), Village Communities (Gramodaya), Urban Communities (Nagarodaya), National Communities (Deshodaya) and the World Community (Vishvodaya).

#### Every individual reflection on interconnection is crucial to recognize compassion and empathy, social change is the product of individual change and personal liberation

Kiessel, 09, (Amanda Kiessel, Dr. Amanda Kiessel is Program Director at Sewalanka Foundation, a Sri Lankan non-profit development organization that focuses on increasing the capacity of rural communities to identify and address their own needs PhD in Environmental Studies and a background in sustainable agriculture and organizational development, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Beyond the Linear Logic of Project Aid Alternative: Understandings of Participation and Community Vitality”, pgs. 183-198)//LOH

Finally a GNH framework highlights the role of the individual agents in system level change. Happiness cannot be experienced at a national level. This means that GNH has to be more than a compilation of existing national-level statistics and indices that hide the individual and village level disparities. Participatory action research will be needed to understand happiness in context and from the bottom up and analyze how people’s definition of ancient teachers and our modern scientists happiness emerges from the type of personal transformation that leads to social transformation. It comes from recognizing the incessant motion, unity, and interdependence of all things and from “widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole nature in its beauty”. Einstein reminds us that even if we are unable to achieve this completely, “striving for such achievement is in itself a part of the liberation and a foundation for inner security”. (Einstein 1954).

#### Meditation and reflection is the first step to teaching ethical actions

Forge, 97, (Paul G. La Forge, Divine Word Missionary and professor in the Business Management Department of Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, Masters Degree in Clinical-Counseling Psychology, he holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 12/13, From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics Journey: The Second Annual Internationa Vincentian Conference Promoting Business Ethics (Sep., 1997), pp. 1283-1295, “Teaching Business Ethics through Meditation”, JSTOR)//LOH

Business Ethics taught only from books and textual materials may occupy an important place in education, but my purpose is different. My goal is to help the students become ethical persons. This requires an ability to perform three seemingly simple tasks: First, to recognize ethical issues; second, to analyze them; and third, to act upon them. The ethical principles derived from textual materials covered in a Business Ethics course have their place, but only as a tool or a standard used by an ethical person. The purpose of this article is to show how meditation can be used to help the student to become an ethical person. My purpose in using meditation to teach Business Ethics is to produce people with an "Ethical Vision". Meditation gives students an awareness of ethical issues in their lives and leads to the discovery and application of models of ethical conduct to serve as guides to behavior in general and to ethical decision making in particular. In effect, I use meditation to stop the world. There are many ways to stop the world and many kinds of meditation. I will restrict myself to two forms, namely, discursive and non-dis cursive meditation. The classroom communica tion process between the instructor and the students is slowed down by both non-discursive and discursive meditation so that students can learn to use meditation to accomplish the three tasks mentioned above. Non-discursive meditation greatly contributes to the process of constructing a vision because it gives people a sense of themselves and their place in the world. Discursive meditation, in its many forms, gives substance to an ethical vision because it leads to an awakening to the existence and importance of ethical issues in life. In part one, I will describe how the students are led through non-discursive meditation to discover themselves as ethical persons. They are also given the tools to explore ethical issues through non-discursive meditation. In part two, I will discuss a transition state between non-discursive and discursive medita tion. After discovering themselves as ethical persons, the students are led to use non-discur sive meditation as a technique to construct their own ethical value system and apply it to their own lives. At this transition stage, an art medium is extremely useful for discovering and analyzing meanings, especially ethical meanings. Through non-discursive meditation, the indi vidual is taught to become aware of him/herself and his/her place in the world. However, non discursive meditation is not an end in itself. Discursive meditation, as is explained in more detail in part three, gives the participant a chance to compare who he/she is with what he/she should be. Here the student is encouraged to compare the values he/she has discovered about him/herself during non-discursive meditation with an ideal, and construct a system of ethical principles for him/herself using discursive meditation. Textual materials are recommended here and the student is encouraged to search for the ideal. The result is the development of a person with an ethical vision through meditation in both non-discursive and discursive forms. I. Discovering ethical issues through non-discursive meditation An ethical person must become aware of his/her self, his/her ethical values, and his/her place in the world. Non-discursive meditation can be a powerful device to teach students how they can stop their world and take stock of their lives because the body itself participates in the meditation as the locus of experience and insight, inseparably one with the mind (Takeuchi, 1993, p. xx). At this point, the process is entirely self centered and observational, without the con straint of reference to any system of ethics or values. Thus viewed, it is only a first step, but a very necessary first step to becoming an ethical person. Because this step is only a means to an end, virtually any school of non-discursive meditation will suffice. There are many kinds of non-discursive meditation techniques, such as Taikyokken, Zen, and Yoga; these teach people to look at and reflect on their place in the world. The goal is to teach students a way of stopping and reflecting, to provide a context for devel oping and applying their own values. Therefore, non-discursive meditation is not used as an end in itself. Taikyokken, Yoga, or Zen all have their proponents, but in an ethics class, they serve only as a tool, not as a philosophy. Non-discursive meditation serves to stop the world. Students, like business people, lead busy, active, stressful lives. Non-discursive meditation serves to put a brake on the activities of a busy day. The ethical person must be able to stop this world and reflect upon life. This is an ability to step aside from normal activities in order to recognize ethical issues that arise in business or personal life.

