

\*\*\*START NEW PANEL\*\*\*

**PAUL GAILEY**

00:01.06

As we opened the conference yesterday, I mentioned that I had a sense there was a new level of excitement in the air to discuss the kinds of issues we've been discussing this weekend and I must admit that I had no idea how rich the conversation would be. I have enjoyed these panels enormously. We had planned to have a kind of a reflection panel where we brought up a few of the participants, few of the panelists to simply reflect on what has occurred over the last couple of days.

00:01.42

As we thought about this, it seemed perhaps it would be more productive to rather than look back - I think we will all be reflecting on this over the next several days - so rather than look back, why not look forward and ask a few of the panelists to make some very brief comments on where they see the possibilities for the future.

Where do we go from here in these many different disciplines that we brought together?

00:02.06

What are the kinds of approaches? What are the approaches individually? What are they jointly? What are some of the questions that we may be able to ask that will productively move this whole area forward? And so I'd like to start with Owen and we'll just have some brief comments and then a little bit of time for discussion among the panelists.

**OWEN FLANAGAN**

00:02.29

Thank you very much. Ok. Yes. Over lunch we sort of reoriented ourselves and were asked to speak for two minutes - I think this is a splendid idea - about future directions. Now, the question is - a question is of course, future directions for what. For this conversation, this kind of conversation or whatever.

00:02.57

So, let me just give really one idea, but I'll - it requires some linkage and I think it will only

take two minutes. And it's actually quite specific. What I want to do is make a suggestion about how to extend the conversation that we've had over the last two days, but actually particularly the one that we had at the very end.

00:03.18

To an area which is hot in big- in contemporary psychology, but is quite new. And what I have in mind here is a field called positive psychology. They need us and we need them. And here's what I want to say. The panel that just ended was talking about the perennial constantly repeated problem about the connections between- and conception of an individual flourishing, conception of an individual flourishing with being good, with social and political justice-

00:04.03

-how we do all this together. And I do think it's the case that there are many philosophical traditions- I'm speaking about- even though I'm a philosopher, I'm using philosophy here in a very, very broad sense. Spiritual, philosophical

traditions which have incredible wisdom.  
Coincidentally, the three that I'm most familiar with - classical Chinese philosophy, Greek and Buddhist - all occur about the same time.

00:04.30

And, there's great wisdom and- but, coming from different directions. Now, what I just referred to as positive psychology is a research program that really is just about five or six years old within psychology. And I think it's either going to turn out well or badly and it will depend on how broad a kind of conversation the psychologists engage themselves in and sort of whether people of the sort that are in this room, how they engage them.

00:05.08

And what I have in mind is this - there's basically- Marty Seligman who's one of the- he's the eminence grise of this field. Well, he's kind of bald, so he's quite- I don't know if he's grey or not. But this movement is concerned in a particularly American way with happiness. Having

noted that if you do research literature- if you do studies of the literature in psychology, you'll see that the number of papers in scientific journals devoted to unhappiness - depression, things like that - outnumber by a hundred to one papers on happiness and its causes. As we would say in Buddhism, its content, causes, constituents, that sort of thing.

00:05.53

And so there's a discussion of what we in- following Aristotle would call conceptions of eudemonia - what constitutes individual and group flourishing. Now, we already have in addition to positive psychology, practices like psychotherapy, clinical psychology, behavioral and cognitive therapy, but now there's this research going on and on neural correlates of happiness and well-being and now, studies of subjective well-being, hedonic well-being, psychological well-being.

00:06.29                    This is out there and I- so, one very profitable and simple thing I could see us doing was next time around, wherever this conversation goes and takes place, invite some of these psychologists - they're mostly psychologists - and have a conversation with them and- where we can learn from them some about how they are trying to study happiness.

00:06.52                    Make them more - as has come up - self-reflective about the fact that they're living with it in a tradition with a certain number- conception of happiness. You saw me yesterday superscripting all things like Buddhism, Dalai Lama-type Buddhism, Owen Buddhism. I think when you talk about happiness or flourishing, which is- of course, we have compassion first and then-

00:07.15                    -at least according to the wild, Celtic Roman Catholic Buddhism that I practice- and I've heard this - some other Buddhists have adopted this. Compassion is to alleviate suffering, loving

kindness is to bring flourishing in its stead. The conception of flourishing has to be very, very well laid out and there's always the danger - because we're talking about the USA - that it's happy, happy, joy, joy, click your heels. That's what the superscript says.

