

A Buddhist Philosophy of Global Mind for Peaceful Future

Juichiro Tanabe
Kumamoto University

While addressing global problems including conflict and violence is a common human agenda, they are human-caused: They are created and sustained through our thoughts. Though external causes and conditions cannot be ignored, the most fundamental problem is an epistemological one—our way of knowing and viewing the world. As the shape of the global conditions relies on our thoughts or ways of thinking, it is imperative to make a critical analysis of our mind. This paper explores how the Buddhist philosophy of human mind develops a model of global mind to achieve a peaceful future. Firstly, the analysis offers the concept of “the conditioned mind”—mind shaped by socially constructed frame of reference and examines how it becomes a cause of trouble. Secondly, it proposes the concept of “the unconditioned mind”—mind-state transcendent of an attachment to any form of frame of reference as an antidote to the potential danger of the conditioned state. Then, global mind is explored. It is characterized as the mixture of the conditioned and the unconditioned mind with the practice of multiple functions of mind—mindful practice, dialectical philosophical contemplation, and compassionate mind. The appreciation and enacting of both the conditioned mind and the unconditioned mind underpinned by the multiple functions of mind empowers us to touch universal humanity and inherent dignity of all human beings and to co-create new values, norms, and visions with those having different frames of reference to embody interdependent and interconnected human relationships.

Keywords: Buddhism, the conditioned mind, the unconditioned mind, global mind, peace

1. Introduction

This paper engages in a Buddhist philosophy of global mind for peaceful future. A pressing environment surrounding human beings is that many challenges such as conflict, violence of any form and environmental problems have global impact as well as local ramifications, which requires us to assume active roles to manage and address them in order to achieve a more just, humane, inclusive, and sustainable world. However, it must also be recognized that many of major problems facing us are human-caused (Elgin and LeDrew 1997). In other words, while social injustice, inter-group antagonism, discrimination, violence and so on, are our targets to tackle, they are actually created and sustained through our own thoughts (Todd 2008). Though external causes and conditions must not be ignored, the most fundamental problem is an epistemological one—our way of knowing and viewing the world. As the shape of global conditions rests with our thoughts or way of thinking, it is of great importance to make critical analysis of our mind that causes problems since the world changes when our thoughts and perspectives on the world change (Nicolescu 2006).

Since its beginning, Buddhism has deepened its analysis of the dynamics of human mind, both as a root cause of suffering including conflict and violence and as a source for harmony. And this paper explores how the Buddhist analysis of human mind can be applied to build a model of global mind with which we can achieve peaceful future.

Starting with the introduction to Buddhist philosophy, the paper offers the concept of “the conditioned mind”—mind shaped by socially constructed frame of reference and makes its critical analysis of how it turns into a cause of conflict and violence. Following the analysis of the conditioned mind, the concept of “the unconditioned mind”—mind-state transcendent of an attachment to any form of frame of reference that socially conditions us—is proposed as an antidote to the potential danger of the conditioned state. And the practice of mindfulness is suggested as a practical method to achieve the unconditioned state of mind. Following the analysis of the two concepts of mind, global mind is explored. It is characterized as the mixture of the conditioned and the unconditioned mind-sets with the practice of multiple functions of mind—mindful practice, dialectical philosophical contemplation, and compassionate mind. The analysis argues that the appreciation and enacting of both the conditioned mind and the unconditioned mind underpinned by the multiple functions of mind empowers us to touch universal humanity and inherent dignity of each of us while respecting social and cultural uniqueness and to develop multiple ways of thinking and knowing to engage in co-creating new values, norms, and visions with those having different frames of reference to embody interdependent and interconnected human relationships.

2. Methodological Considerations

As is widely acknowledged, three schools constitute Buddhism—Theravada, Mahayana, and Vajrayana. Each of them further has sub-schools that have respectively developed distinct teachings, traditions, and rituals along with the common objective, that is, overcoming human suffering. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine all of those schools in detail to analyze their contributions to global mind.

Therefore, the research employs the following texts and teachings to explore global mind: Dhamapada,¹ Surangama-Sutra,² Nagarjuna’s³ Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness, Catustava or Four Hymns to Absolute Reality. However, it must be emphatically noticed that though those texts and teachings are embraced to develop the analysis of global mind, what is discussed here is merely one of the possible ideas of Buddhist approach to global mind as other texts and teachings would lead us to propose ideas of global mind distinct from the one explored in this paper.

3. Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy

3.1. Foundational Aim of Buddhist Philosophy

The main focus of Buddhism is human mind, which is stated in the Dhamapada: “All experience is preceded by mind, led by mind, made by mind” (Fronsdal 2005, 1). Further, the Surangama Sutra states, “The Tathagata has always said that all phenomena are manifestations of mind and that all causes and effects including (all things from) the world to its dust, take shape because of the mind” (Luk 2001, 16). These statements do not mean to deny the existence of objects outside our minds. Rather, they claim that the qualities and attributes of things and objects are dependent upon and made up of mind (Lai 1977). In short, the state of the world around us is a reflection of the condition of our minds (Ramanan 1978).