#### Mindfulness allows us to shed the ego - this creates a realization of our unity with all living things

Snauwaert 9 - Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education; Chair of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Toledo

(Dale, “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity,” Current Issues in Comparative Education 12.1, Directory of Open Access Journals)//BB

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes:¶ What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” ”reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, the ego is a socially constructed entity, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a prediscursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum-reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is selfrealization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes:¶ I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43)¶ In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

#### MRI studies reveal that reaching enlightenment fundamentally changes brain function and generates an experience of unity with the world

Ritskes 3 - MRI Research Centre, Aarhus University Hospital Skejby, Denmark, Biomedical Laboratory University of Southern Denmark, and Institute of Psychology University of Aarhus

(Rients, “MRI Scanning During Zen Meditation: The Picture of Enlightenment,” Constructivism in the Human Sciences, 8.1, http://zen.nl/nieuws/artikelen/hersenscan.pdf)//BB

This study demonstrates, consistent with earlier findings, that a higher activity in the gyrus frontalis medius arises during the initial phase of Zen meditation. The gyrus frontalis medius is part of the frontal lobe, this area, sometimes called the Attention Association area, is held responsible for more¶ ¶ complex human feelings. Austin\* concludes, based on studies of people with frontal lobe lesions, that increased activity in this area is thought to be associated with enhanced insights and attcntiveness, heightened interests, sharper mental focussing, and deepened emotional resonances. In the famous case report on Phincas Gage-, it is reported that the gyrus frontalis medius in the prefrontal cortex was damaged due to an accident. Consequently, he lost his personality, developed blunted emotions and lost social interest. Presumably, this outcome can be summarized as a loss of compassion. Other research has shown that electrical stimulation of the prefrontal cortex is associated with positive feelings\*. This study reports that one-quarter of the group that received electrical stimulation of this area of the brain, reported positive changes in the mood as well. Additionally, a PET-studyiohas demonstrated decreased frontal-lobe activity in murderers (there may after all have been a good scientific reason for the¶ ¶ New York State prison to have started a Zen meditation group in 1984 -an example that is followed by many prisons world wide). Increased activity in the basal ganglia during meditation conforms to what one would expect during certain Zen practices. For example, the tea-ceremony and Zen-archery are just two examples of rituals that need optimal use of the main functions of the basal ganglia, namely the making of precisely controlled movements. Moreover, activation of the basal ganglia appears to be stimulated by counting the breadth,¶ ¶ thereby possibly resulting in improved control of movements by the conscious breathing process. Decreased activity in the gyrus occipitalis superior and the anterior cingulatcd suggests that, during meditation, there is less interference of our will and less awareness of where we are. In summary, current research is suggestive of a state of mind, which may have resemblances to the experience of an enlightenment state, where time and place limits have disappeared, and a great feeling of love/unity is experienced.

#### Neuroplasticity proves

Begley 7 – Yale graduate, former science columnist @ Newsweek

(Sharon, “Train Your Mind, Change Your Brain: How a New Science Reveals Our Extraordinary Potential to Transform Ourselves,” p. 13-14)//BB

The discoveries of neuroplasticity, in particular, resonate with Buddhist teachings and have the potential to benefit from interactions with Buddhism. The reason gets to the very core of Buddhist belief "Buddhism defines a person as a constantly changing dynamic stream,” says Matthiew Ricard, a French-born Buddhist monk. A veteran of the scientific dialogues with the Dalai lama, he is anchoring the "Buddhist side" of the 2004 meeting.¶ Even scholars who were not involved in the meeting—hut who have followed the dialogues closely—point out the consonances between Buddhist teaching and the idea, and potential, of neuroplasticity. "There are many strong parallels between the neuroscientific findings and the Buddhist narrative," savs Francisca Cho, a Buddhist scholar at George Washington University. "Buddhism's is a story of how we are in pain and suffering and how we have the power to change that. The scientific findings about neuroplasticity parallel the Buddhist narrative of enlightenment because the) show that, although we have deeply ingrained ways of thinking and although the brain comes with some hardwiring, we also have the possibility of changing. The idea that we are constantly changing means there is no intrinsic nature to the self or the mind, which is what Buddhism teaches. Instead, both self and mind are extremely plastic. Our activities inform who we are; as we act. so we shall become. We are products of the past, but because of our inherently empty nature, we always have the opportunity to reshape ourselves."¶ The discovery that mere thought can alter the very stuff of the brain is another natural point of connection between the science of neuroplasticity and Buddhism. Buddhism has taught for twenty-five hundred years that the mind is an independent force that can be harnessed by will and attention to bring about physical change. "The discovery that thinking something produces effects just as doing something does is a fascinating consonance with Buddhism," says Francisca Cho. "Buddhism challenges the traditional belief in an external, objective reality. Instead, it teaches that our reality is created by our own projections; it is thinking that creates the external world beyond us. The neuroscience findings harmonize with this Buddhist teaching."