00:07.47

That isn't the kind of happiness that most of the wisdom traditions have gone for. So, I make a practical proposal - bring those people in, bring them to us. A distinguished young person that I feel is in the audience and will be at the reception and you can ask her all follow-up questions - Kristin Neff. Thank you.

**PAUL GAILEY**

00:08.07

Teed.

**TEED ROCKWELL**

00:08.08

Ok, I wanted to start off by saying a little something about the last question that Jay and Bob Pollack were dealing with - the question of whether suffering arose from evil, deliberately chosen evil, or from ignorance. And it reminded

me of an episode on the Rocky and Bullwinkle show - actually there's a whole series of episodes where they were trying to get something called the Kirwood Derby. And whoever had the Kirwood Derby what they wore it, it would be they'd become the smartest person in the whole world.

00:08.33

So Boris Badenov was trying to get the Kirwood Derby for about 25 episodes. He finally got it - you know, he figured then he'd be able to rule the world because he'd be the smartest one. And he put it on his head and he said, "Tasha, I just realized, you know, this is crazy." He says, "I'm not gonna be happy if I rule the world. You know, why don't we just get married, settle down and get a nice job somewhere." You know, and then he threw the hat off his head and said, "Phooey, if this is what being smart is, it isn't worth it."

00:08.57

Now, you know, this seemed to be indicating that, you know, the question of whether evil comes from ignorance or whether it comes from, you know,

deliberately choice - it kind of gets blurry. And you- some people apparently choose to be stupid. I mean, this is- you might choose to be stupid. And the reason this question is important it becomes a question of how far do we want to expand this circle of people that we're talking to.

00:09.20

Because one of the things- If you operate on the assumption that suffering comes from ignorance rather than evil, the difference between the way you react to ignorance and the way to evil, when you react to ignorance what you try to do is you try to enlighten somebody, you try to talk to them, you try to persuade them. The way you deal with evil is you either restrain them or you kill them. And, you know, not necessarily restrain them, kill them or at best, ignore them.

00:09.44

And I know that certainly, you know, we're creating a kind of consensus here of how to look at the world, you know, from some relatively

diverse positions, but there's still an awful lot of positions that are being left out here. So the question is how far do you want to extend this. I mean, who else might you want to invite to a conference like that. I mean, I thought until Bob Pollack came up here that, you know, two positions that were missing were, you know, materialist absurdity and Christianity. He managed to combine both simultaneously in the same position, which was an accomplishment.

00:10.18

And, you know, and for which there is also a tradition. I mean, he was definitely coming out of Kierkegaard's place for that. But, you know, I mean what would this conference have been like if Dan Dennett had been here, you know. I mean that's a good- You invited him? Well, it's a good question, you know. Certainly when we go- When Owen and I go to the Society for Philosophy and Psychology, the assumption- the default assumption is that everybody is an atheist materialist.

00:10.43

I mean, the assumption is that no sane person would believe otherwise. And, you know, maybe at this point in the history of something like this, we need to simply get a better sense of what we believe ourselves - and I certainly- there's been a tremendous amount of that going on here. Of- You know because I mean one of the things I really liked about this conference is that everybody changed their papers while delivering. You know, like there was a paper that was on the Web site and then there was like a later person- you'd see a later version would come along.

00:11.13

And then by the time they were talking, everybody was saying, well, seeing as Ned said this and Bob said this and everybody had rewritten their papers to respond to everybody else - right on the fly. And that was great, you know. I mean, usually the assumption is that nobody- you know, a lot of times - certainly in old line analytic philosophy - nobody ever changes anybody's minds,

you know. I mean it's just- you keep- you know, you've got the determinists and the free-willists over here and they just go at it forever.

00:11.35

And that's a very encouraging thing. Perhaps that isn't possible unless, you know, we keep the circle stretched just enough so that you've got people that haven't talked to each other yet - or not talked to each other enough yet - who can create a new vision of some sort. Or if you stretch it even further-

00:11.54

You know, if it's too small, you've got a mutual admiration society. If it's too big, there's a real danger that it's going to turn into a food fight, a shouting match, you know. You know, and if we had had some Orthodox Christians here, if we'd had some Moslems here, perhaps some Sufi Moslems. You know, who of course are having really serious trouble with the Wahhabi Moslems.