As the condition of our mind shapes the state of our reality, the root cause of problems facing us is to be attributed to our minds as stated in the Dhamapada: “Speak or act with a corrupted mind, and suffering follows as the wagon wheel follows the hoof of the ox” (Fronsdall 2005, 1). However, when we overcome the cause of suffering in our mind, we can achieve inner serenity and well-being: “Speak or act with a peaceful mind, and happiness follows like a never-departing shadow” (Fronsdall 2005, 1). These statements imply that it is crucial to Buddhism to make a critical analysis of the nature of our mind or the principles of epistemic function to deepen our understanding of internal dynamics of suffering. Thus, Buddhist philosophy can be understood as a critical study of the structure of human thinking process: knowing, first of all, reality as a human-thought construct, critically examining how thought construction turns into the root cause of suffering and contemplating and enacting the way to resolve it constitute the core of Buddhist philosophy (Matsuo 1981). And the Four Noble Truth doctrine underpins Buddhist philosophy.

3.2. Analysis of the Four Noble Truths Doctrine

The Four Noble Truths doctrine is the Buddha’s first and fundamental teaching that undergirds all Buddhist schools (Yun 2002). Pereira and Tiso explain that the Four Noble Truths are “truths of pain, origin of pain, suppression of pain and the way to suppress pain” (1988, 172).

The first noble truth states that our life is basically filled with suffering (Rahula 1974). However, it does not present a pessimistic or nihilistic view of reality. Rather, the knowledge of our reality filled with suffering leads to a deeper and more profound question of how such suffering happens to us and this is the core of the second noble truth.

The second noble truth proposes that human suffering arises from craving, that is, a mental state of attachment—our tendency to cling to specific object or view (Burton 2002). Besides craving, ignorance is posited as a fundamental cause of suffering (Cho 2002). On Buddhist view, it refers to our basic misapprehension of the nature of reality, or lack of correct knowledge or insight into the nature of reality. More concretely, in ignorant state, we tend to see things including human beings as having permanent or fixed nature or attribute and cling to anything that reinforces our concept of permanence while pushing away those views that deny it (Geshe Tashi 2005). Furthermore, craving and ignorance give rise to three mental defilements—greed, anger, and delusion—and impair human interaction (Olendzki 2003). The second truth shows that human mind itself is the locus wherein the gap between reality and our hermeneutical reality represented in conceptual or linguistic rendering along with lack of correct knowledge of the nature of reality takes place, which results in suffering (Park 2008).

The third noble truth claims that since suffering is human-caused, we can overcome the suffering through our self-effort (Yun 2002). As the causes of suffering and liberation from suffering are two different states but are created by our minds (Park 2008), the solution lies within our minds.

The fourth noble truth proposes the way to address suffering and realize mental well-being and serenity, which is called the noble eightfold path (Rubin 2003). It is: right view,⁴ right thought,⁵ right speech,⁶ right action,⁷ right livelihood,⁸ right effort,⁹ right mindfulness,¹⁰ and right concentration¹¹ (Rubin 2003). The gist of the fourth truth is that three angles—ethical conduct (right speech, right action, right livelihood, and right effort), mental discipline (right mindfulness and right concentration), and wisdom (right view and right thought)—need to be enacted in synergy to overcome suffering (Rahula 1974). When wisdom—an insight into reality, that is, impermanence, interdependence and lack of any fixed or unchanging nature of reality, mental

discipline—the ability to observe whatever object, view, standpoint we choose or build and to sharpen the level of awareness of our own internal psychological and subjective dynamics, and ethical conduct—practicing a moral life with altruism, compassion and empathy are well integrated, we can break the cycle of suffering and construct a positive and harmonious relationship.

4. Exploring Global Mind

4.1. The Conditioned Mind

The analysis of the Four Noble Truths doctrine shows us two dimensions of human mind. When controlled by an attachment to certain view or perspective along with misunderstanding of the nature of reality or conceptual thought framing reality, human mind becomes the cause of trouble. However, we can turn the same mind into the powerful tool to address the trouble on a deeper and fundamental level and achieve harmonious human relationship and society when we enact multiple functions of mind such as philosophical analysis of reality, mindful observation of internal dynamics and embodiment of positive psychology such as empathy and compassion. And this section will explore how these dimensions of human mind can develop the model of global mind.