#### The alternative allows us to DIG DEEPER – creates understandings of webs of economic relationships

Payutto 88 (a well-known Thai Buddhist monk, an intellectual, and a prolific writer. He is among the most brilliant Buddhist scholars in the Thai Buddhist history. He authored Buddha Dhamma, which is acclaimed to as one of the masterpieces in Buddhism that puts together Dhamma and natural laws by extensively drawing upon Pali Canon, Atthakatha, Digha, etc., to clarify Buddha's verbatim speech, Buddhist Economists: A middle way for the Marketplace, pg 10) //T.C.

Yet this is precisely the trouble with modern economic thinking. Lacking any holistic, comprehensive insight and limited by the narrowness of their specialized view, economists single out one isolated portion of the stream of conditions and fail to consider results beyond that point. An example: there exists a demand for a commodity, such as whiskey. The demand is supplied by production - growing grain and distilling it into liquor. The whiskey is then put on the market and then purchased and consumed. When it is consumed, demand is satisfied. Modern economic thinking stops here, at the satisfaction of the demand. There is no investigation of what happens after the demand is satisfied. By contrast, an economics inspired by Dhamma would be concerned with how economic activities influence the entire process of causes and conditions. While modern economics confines its regard to events within its specialized sphere, Buddhist economics would investigate how a given economic activity affects the three interconnected spheres of human existence: the individual, society, and nature or the environment. In the case of the demand for a commodity such as whiskey, we would have to ask ourselves how liquor production affects the ecology and how its consumption affects the individual and society.

#### Only in the space opened by the alternative reflection can we find kusala and go beyond the affirmative’s

Hershock, 07, (Peter D. Hershock, Coordinator of the Asian Studies Development Program degrees from Yale University (B.A., Philosophy) and the University of Hawai’i (Ph.D., Asian and Comparative Philosophy) and has focused his research on the philosophical dimensions of Buddhism and on using Buddhist conceptual resources to address contemporary issues, including: technology and development, education, human rights, and the role of values in cultural and social change, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Activating Difference: Appreciating Equity in an Era of Global Interdependence”, pgs. 1-9.)//LOH