00:12.14

You know, the Sufis have converted most of the Moslems, particularly in South Asia and you have Wahhabi, you know, clerics being paid for with Saudi oil money going in and turning them all into fundamentalists, when they used to be, you know, people that were happily singing koali (ph) and saying that God was everywhere. You know, and worshipping Saraswati the way my Moslem teacher does. He's got a great big statue of Saraswati - the Hindu god of music - at the school where I study music.

00:12.39

And all my, you know, all my music teachers have been Moslems. You know, even though there are a lot of other Moslems who think, you know, music is haram. So, those moderate Moslems probably need a place- and there's certainly a lot of similarities in the Sufi tradition, you know, and the Buddhist tradition, certainly with Sufi and Zen there's a lot of tradition. So, questions- I mean that's really the question and I think we have to ask ourselves when we look at that, where

do we go from here is expand the circle, but when we do expand the circle, we're gonna have to think in terms of how far do we expand the circle and those are the two issues that happen.

00:13.13

If we extend it- expand it too far, it may disintegrate. If we don't expand it far enough, it'll be a mutual admiration society and there no real communication. And, you know, I think that we have to use our judgment and our intuitions to figure exactly how far that circle expands. That's a question we're gonna have to constantly keep in mind.

**EVAN THOMPSON**

00:13.35

Anne.

**ANNE KLEIN**

00:13.36

Well, I have to say it's been a privilege, an honor and really a great pleasure to be part of this conference and hats off to the organizers, Chris and Annabella. Thank you.

\*\*\*APPLAUSE\*\*\*

00:13.56

Just a fantastic amount of work has gone into this and I can only respond really, out of my own personal subjectivity, I suppose, at this moment. And one thing that has struck me - I couldn't help but remember when I first began studying Tibetan Buddhism, like many of you sitting here, none of our neighbors, certainly not our parents had ever heard of it.

00:14.21

One of my friends was asked by her parents' best friend what she was doing and she said, oh I'm staying at a Buddhist monastery in New Jersey. And she said, you know, there was this dead silence. I felt like I'd given the wrong line in a play. And to come from that corner of obscurity, you know, when we were just a group of rather odd people who didn't seem to be doing anything that anyone else in this culture had an interest in to now be participants in this major cultural conversation, thanks in large part to the curiosity of His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, and the hard work of people like Alan Wallace and

many, many people who've been part of the Mind and Life.

00:15.05

It's really a moment. It's a cultural moment that is just worth stating that to be the case. And at the same time, it's a moment of enormous promise. I feel that from my own perspective, people in this conference as Teed just suggested, have been very generous, very open and yet, no doubt, there are boundaries that we would still like to press against.

00:15.31

When I was part of the conference at Stanford with His Holiness said- in November one of- in preparation for the discussion, one of the heads of the neurological side of the conference said - only half in jest - he said, well, you know, don't use the C word. That means consciousness.

00:15.51

And Alan has given us a wonderful backdrop as to why that should have been a problem. And I feel that as we move forward, as this conversation

moves forward, which it seems bound to do and very important that it does do, so that we might still press some further boundaries. We haven't talked a lot about other kinds of knowing besides intellectual understanding. We haven't talked a lot about some of the subtle energies of the body. There are many Buddhist traditions which really define the transformation that they're after not so much in terms of an intellectual or any other kind of really cognitive understanding, but in terms of the energies in the body moving in a different way.

00:16.37

And that would take us further from the paradigms that many of us are comfortable with. But, in the spirit of exploration and curiosity and sheer courage, perhaps that's something in the next hundred fifty years - I don't think we have to wait 30,000 - that we can be looking at. And I think that would be something very, very exciting for us to consider.

00:17.01                   The issue of representation that Teed mentioned, certainly. I think that my gender has been very well represented by the two other women who were on these panels, but I think we could see more of that. I think we could see more cultural diversity, racial diversity, which is not to greatly honor the diversity that is present in this conference.

00:17.29                   Still, we can look to increase it. And the one other- which was mentioned earlier. There's been a sub-theme here that maybe we don't want to get caught up only in looking at individuals. And I think that's something very important for us because from quantum physics to Buddhist experience there is certainly a- there is certainly much to testify to the fact that there are many ways in which we're not individuals.

00:18.05                   And in fact, individual didn't even mean what it means today - to be apart - until the 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> century, when individuality in the West became a

great trope. It used to mean that which cannot be parted. Like the Holy Trinity. So, I think as we study ourselves, we want to study ourselves also in community. And we've talked a lot about Buddha and dharma so far, but we haven't talked a lot about Sangha.