At first, to develop an analysis of the model of global mind, the concept of “the conditioned mind” is proposed. The conditioned mind is defined as mind framed by the belief and form of truth that are conventionally accepted as valid and effective in the practical matters of our social life-world. From time immemorial, human beings have developed conceptual thought or linguistic knowledge as the main tool to make sense of the world of experiences and to communicate with fellow human beings (Ichimura 1997). As collective beings, our minds are inevitably shaped by socially or culturally embedded assumptions and habitual ways of interpretation to respond to a given life-world (Gunnlaugson 2007).

We inhabit socially constructed and historically evolved and succeeded life-worlds that form certain cultural patterns—identities, beliefs, values and norms—as scaffolding for meaningful experience (Reysen and Katzarska-Miller 2013). Getting our minds socially conditioned means that we build and accept certain frame of reference—pattern of worldviews, cultural values, political orientations and ideologies, religious doctrines, moral-ethical norms and paradigms in intellectual enterprise—to construct conceptually framed reality to lead a meaningful life (Mezirow 2003). Culture or society of any kind molds us to conform to certain norms, limits the types of experience or categories for experience available to us, and determines the appropriateness or acceptability of a given state of awareness or communication in the collective setting (Goleman 1993).

Further, constructing or accepting certain frame of reference is connected to an expression of our eagerness for psychological security in the face of the uncertainty of practical life (Gordon 2006). According to Loy, security refers to “the conditions where we can live without care, where our life is not preoccupied without worrying about our life” (2002, 8) and that entails stabilizing ourselves by controlling and fixating reality with certain attributes (Mipham 2002) as the fragility or instability of constructed views or presuppositions is seen as a threat to security.

Thus, getting our minds conditioned by social frame of reference is essential to us in dual sense: helping us to make sense of reality and acquire ways to think, infer, behave, and interact with other people in a certain and supposed manner; and giving us a sense of security as it enables us to understand and approach reality in a stable manner.

4.2. *Critical Analysis of the Conditioned Mind*

While becoming socially conditioned is essential to us to make sense of reality and lead a meaningful life, the potential danger lurks within the construction of socially patterned frame of reference. The fundamental problem with the conditioned mind lies in our propensity to absolutize frame of reference conditioning us as universal or complete (Gomez 1976). Once we establish frame of reference or discursive thought and cling to it as complete, it causes us to fixate the real—objects, persons, groups of people and events—with some supposedly unchanging attributes (Chang 1971).

When we build particular thought and claim universality and completeness for the perspective constructed, it causes us to be dogmatic and exclusive of other views or thoughts (Ramanan 1978). The extreme attachment to our own views tends to elapse into polarity or negation of other views, values, and ultimately of people who are different from us (Der-lan 2006). Once frame of reference socially conditioning us is seen as complete, we are prone to feel threat, anger, or hatred to others with distinct frames of reference, which provides us with self-serving justification for discrimination and impedes constructive communication with those having different views and perspectives (Der-lan 2006).

What should be further discussed is the mode of thinking that predominates the conditioned state. Though becoming conditioned by social or cultural frame of reference is natural and essential to us, as Wade insightfully claims, it is fundamentally of dualistic nature of thought (right/wrong, good/bad, black/white, to name a few) and divides the world into “in-group” and “out-group” (1996). Dualistic thought is informed by the principle of the excluded middle (Nicolescu 2006) or “either-or” stance (Nagatomo 2000). When frame of reference conditioning us becomes absolutized as universal, the dualistic or binary thinking comes to be believed as the only way of thought. As the dichotomous relationship between in-group and out-group becomes sharpened, an imbalanced attitude invested by extreme in-group self-interest, desire, and needs is favored and promoted at the expense of others’ (Nagatomo 2000).

Once we see and treat others as something disconnected from us as a consequence of the establishment of conceptual boundary based on dualistic or dichotomous thought, it becomes easier to propagate violence of any form upon them outside the boundary (Hart et al. 2000). In dualistic logical and epistemological structure, we tend to project negative qualities upon the outside and see them objectively belonging to them (Wilber 1993), which promotes self-righteousness to take discriminatory attitude to them. Further, the mind in dualistic stance swings from extreme to extreme, and sticks to dead-ends, whereby values, ideas, or norms of our own group are not viewed as one of many alternatives, but the only right one: Other possibilities are dimly conceived or denied as wrong or inferior (Wade 1996).

Getting socially conditioned and building a provisionally coherent thought system is an inevitable part of everyday human life. However, when dualistic thought mode exerts exclusive control on the conditioned state, it causes us to exaggerate differences between people and create supposedly firm and fixed boundaries between in-group and out-group by imputing intrinsic and insurmountable differences (Waldron 2003). Forming the sedimented and habitual ways of seeing the dynamic and complex reality with fixed perspectives restricts the patterns of awareness and limits our intentional range and capacity for meaning-making commitments (Hershock 2006), which impedes a constructive communication between those having different frames of reference to address complex global problems including conflict and violence that requires those having different values, perspectives, and norms to cooperate for joint-solution (Nicolescu 2006). In short, whereas

social conditioned state and its dualistic logic foundation is a natural phenomenon and useful in some circumstance, it becomes the crux of the problem for its very nature (Wilber 1993).