sTo pass through the aporta posed by the complex realities of the 21” centuly. we must or’iwale our dijfererwiea as the very basis of all mutual contribution. As a way of fleshing out what titis activation might Izacan, let me distinguish between variety and diversity as two means-to and meanings-of difference — two qualities and directions of differentiation processes, Variety is function of simple co existence, s quantItative index of factual multiplicity, (t connotes (hinge beiri-dfffcrerw a surface characteristic that is visible si a glance. Diversity Is a function of complex intrrtlrprwiencc. a qualitative Index of self-sustaining and difference-appreciating patterns of mutual enninibunon Lo shared welfare. Diversity connotes things b omLrtg-dffeient a process of meaningful dlfferentimion. a relational aclijevenient that becomes evident, If st ail, only over time. To make this distinction more concrete. consider the ranges of plant and animal species and the InterrelatIonships among them in a zoo and in a naturally occurring ecosystem. An idea] ZiXi. for Instance, might include representatives of every relevant Plant and animal species In a given ecosystem. ¡tut these species Would bevase of the nature of zoos, have vy little relevance for ‘tue another. They wuulct be tri little or no position to contribute to OIi OiiOthe?s welfare as they do In the environments within, and along with which, they have evolved. Zoos are high In varlety’ are high In diversity. In this room today, there is Tharkable variety In terms of cultural backgrounds, histories] experiences academic training, and religious or spiritual ‘alb1liUes. Whether or not this gathering begins to exhibit dbersity will depend on how well we are able to go beyond how much we dfffcr’frovrt each another to how best we might differ.Jœ cine another. To resolve the predicaments arising with complex globalization interdependence and to break through the aporia of difference they bring Into focus, we must go beyond recognizing the co existence of different world views - the variety of ways In which humans conceive the meaning of ‘the good’: a good life, a good environment or s good political economy. ‘To bring about truly equitable global transformation, we must begin realising and continuously enhancing social, economic, political, cultural. technological, and -l wpuld argue - spirItual diversity. This means going beyond modem universalism that would deny our differences In celebration of dreamed for equality. But It also means going beyond postmodern relativisms that would hold differences to be critically incommensurable and that would warrant the validity of fundamentalist tribalism. The former are likely to result In a world In which everyone Is exactly like me the latter, one in which we live adjacent to one another In enclaves of mutually enforced moral apartheid. There Is no doubt that tolerance Is better than intolerance. But tolerating the differences of others Is no longer good enough. An n’a of predicament- resolution compels: first, developing capadUra foe hsnnonitjng distinctively differing worldvlews and conceptions of the good: and, secondly. generating commitments of sufficient intercultural gravity to reconfigure the dynamics cf our globally complex Interdependence across both sectors and scales. DiversIty Itself, I would argue. should be seen as an Indispensable global commons and public good. A crucial entailment of enhancing diversity Is moving beyond dichotomous thinking. The self other dichotomy Is perhaps the most basic and virulent expression of this, but no less entrenched are our tendencies to split the world Into what Is attractive or aversive, pure or Impure. right or wrong. good or evil. in s phrase drawn from Mahaysna Buddhism (but with resonances in other spintual and religious traditions sa weill. we must begin engaging our circumstances no-duallstlcally. This does not mean ignorinS differences. Rather, sa proposed by the Huayrn Buddhist thinker. Fazang. It means seeing that all things are the same. precises Insofar as they differ meaningfully from one another. Non.dti&tSO’ means renlisng that thlng ultimately ore only what they neon for one another. Given this, changing the way things are changing ran be’ seen sa a process of opening, within present realities, new courses vI meaning making Itere. the early Buddhist contrast between alms and cncieavuurs that have kusoio results and those thai have aku,sciki resulta la quite useful- Kusoio and ctktiscrla arr normally translated as wholesome’ and unwholrsiinw’. inri lii tari kusolo s a superlative it dors not mean good as tipirrsr’d r» had ‘killed as opposed to unskilled. wholesotne as opposed io unwholesome. or something that Is just good enough’ Rather. kiisoin ercmtnotes heading In the direction of excellence or virumosity. Conducting ourselves in a kusala manner is the Buddhist meaning of going ‘beyond good and evil. It Is the expression of resolutely appreciative karma—intentions and conduct that continuously result in adding value to or enriching our situation. but also lo our becoming ever iriree valuably situated. Acnwdlng to the Sakkapanlia butta. It is only by both decreasing the akusala and Increasing the kusala that we stop proliferating impediments to liberation (pcipnncnl) dissolving the root conditions of conflict and suffering. To break through the aporia of difference with which we now flnd ourselves confronted, we must go beyond being non-judgmental or averring the ultimate equality of one and ail- ‘fliese may perhaps help decrease the okwmla effects of dichotomous thinking: but they will not generate kuanlo patterns el outcome and opportunity. For that. we must conserve our dillernien rather than disarming them Perhaps surpnsingly. then, if we are to orirmtl global Interdependence toward greater equity. we most refrain from the temptation to conceive of equity In terms of equality of opportunity. Equality is a very useful fiction - the pursuit of which has done much. for example. to positively reframe gender discourse and political practice – but it is a fiction nonetheless .and One that can hardly ring true in a world of fabulously widening Income gaps Equity can only be enhanced to the extent that the dynamics of our interdependence’ enable and encourage all present to contribute to furthering their own interest in ways that are deemed valuable by others. In short. equity is rooted in activation of our differences to be able to make a difference for ourselves and for others. ultimately there is no equity without diversity. One of the insights about diversity afforded by the natural a’orid is that diversity is highest. not within any wven ecosystem. ini rather In the ecotone or zone o’ overlap between them. That s. diversity tends to br highest where the potentiatl for conflicts among values, aims and interests is greatest. it is not coincidental ¡hat our era of increasingly broad and deep predicaments is also an eta of historically unprecedented potendail for both diversity and equity. Realising this potential would surely bring about a happier world Ðcsng so. however, will require that wr work together to create social. economic. political, cultural and rçhnobogicai conditioru under which we can realise and deepen our diversity as a crucial global relational commons and pubLic good. This can he accomplished only 1w deepening our capacities for and commitnients- o r’gntributing tu shared iloiirisliiiig. realising ktisala ores of choiwje. mtimeiiFby’mumdnit trois wherever each of us happens to br sitting. standing. walking or lying dnwn. Some might object that as good as titis sounds. surety It is a path that could br travelled only by the extraordinary few. Global transInrinatio’i’ has a heroic ring. and it is tempting to insist that it can only be spurred and guided by those chosen by heaven’. To this. I would respond by invuking the Confucian response of Mcncius when asked about tite difference between the human and the animai. The difference, he admitted. is infinitesimal. What distinguishes the human is a dispositiOn for enchanting the ordinary: taking eattng atad turning it into culinary and social art. taking cries of fear and pain and turning them into poetry and sonw taking the act ol procreation and translormink it Into romantic Love and family, It is our human nature to take thln. as they have cane to be. and to dtstirlctltiell, enchant nr appreciate them. And given this. although some freedom of choice is certainly better than none at all, human freedom cannot be exhausted by the exercise of choice. That would be to root freedom in dichotomotic thinking - a matter of getting what I want and avoiding what I do not want. Freedom finally becomes then only a means to further want or lack. Expressing our deepest human nature is expressing our disposition for entering into appreciative and liberating relationships. ‘Riere la a passage in the Dicwmond Sainz where the Buddha is asked what he attained with complete, unsurpassed enlightenment and liberation. His answer was: “Not thing.” Liberating happiness is not something achieved or gained: it is a quality of relationship through which our entire situation is suffused with compassion, equanimity, loving-kindness and joy in the good fortune of others ultimately, there is no freedom or happiness to be attained. There is only the happiness of relating freely in deep and mutual enrichment. Although the dynamics of 21st century globalization are generating ever greater and deeper predicaments they are also generating ever more potent opportunities for realizing global meaning of happiness and human flourishing. Let me nid 1w voicing hope that the academic sessions lit folles’ will eontnbute, in distinctively differing and concrete ways. to the wise and kusaln activation of these opportunities.

#### The alternatives path of individual liberation opens spaces for compassion insight tolerance and happiness

TIDEMAN, 04, (SANDER G.TIDEMAN, Mandarin Training Center, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 2004, “Gross National Happiness: Towards a New Paradigm in Economics”, http://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/pubFiles/Gnh&dev-10.pdf)//LOH

These Buddhist principles provided the ground for some 21st century authors to define the concept of Buddhist economics . But Buddha himself made it very clear: real happiness does not come from acquiring or consuming material things. Happiness is essentially a state of mind or consciousness, and mind/consciousness is distinct from matter. Thus, Buddhism considers the path of mental or spiritual development superior to that of material development. What really matters is to psychologically detach oneself from matter, and strive for liberation and enlightenment, which is considered the ultimate state of happiness and fulfillment. This is achieved by the cultivation of values within one’s mind, such as insight, compassion, tolerance and detachment. Only this will bring true happiness, both for the individual and society.

#### Meditation can reveal the “no-self” and eventually reveal that there was never a self in the first place

Purser 12 {Ronald E. Purser, PhD in organizational behavior from Case Western Reserve University and a BA in psychology from Sonoma State University, Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, Vol 10, No 4 (2012), “Deconstructing Lack: A Buddhist Perspective on Egocentric Organizations”} //DTB

The sense of self is constructed and sustained through the interactions of the five skandhas. In other words, the skandhas are physical-perceptual-cognitive-affective events—constantly changing configurations—that appear to the untrained observer to be continuous and substantial. Buddhist insight meditation trains the mind of the practitioner in powers of concentration, observation and contemplation—with the intent of fostering the growth of insight into anatman(no-self)—that what appears as a substantial, enduring and independent entity is rapidly constructed moment-by-moment, with no real sense of permanence or ground. Thus, Buddhist practice aims to foster a deeply embodied insight into the nature of the self, cutting through the delusion in a fictitious and illusory self that we normally represent and mistakenly take to be real (Brown and Engler, 1986). Such insight or realization is not a one-time affair, but is continuously deepened and stabilized through repeated and disciplined meditative practice. Describing the advanced stages of insight (vipassana) practice, Engler (2003) states:…I can observe how individual, discrete moments of consciousness and their ―objects‖ arise and pass away together, are constructed and deconstructed moment by moment without remainder—without any ―subject‖ or ―self,‖ even an observing self, existing apart from the process, enduring behind it, or carrying it forward to the next moment (75). Buddhist meditation practice weakens attachment and identifications with such false constructions of the self, revealing the self as being empty of any ―self-nature,‖ essentially exposing the groundlessness of identity. Insights into ―no-self‖ nature may come gradually or suddenly (in Zen, kensho or satori). The goal of Buddhist practice is not to attain some sort of extraordinary ―mystical experience,‖ nor does it result in regressive return to primary narcissism by basking in oceanic feelings of oneness (Bion, 1963; Epstein, 1998), for example, warned such pursuits could lead to a ―catastrophe‖ (Bion, 1963), triggering psychic fragmentation or disintegration, or even touch what Eigen describes as the ―psychotic core‖ within each individual. However, most psychoanalysts, until recently, have not practiced nor studied Buddhism—and such criticisms and misconceptions are misleading. Clearly, recognition of no-self is often profoundly disturbing, evoking feelings of terror, anxiety and fear (Epstein, 1995; 2007:30; 2008). Preliminary concentration practices are first employed to develop a strong somatic foundation of stability in order to counterbalance the effects of these destabilizing insights. As pointed out earlier, insight into selflessness does not eliminate nor annihilate the self—but only reveals that it never existed in the first place. As Gyatso (1984:40) clarifies, ―Selflessness is not a case of something that existed in the past becoming non-existent; rather, this sort of ‗self‘ is something that never did exist. What is needed is to identify as non-existent something that always was non-existent…‖. The true self of Buddhist awakening is, as Magid (2003:270) points out, more of a recognition of an ―absence rather than a presence of something.‖