4.3. The Unconditioned Mind

The proposition and the critical analysis of the conditioned mind has demonstrated that while engagement in social or cultural conceptual thought is essential to make sense of reality and lead a meaningful life, it can become a cause of trouble and hamper positive interaction between those having different perspectives, values, and norms when the conditioned state is clung to as universal or complete. And as an antidote to the potential danger of the conditioned state, the concept of the unconditioned mind is proposed.

The unconditioned mind is characterized as mind transcending an attachment to any particular frame of reference that conditions us. Why is the unconditioned mind proposed here? As our propensity to cling to certain conditioned state as absolute or complete becomes the root cause of problems and restricts the purview of our way of thinking and knowing and intentional meaning-making, breaking the attachment to the conditioned state is imperative (Muller 1998). Disidentifying ourselves from the conditioned state to make it conscious and reflect upon it becomes crucial and mindfulness practice is offered as a practical method to achieve the unconditioned mind characterized here.

Mindfulness refers to disciplining the mind by focusing on a certain object of thought and be letting go of all thoughts and emotions, and watching or witnessing whatever arises in consciousness (Kabat-Zinn 1994). It is a type of detachment from the thoughts, feeling, and reactions emerging from our own minds (Hart 2004). To be detached from a given perspective is to refrain from being taken in or possessed by it to suspend the natural tendency to become conditioned by certain perspective position (Laycock 1985). The practice of mindful objectification of consciousness, thoughts, feelings, and reactions flowing from our minds develops moment-to-moment awareness of our internal states (Brantmeier 2007), which empowers us to realize that the contents of reality depend not so much on what happens to us, but on what attitudes, understandings, feelings, and reactions we give to those events (Chappell 1999).

The practice of mindfulness sharpens our first-hand awareness and experience of social or cultural conditionedness of our thinking and knowing and helps us become less identified with our habits of thinking and standpoints (Gunnlaugson 2007). Mindful disengagement creates a space in our minds for the development of enlarged awareness, attentiveness to broader dimensions of how mind can work by going beyond socially built presuppositions and sedimented habits of thinking and knowing (Hart 2001). The transition from being focally embedded with our thoughts and feelings through mindful suspension of habitual reaction gives us a preview of a different self-sense and more complex and multi-faceted form and order of consciousness to appreciate different views and ideas (Chappell 1999). Internal observation of ourselves empowers us to expose and deconstruct socially conditioned positions of belief, thought, value, and norm and frees ourselves to notice and accept multiple perspectives and unexpected insights (Hart 2004).

Experiencing the unconditioned state through the mindfulness practice to deconstruct social conditioned state does not mean to deny the conditioned mind itself. However, problems created by the conditioned state cannot be solved by the same conditioned mind-set (O'Hara 2005). A new order of consciousness or higher level of mind-set that capacitates us to make critical reflection on our social conditioned state to create new possibilities and to transform our current ways of thinking is required (Sterling 2011). By knowing the unconditioned nature of mind, we can be conscientized that we do not necessarily have to restrict ourselves to a

particular social or cultural conceptual thought pattern (Murti 1955). The achievement of the unconditioned mind based on self-reflective knowing of the conditioned state empowers us to recognize that all ways of thinking and knowing are socially or culturally constructed, contextual, and contingent, to recognize alternative ways of thinking and knowing are available and consequently to be open to others' views, values, and norms to explore more inclusive and synthetic visions.

4.4. *Global Mind*

Two concepts of human mind—the conditioned mind and the unconditioned mind—have been proposed and examined. The upshot of the analysis is that both natures constitute our mind and it is crucial to appreciate and enact both dimensions in thinking and behaving in our real world. Based on that, global mind can be characterized as the mixture of the conditioned and the unconditioned mind-sets with the practice of multiple functions of mind, especially, mindful practice, dialectical philosophical contemplation, and compassionate mind. It is mind engaged in social or cultural conceptual thought with detached and transcendental attitude underpinned by reflective self-awareness, an insight into the nature of conceptual thought shaping our reality and compassion.

As examined, though getting ourselves conditioned by certain conceptual thought or frame of reference is natural and essential to us, it is of divisive and dichotomous nature. Further, when we consciously or unconsciously absolutize the conditioned state and divisive in-group and out-group boundary as complete and fixed, we become dogmatic and exclusive of different perspective, values, and norms. One of the most transformative methods is mindful practice to achieve a mind-state that is not imprisoned by any particular view, value of frame of reference that creates social or cultural boundaries (Bush 2011) and generates pliability and flexibility with our thoughts and emotions.