#### Personal reflection transcends existential shackles

Zadek 93 (Simon Zadek writer and advisor focused on business and sustainability. He is Senior Visiting Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation and Senior Fellow at the Global Green Growth Institute,“The Practice of Buddhist Economics? Another View”

The American Journal of Economics and Sociology , Vol. 52, No. 4 (Oct., 1993), pp. 433-445

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc., http://www.jstor.org/stable/3487468)

It is wrong to conclude, therefore, that the practice of Buddhism does not ¶ offer insights into the matter of social organization, even if Pryor is right in ¶ arguing that the canonical texts do not suggest that the Buddha advocated one ¶ or other form. In particular, the form of social organization of the Sangha de- ¶ scribed by Chakravarti suggests that communal, non-hierarchical forms of decision-making were seen as offering an aid in discarding the pressures of desires ¶ rooted in the Self (ego), and thus an aid to achieving nibbana (nirvana). Thus, ¶ while the Buddha saw the process of production (and reproduction) as key ¶ elements in the generation of greed and the loss of compassion (Chakravarti, ¶ 1992:16), he also saw that the actual structure of decision-making could support ¶ or impede a transcendence of these existential shackles. Pryor certainly rec- ¶ ognizes this. So, although he insists that the Buddha understood that social ¶ conditions could never be fundamentally bettered, he agrees that they "might ¶ help or hinder humans in their search for nibbana" (1991:20).5 However, Pryor's ¶ decision to focus on the texts rather than practice draws him away from exploring ¶ this in more detail.

#### The alternative challenges self-identity as a motivating factor

Purser 12 {Ronald E. Purser, PhD in organizational behavior from Case Western Reserve University and a BA in psychology from Sonoma State University, Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, Vol 10, No 4 (2012), “Deconstructing Lack: A Buddhist Perspective on Egocentric Organizations”} //DTB

Psychoanalysts have shown a great deal of interest in Buddhism, going back to the early dialogues with Eric Fromm and D.T. Suzuki (Fromm, Suzuki, and Demartino, 1960). Buddhist practice is aimed at seeing through the mechanism of mind that perpetuates a belief in an ontological self. Buddhist meditative inquiry is concerned with seeing into the ―illusory ontology of the self‖ (Hanley, 1984:255). Even Freud recognized that the ego (das ich) can impute to itself its own independent existence and treat itself as an object (see Sterba, 1934:120). Thus, Buddhism does not attempt to annihilate or denigrate the psychologically differentiated self of psychoanalytic theory, nor the Western conception of the self as a highly autonomous individual (Engler, 2003:50). Rather, Buddhist insight into anatman, or ―no self,‖ is a transformation of awareness—an internal revolution in consciousness—based on a deeply embodied insight that reveals the belief in an independent, substantial, and enduring sense of self is a misperception. Stolorow and Atwood (1992) refers to as the ―myth of the isolated mind,‖ the notion that each human being is a separate from the world. This is a fundamentaldualism, a myth which perpetuates an alienation from nature, society, and estrangement from oneself. It is the basis for both self-centeredness and egocentricity (Magid, 2003:268). The Buddhist path of insight meditation challenges our habitual sense of ―having a self-identity‖ which appears as permanent and unchanging. Engler (2003:88) states that our so-called normal sense of self has ―the tendency to regard every object of experience or perception as a separate entity or thing having its own separate concrete existence and identity and only secondarily related to other things‘. Insight or ―mindfulness‖ meditation is a Buddhist method which trains practitioners to observe their moment-to-moment elements of psycho-physical experience—advancing to stages where attention is focused on seeing directly the essenceless of self. Mindfulness meditation develops and refines the ability to discriminate and observe the successive arising and dissolution of the contents of the mind.

Tamara Ditrich, 17, Thimphu: Centre for Bhutan Studies, 2017, DOA: 1-12-2022, https://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/publicationFiles/ConferenceProceedings/Mandala%2021st%20Century/19%20Meditation%20in%20Modern%20Education%20by%20Tamara.pdf, r0w@n

As discussed elsewhere, 1 meditation is deeply ingrained within Buddhist soteriological structures, as exemplified by the eightfold path, where meditation (comprised of right effort, right concentration and right mindfulness) is innately correlated with, and linked to, the other two components, i.e., wisdom (comprising right understanding and right thought) and morality or ethics (i.e., right speech, right action and right livelihood). The term rendered in English as “mindfulness” (Pāli sati, Sanskrit smṛti, and Tibetan dran pa) occurs in Buddhist texts in a range of meanings, from “memory, recollection” to “wakefulness, alertness.”2 The term “mindfulness” most frequently refers to meditative attention, non-forgetfulness, wakefulness or presence; usually linked to clear understanding and ethical awareness; thus, according to the textual evidence in the Pāli canon, it functions as an ethical guardian.3 In Buddhist teachings, mindfulness is positioned within the broader context of the Buddhist soteriological goals: as one of the components of the Buddhist path, it is called “right mindfulness” (Pāli sammā sati, Sanskrit samyak-smṛti, Tibetan yaṅ dag pa’i dran pa), indicating that it is appropriate or “right” for development of wisdom and other factors on the path to liberation. For example, one of the most frequently referred to discourses-the text on the presence or foundation of mindfulness (Pāli Satipaṭṭhānasutta, Sanskrit Smṛtyupasthānasūtra), prescribes or describes that mindfulness is to be 1 For a comprehensive discussion of Buddhist perspectives on mindfulness within different models of Buddhist teachings, with a special focus on the Theravāda, see Ditrich, 2016b. 2 A broad overview of this term in different Buddhist textual traditions and contexts is given in Gyatso, 1992. 3 E.g., Dhammasaṅgaṇi (Müller, 2001, pp. 11, 16); Visuddhimagga (Rhys Davids, 1975, p. 464). Meditation in Modern Education 207 practised in conjunction with diligence;4 clear comprehension;5 and absence of desire and ill-will concerning the world.6 Right mindfulness is thus presented with several other mental qualities that are to be cultivated in meditative training, aiming to develop wisdom and result in liberation from suffering. Buddhist teachings intrinsically link right mindfulness to ethics, presuming that the absence of clinging, desire and ill-will preconditions ethical speech and actions. In ancient Buddhist languages, such as Pāli and Sanskrit, there are no equivalent terms for the categories ethics and morality, as understood in Western philosophy (Keown, 1992, pp. 2–3). Instead the concept of virtue (Pāli sīla, Sanskrit śīla)—wholesome, skilful speech and actions—is underpinned by the notion of wholesomeness or skilfulness (Pāli kusala, Sanskrit kuśala).7 This means that moral speech and actions are grounded in wholesome mental states or, in the language of the Theravāda Abhidhamma, accompanied by wholesome mental concomitants (cetasika), such as peace, kindness, compassion and wisdom.8 Wisdom (Pāli paññā, Sanskrit prajñā) is posited as one of the fundamental conditions for liberation from suffering; being represented as an understanding of impermanence, non-satisfactoriness and absence of any intrinsic permanent self or, in other words, as an insight into the empty nature of all phenomena.9 Thus, meditation, which encompasses right mindfulness, is firmly embedded in Buddhist discourse, fundamentally (and apparently inextricably) linked to ethical training and wisdom

Tamara Ditrich, 17, Thimphu: Centre for Bhutan Studies, 2017, DOA: 1-12-2022, https://www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/publicationFiles/ConferenceProceedings/Mandala%2021st%20Century/19%20Meditation%20in%20Modern%20Education%20by%20Tamara.pdf, r0w@n