The practice of mindfulness plays a crucial role in promoting dialogue. Dialogue—for which the need emerges from the increasing acknowledgement that our changing reality demands a new global ethic and perspective of one another—has become one of the core methods to build harmonious relation (Said et al. 2006). The main objective of dialogue is not just to share information but to uncover the processes that shape us and the struggle we are having, so that mutual respect and a sense of solidarity can be aroused (Der-lan 2006). What needs to be addressed during dialogue is a reactive and impulsive interaction between those having different opinions, values, and norms. And mindful practice helps us avoid reactive interaction and hone our active listening ability, making dialogue constructive and viable.

As we become mindful of our internal dynamics and reflective of contextual and constructed nature of our conditioned state, we can reach a deeper and more profound intellectual insight into the nature of reality or more specifically, conceptual, or discursive thought that frames our view of reality to address dogmatism (Daneth 2006). And the practice of dialectical contemplative philosophy plays the key role.

Dialectical contemplation means the consciousness of the total and interminable conflict in conceptual thought and the consequent attempt to resolve the conflict by rising to a higher standpoint (Murti 1955). Dialectical contemplation is engendered by the claim of diametrically opposed points of view or systems of thought to lead us beyond dualistic understanding of different frames of reference. The dialectical contemplation reveals the inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of conceptual thoughts that frame different views and understandings of reality (Apffel-Marglin and Bush 2005).

Interdependent and interpenetrating nature of conceptual thought shaping our reality is shown by Nagarjuna: “Without one there cannot be many and without many, it is not possible to refer to one. Therefore, one and many arise dependently and such phenomena do not have sign of inherent existence” (Komito 1987, 80). He also states that “if there is something long, similarly (there is) something short; and if there is non-existence, (there is) existence; therefore, both (existence and non-existence) are not existent” (Tola and Dragonetti 1995, 128). He further states, “Unity and multiplicity and past and future, etc., defilement and purification, correct and false—how can they exist per se?” (Tola and Dragonetti 1995, 128). With these arguments, Nagarjuna reveals the inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of conceptual thought and inadequacy of conceiving identity and difference in dichotomous terms (Hershock 2012). By showing the interdependent relation of different systems of thought, values, or perspectives, the dialectical contemplation reaches an ultimate unreality and impossibility of their claim to be in total opposition and superior to the other.

The practice of dialectical contemplation does not aim to deny conceptual thought or frame of reference itself; rather, it seeks to transform how we understand different conceptual thoughts that condition us and create boundaries. The reason for transforming our view of conceptual thought is that, since it gives us a sort of lens to organize our world and builds our lived experiences, it becomes imperative to address our view of conceptual thought when it causes conflict, violence, and division (Orr 2014). Though exchanging information and opinions between those having different or opposing values or systems of thought is important to build constructive relationship and address social and global problems together, more crucial is to change the foundational cognitive structure that affects how we understand and give meaning to those information and viewpoints exchanged (Zajonc 2006).

With the recognition of the dependent-originated nature of conceptual or linguistic frame of reference through dialectical contemplation, we learn to understand that any form of symbolic knowledge shaping dichotomous relationship cannot be seen as existing outside of the purview of interdependency (Muller 1998). This means neither total erasure of difference nor demise of all distinctions into all-frozen sameness. Rather, it refers to a transformation of dualistic thinking: It is a shift from the dualistic stance to nondualistic one (Nagatomo 2000). While the logic of the excluded middle staticizes and fixates differences, nondualistic view of differences understands them as dynamic relationality and temporal phenomena (Hershock 2012), whereby *prima facie* opposing views and perspectives are not seen as hard and fixed pair of opposites but as inter-relational and interpenetrating constructs, which leads to the recognition that the harmony of the world is a harmony of opposites and contradiction (Putney 1992). The transcendence of dualistic thought empowers us to appreciate that the opposite of a deep truth is another deep truth and to hold multiplex and complementary both/and thinking (Braud and Anderson 1998). Consequently, capacity for synthetic, integrative or holistic thinking and appreciation for the diversity of values and perspectives can be sharpened (Apffel-Marglin and Bush 2005).

The third element of global mind is compassionate mind. Compassion is an acknowledgement of shared humanity and the commonalities in both suffering and aspiration among those with different identities (Pruitt and McCollum 2010). It is a capacity to feel others' pain, sorrow, despair, or suffering as our own, but at the same time, an ability to have clear awareness of interdependent origination of phenomenon of any kind (Hoyt 2014). Compassionate mind inspires the development of a quality of loving kindness, a universal and unselfish love that extends to ourselves, to friends and family, and ultimately to all people (Pruitt and McCollum 2010). Extension of compassionate mind to all sentient beings regardless of whether are strangers, opponents, or those

whom we disagree with leads us to realize that our well-being and others' are inseparable and to act on this recognition (Vaughan 2002).