In terms of Buddhist meditation, particular historical developments during the colonial period in Burma (Myanmar) greatly contributed to novel representations or adaptations of Buddhism. To popularise meditation among lay people, mindfulness was singled out as one of the most important Buddhist practices for them to be practised in everyday life.11 Consequently, methods of instruction and approaches had to be simplified. For example, the time dedicated to formal meditation practice was significantly reduced. Thus repositioned and, to some extent reinterpreted, mindfulness meditation started to spread in Burma and other Asian countries and, since the 1970s onwards, across the world. In the West, mindfulness practice started to be increasingly viewed as training in attention with a largely therapeutic focus, thus gradually leading to its secularisation. The introduction of the “Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction” programme (MBSR) in the late 1970s, developed by Kabat-Zinn, has had a great impact on advancing the secularisation of mindfulness. This eight-week programme, drawing to a large extent from the modern Burmese methods of meditation, developed and refined during the twentieth-century. It has been adapted and incorporated into various kinds of psychotherapy, addressing a range of psychological disorders. 12 It has also been implemented in many other contexts, such as schools, workplace, wellness industries, focusing mainly on stress reduction and enhanced wellbeing. In this process of the secularisation and expansion of mindfulness, it has been presented in new ways, typically defined as a practise of “paying attention on purpose, in the present moment, 10 Several modern scholars have explored the phenomenon of modern Buddhism, e.g., McMahan, 2008; Lopez, 2002; Sharf, 1995. 11 Interpretations of mindfulness from a historical perspective are discussed in Ditrich, 2016a; for a comprehensive and exemplary study on the emergence of modern Buddhism in Burma, see Braun, 2013. 12 For example, Mindfulness Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT), which was developed as an intervention for prevention of depression relapse (Segal, Williams and Teasdale, 2002); Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT) (Lineham, 1993), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) (Hayes, Strosahl, and Wilson, 1999). For a review, see Germer et al., 2016. Meditation in Modern Education 209 and nonjudgmentally to the unfolding of experience moment to moment” (Kabat-Zinn, 2003, p. 145). Although secular and Buddhist interpretations of mindfulness share one major aim, i.e., the alleviation of suffering, there are also several distinctions between the two approaches.13 Firstly, as briefly outlined above, in Buddhist contexts right mindfulness is practiced in conjunction with other components of meditative and ethical training and hence is not presented as “nonjudgemental attention” but rather the cultivation of wholesome or skilful mental states and consequent ethical responses to lived experience. Buddhist meditation is underpinned by an ethical structure founded on the notion of wholesomeness; this axiomatic distinction sharply separates the traditional approach from secular interpretations of mindfulness, in which ethical considerations have been largely shifted to the background (McCown, 2013; Purser and Millilo, 2015; Monteiro, Musten and Compson, 2015). Secondly, secular interpretations largely view mindfulness as a method for the enhancement of wellbeing in worldly life, whereas Buddhist meditation (traditionally largely a monastic practice, as it seems) aims towards a deep existential transformation, achieved through insight into the empty nature of all phenomena and events, built on the foundational assumption that complete liberation from suffering is possible. Thirdly, the two conceptualisations of mindfulness differ in their understanding of a “self”: from the Buddhist perspective, an understanding of the intrinsic emptiness of any self is viewed as axiomatic for the path leading towards freedom from delusion and suffering, whereas to the Western perspective (and the psychotherapeutic in particular), the operationalisation of mindfulness primarily aims towards the development of a stable self or a healthy identity, with well-defined self-boundaries. These differences in the fundamental conceptualisation of mindfulness have concomitant implications for the processes involved in the meditation practice itself, its perceived goals and outcomes, as well as for the methodological approaches applied in modern research of mindfulness. Without understanding the different foundational paradigms of the two approaches, it is not possible to fully appreciate the disjuncture now becoming apparent in approaches to mindfulness. With the rapid growth of applications of mindfulness in various environments, research into its efficacy has been expanding, most extensively in psychology and related fields.14 Numerous studies indicate that mindfulness promotes mental and physical health (Khoury et al., 2013) to be moderately effective (Vibe et al., 2012). Since research into mindfulness is still nascent, many methodological concerns require scholarly attention (Sedlmeier et al., 2012; 13 For discussion on distinctions between traditional Buddhist and modern secular representations of mindfulness, see Ditrich, forthcoming. 14 A brief overview of current research on mindfulness is given in Ditrich, forthcoming. Tradition and Innovation in Vajrayāna Buddhism 210 Thomas and Cohen, 2014). Currently, quantitative research methods prevail, e.g., measuring the efficacy of mindfulness through self-report questionnaires; such studies, mostly conducted in a theoretical (or at the very least under theorised) manner (Sedlmeier et al., 2012), focus more on the question of whether mindfulness works or not, rather than how it works. Qualitative approaches, although often recommended (Grossman and Van Dam, 2013, p. 235), are rare and the outcomes from it do not seem to be significantly different from those of quantitative research (e.g., Ames et al., 2014; Sibinga et al., 2014). More recently, scientific interest in meditation has been growing in neuroscience (e.g., Davidson et al., 2003) and new theoretical models have been proposed (Lutz et al., 2015). However, scarce attention has been paid to the question of how the proposed scientific theories may relate to and be informed by Buddhist traditions; the source traditions may well provide useful correctives or elucidations, simply because the Buddhist model provides a unique and well-structured holistic presentation of mindfulness, embedded within elaborated (Buddhist) theoretical models and the practice of meditation and ethics.