4.5. Meaning of Peace

How is peace understood from the perspective of the global mind examined here? It is to be proposed as a nondualistic peace. It is an awareness that our well-being and others' are interdependent and interpenetrating: Our own peace of any kind would be impossible to achieve without considering and acting to promote others'. It is a transition from self-centered and dichotomous tensions of in-group and out-group process to an all-inclusive state of awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

The awareness of our fundamental interdependence does not refer to denying the uniqueness or individuality of each of us; rather, it is a qualitative transformation of viewing the nature of identity. Instead of seeing our identity as independent and fixed entity with firm boundary, we effect a perspectival shift to understand it as the interconnected web of life with no fixed nature (Loy 1993). Realizing identity as an open and dynamic living system within a larger interdependent and interconnected system inspires us to experience an ultimate nondualistic relationship between ourselves and others, whereby we come to see that we cannot discriminate ourselves from the inter-relational web of life without damaging both others and ourselves (Loy 1993).

The recognition of interconnected nature of any human relation affords individuals the opportunity to construct more inclusive superordinate identity with integrative or holistic view and way of thinking and a sense of responsibility to act in interdependent and interconnected relations, which drives us to make an effort to gratify basic needs of all beyond group boundaries and promote social justice for others with different identities as well as for ourselves. This does not mean that all of us achieve qualitatively same well-being, basic needs and justice. Rather, it means that we become conscious of interdependent and interpenetrating nature of different ideas and goals of peace, basic needs and justice and make a mutual contribution to help achieve each other's ideas of peace.

Furthermore, the expanded awareness of interdependence and the ultimate nondualistic nature of human relation paves the way for unity in diversity. Diversity does not mean differences exist separately. It is a function of complex and coordination-enriching relationship (Hershock 2012), whereby we experience difference or distinctiveness not as a threat or a subject for hatred or antagonism but as an opportunity for mutual insight and inspiration to explore something new to all participants. It is neither to reject nor abandon distinct values or worldviews that different individuals or groups possess. It is their meaningful revision and reorientation so that we can add new understandings or views to them according to interdependent and interpenetrating encounters (Hershock 2012). Unity in diversity in nondualistic peace means that those having different or even opposing frames of reference engage in an exploratory ongoing and ever-lasting process that explicates or unfolds new values and meanings to achieve and sustain their interdependent, mutually liberating and transformative relational dynamics.

5. Conclusion

This paper has made Buddhist philosophical analysis of global mind for sustainable future. Expanding the purview of thinking and knowing beyond social conditioned state and enacting multiple functions of mind proposed in this paper is not easy. However, any form of human interaction does not take pre-determined

course of action or direction. Rather, as our intention, perspective and reaction affect how it unfolds (Hershock 2006), interaction based on reflective and contemplative practice would become an opportunity for co-emergent and co-creative perspectives, values and visions to embody sustainable relationships.

The globalize era characterized as complexity, interdependence, and interconnectedness requires those with different and even opposing values, norms, and interests to understand that they are all essential players of the globe and to exercise collective creativity to build more integrative and holistic perspectives in creative tension and mutual respect (O'Hara 2005). The human development of higher moral, cognitive, and epistemological potentials and capacities needs to be acknowledged as central to understanding and addressing our social and global problems constructively (Slaughter 2006). Though social and cultural constraints are always in place, experiencing the unconditioned state through mindful practice and enacting global mind have a practical epistemic implication. By liberating ourselves from social constraints through reflective and contemplative practice and an insight into the nature of conceptual and linguistic boundaries, we can open up untapped potential to unfold new forms of imagination and help each other extract unexpected power to foster sustainable future.

Notes

-
1. Dhamapada is a collection of the sayings of the Buddha.
 2. Surangama-Sutra is a sutra in Mahayana Buddhism. Especially, it has been influential in Chinese Chan (Zen) Buddhist school.
 3. Nagarjuna is one of the most important Buddhist philosophers, who lived between the second and third century. He is revered as a founder and exponent of Madhyamaka philosophy that centers on sunyata (emptiness) doctrine to achieve liberation from suffering.
 4. Yun defines it as a correct view of reality, that is, mutual interdependence and ultimate empty nature (2002).
 5. Yun explains that it refers to a correct perception that our bodies will eventually decay and disappear and that our emotions and thoughts are temporal and impermanent (2002).
 6. Rubin explains that it means speaking trustfully, sincerely, and compassionately (2003).
 7. It refers to refraining from needless killing, stealing, and sexual misconduct (Rubin 2003).
 8. It means living a reasonable economic life, an altruistic life, and a harmonious communal life (Yun 2002).
 9. It means correct diligence in developing wholesomeness that has not yet risen, increasing wholesomeness that has already arisen, and preventing unwholesomeness from arising (Yun 2002).
 10. It signifies constant awareness of phenomena that are happening at present and careful recollection of phenomena that occurred in the past (Rubin 2003).
 11. It refers to spiritual concentration and mental tranquility achieved through the act of meditation to recall the actions and thoughts in the past, perceive the dynamics of mind at present and cultivate goodwill and compassion (Rubin 2003).

Works Cited

- Apffel-Marglin, F. and Bush, M. *Healing the Breach of Faith toward Everything That Is: Integration in Academia* 2005. August 15, 2012. <http://www.contemplativemind.org/programs/academic/summer05/Apffel-Marglin_Bush.pdf>.
- Brantmeier, E. J. "Connecting Inner and Outer Peace: Buddhist Meditation Integrated with Peace Education." *Journal of Peace Education and Social Justice* 1.1 (2007): 120-57.
- Braud, W. and Anderson, R. *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences: Honoring Human Experience*. London: SAGE, 1998.
- Burton, D. "Knowledge and Liberation: Philosophical Ruminations on a Buddhist Conundrum." *Philosophy East and West* 52.3 (2002): 326-45.
- Bush, M. "Mindfulness in Higher Education." *Contemporary Buddhism* 12.1 (2011): 183-97.

- Chang, C. C. G. *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality: The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.
- Chappell, D. W. "Buddhist Peace Principles." *Buddhist Peacework: Creating Cultures of Peace*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1999. 199-231.
- Cho, S. "The Rationalist Tendency in Modern Buddhist Scholarship: A Reevaluation." *Philosophy East and West* 52.4 (2002): 426-40.
- Danesh, H. B. "Towards an Integrative Theory of Peace Education." *Journal of Peace Education* 3.1 (2006): 55-78.
- Der-lan Yeh. "The Way to Peace: A Buddhist Perspective." *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11.1 (2006): 91-112.
- Elgin, D. and LeDrew, C. *Global Consciousness Change: Indicators of an Emerging Paradigm*. May 14, 2014. <www.duaneelgin.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/global_consciousness.pdf>.
- Fronsdal, G. *The Dhammapada: A New Translation of the Buddhist Classic with Annotations*. Boston: Shambala, 2005.
- Geshe Tashi Tsering. *The Four Noble Truths: The Foundation of Buddhist Thought Volume 1*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2005.
- Goleman, D. "Psychology, Reality, and Consciousness." Eds. Walsh, R. and Vaughan, F. *Path beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*. New York: Penguin Putnam, 1993. 18-21.
- Gomez, L. "Proto-Madhyamika in the Pali Canon." *Philosophy East and West* 26.2 (1976): 137-65.
- Gordon, M. "Welcoming Confusion, Embracing Uncertainty: Educating Teacher Candidates in an Age of Certitude." *Paideusis* 15.2 (2006): 15-25.
- Gunnlaugson, O. "Shedding Lights on the Underlying Forms of Transformative Learning Theory: Introducing Three Distinct Categories of Consciousness." *Journal of Transformative Education* 5.2 (2007): 134-51.
- Hart, T. "Teaching for Wisdom." *Encounter; Education for Meaning and Social Justice* 14.2 (2001): 3-16.
- . "Opening the Contemplative Mind in the Classroom." *Journal of Transformative Education* 2.1 (2004): 28-46.
- Hart, T., Nelson P. L., and Puhakka, K. "Introduction." *Transpersonal Knowing: Exploring the Horizon of Consciousness*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2000. 1-9.
- Hershock, P. D. *Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- . *Valuing Diversity: Buddhist Reflection on Realizing a More Equitable Global Future*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2012.
- Hoyt, M. "Engaging Bodhisattva Compassion in Pedagogical Aporias." *Paideusis* 21.2 (2014): 24-31.
- Ichimura, S. "Contemporary Significance of Chinese Buddhist Philosophy." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 24 (1997): 75-106.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. *Catalyzing Movement towards a More Contemplative/Sacred-Appreciating/Non-Dualistic Society*. August 15, 2012. <<http://www.contemplativemind.org/programs/academic/kabat-zinn.pdf>>.
- Komito, D. R. *Nagarjuna's "Seventy Stanzas": A Buddhist Psychology of Emptiness*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion, 1987.
- Lai, W. "The Meaning of 'Mind-Only' (Wei-Hsin): An Analysis of a Sinitic Mahayana Phenomenon." *Philosophy East and West* 27.1 (1977): 65-83.
- Laycock, S. W. "Hui-Neng and the Transcendental Standpoint." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 12.2 (1985): 179-96.
- Loy, D. "Indra's Postmodern Net." *Philosophy East and West* 43.3 (1993): 481-510.
- . *On the Nonduality of Good and Evil: Buddhist Reflections on the New Holy War*. August 15, 2012. <http://www.thezensite.com/ZenEssays/Miscellaneous/NonDuality_Good_and_Evil.htm>.
- Luk, C. *The Surangama Sutra*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2001.
- Matsuo, H. *The Logic of Unity: The Discovery of Zero and Emptiness in Prajnaparamita Thought*. Trans. Inada Kenneth. Tokyo: Hokuju Shuppan, 1981.
- Mezirow, J. "Transformative Learning as Discourse." *Journal of Transformative Education* 1.1 (2003): 58-63.
- . *Introduction to the Middle Way: Candrakirti's Madhyamakavatara with Commentary by Jamgon Mipham*. Boston: Shambhala, 2002.
- Muller, C. A. "Innate Enlightenment and No-thought: A Response to the Critical Buddhist Position on Zen." *International Conference on Son, Paekyang-sa, Kwangju, Korea*, August 18-22, 1998.
- Murti, T. R. V. *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of Madhyamika System*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharla, 1955.
- Nagatomo, S. "The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A Is Not A, Therefore It Is A." *Asian Philosophy* 10.3 (2000): 213-44.
- Nicolescu, B. *Transdisciplinarity—Past, Present and Future*. May 4, 2014. <<http://www.movingworldviews.net/Downloads/Papers/Nicolescu.pdf>>.
- O'Hara M. *The Challenge for Education in Uncertain Times. General Assembly of the World Academy of Arts and Science*, Zagreb, Croatia, November 2005.

- Olendzki, A. "Buddhist Psychology." Ed. Segall, S. R. *Encountering Buddhism: Western Psychology and Buddhist Teachings*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2003. 9-30.
- Orr, D. "In a Mindful Moral Voice: Mindful Compassion, the Ethic of Care and Education." *Paideusis* 21.2 (2014): 42-54.
- Park, J. Y. *Buddhism and Postmodernity: Zen, Huayan, and the Possibility of Buddhist Postmodern Ethics*. Plymouth, United Kingdom: Lexington Books, 2008.
- Pereira, J. and Tiso, F. "The Evolution of Buddhist Systematics from the Buddha to Vasubandhu." *Philosophy East and West* 38.2 (1988): 172-86.
- Pruitt, I. T. and McCollum, E. E. *Voices of Experienced Meditators: The Impact of Meditation Practice on Intimate Relationships*. May 4, 2014. <http://portal.idc.ac.il/he/main/research/aware/research/documents/social/attachment/voices%20_of%20_experienced%20_meditators%20_the%20_im>.
- Putney, D. "Identity and the Unity of Experience: A Critique of Nishida's Theory of Self." *Asian Philosophy* 1.2 (1992): 141-61.
- Rahula, W. S. *What the Buddha Taught*. New York: Grove, 1974.
- Ramanan, V. *Nagarjuna's Philosophy as Presented in the Maha-Prajnaparamita-Sutra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.
- Reysen, S. and Katzarska-Miller, I. "Intentional Worlds and Global Citizenship." *Journal of Global Citizenship and Equity Education* 3.1 (2013): 34-52.
- Rubin, J. B. "Close Encounters of a New Kind: Toward an Integration of Psychoanalysis and Buddhism." Ed. Segall, Seth R. *Encountering Buddhism: Western Psychology and Buddhist Teachings*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2003. 31-60.
- Said, A., Lerche, C. and Funk, N. "For the Need for New Thinking." *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11.2 (2006): 105-20.
- Slaughter, R. "Beyond the Mundane—Towards Post-Conventional Future Practice." *Journal of Futures Studies* 10.4 (2006): 15-24.
- Sterling, S. "Transformative Learning and Sustainability: Sketching the Conceptual Ground." *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* 5 (2011): 17-33.
- Todd, S. *Facing Humanity: The Difficult Task of Cosmopolitan Education*. May 15, 2014. <www.philosophy-of-education.org/conferences/pdfs/Sharon_Todd.pdf>.
- Tola, F. and Dragonetti, C. *On Voidness: A Study on Buddhist Nihilism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.
- Vaughan, F. "What Is Spiritual Intelligence?" *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 42.2 (2002): 16-33.
- Wade, J. *Changing of Mind: A Holonomic Theory of the Evolution of Consciousness*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Waldron, W. S. "Common Ground, Common Cause: Buddhism and Science on the Afflictions of Identity." Ed. Wallace, A. *Buddhism and Science: Breaking New Ground*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003. 145-91.
- Wilber, K. *The Spectrum of Consciousness*. Wheaton, Illinois: Quest Books, 1993.
- Yun, H. *From the Four Noble Truths to the Four Universal Vow*. Hacienda Heights, California: Buddha's Light Publishing, 2002.
- Zajonc, A. "Contemplative and Transformative Pedagogy." *Kosmos Journal* 5.1 (2006): 1-3.