00:18.32

In the sense of which the way community impacts not only the intellectual understanding of a person in community, but the energies of that person, also. One reason why chanting is so significant, for example. And so, as we study the bodies and brains of people in isolation, we might also want to look at how they're operated in community. And I for one greatly look forward to whatever of many possible, wonderful directions this conversation will take. And again, thanks to all who've made this much possible.

\*\*\*APPLAUSE\*\*\*

**THUBTEN JINPA**

00:19.16 I would also like to thank Chris and Annabella for inviting me and giving me this opportunity to be part of this very exciting and enriching conversation. One of the, you can say, advantages or disadvantages of speaking last is that quite a lot of what you wanted to say is already being said, in many cases in a more articulate way.

00:19.39 In fact, the question of inclusiveness and how much to- how far to expand the circle for this conversation is a very difficult one. It's a very challenging one. On the one hand, you know, one would like to be as inclusive and pluralistic as possible, but at the same time it creates a lot of problems - practical and conceptual, as well. Because I have been personally part of various conversations and where the conversations have been most successful is when it's a dialogical part- you know, context.

00:20.20 And then when they are more than two voices, the dialogue gets very complicated. So, it's just a

practical consideration that we need to take very seriously. If we are going to expand the circle, it has to be done in a very thoughtful, careful way with a full awareness of what, you know, what it means in terms of actual prob- you know, practical issues and problems.

00:20.46

I was going to make a specific suggestion, but either Owen has clairvoyance or, you know, as the Tibetans say when both not very smart, we think alike. As Georges pointed out. Only idiots think alike - that's the Tibetan expression in the debating courtyard.

00:21.10

So, I was actually going to make a suggestion on this positive psychology. I've personally been very impressed by Seligman's work. And it's also looks very promising because as he pointed out- points out in his book that much of Western psychological vocabulary has been really dominated by the clinical model. And so, what he would like to see - and he puts it very nicely -

that he would like to see an equivalent of this  
DSL for the posit- is it DSL, yeah? DSM, yeah.

00:21.44

He would like to see an equivalent of DSM for  
positive emotions. Which I think is a very  
interesting way of putting it and the reason why  
I, as a Buddhist and Buddhist scholar, is very  
interested in this. Is because I know the power  
of the dominance of scientific discourse.  
Effectively, when you think of clinical problems  
and pathologies - psychological patho- you know,  
psychiatric issues and psychopathologies - DSM is  
the Bible.

00:22.16

And it's the language and the standard and so on  
is so dominant. And if ever someday an equivalent  
to that is going to be produced for positive  
emotions - emotions that pertain to experience of  
happiness, well-being and so on - then I fully  
agree with Owen that process in the creation of  
that kind of manual or standardization really  
needs to be much more inclusive. It cannot be

confined to a specific culture's bias of what happiness consists of.

00:22.53

What kind of emotions are positive. And here, I feel that the contemplative traditions can make a very significant contribution. And I can speak for my own Buddhist, Indo-Tibetan Buddhist tradition. In the Tibetan Buddhist tradition in- not just in the non-Mahayana Abhidharma sources, but also in the Mahayana Abhidharma sources - I'm particularly thinking of the fourth century brothers Asanga and Vasubandhu - in some sense we can refer to them as kind of, you know, primary Buddhist psychologists.

00:23.29

I mean, if one can use the term in a loose way. They have written quite extensively on many of these mental factors - the interrelationships. What- you know, their definitions, their cause and effect dynamical relationships and so on and in fact, they also have programs or practices which can help enhance and cultivate and develop

them. So, and some of these are empirical claims, but whatever it may be I think in the formulation of the concept of what constitutes a positive emotions and what not, I think that the part- there has to be much more participation from different voices.

00:24.12

And I know that one of Alan's main kind of, in some sense, slogan is this, you know, human flourishing. Alan wants to, you know, kind of help- encourage the Western philosophy of mind and psychological world to try to re-appreciate the Greek concept of eudemonia. So, the understanding of happiness is not just confined to just, you know, immediate sense gratification. So, I just wanted to add that.

\*\*\*APPLAUSE\*\*\*

**PAUL GAILEY**

00:24.51

It's interesting that in physics, we have a very clear concept of time. What we're missing in physics is a concept of now. We don't have a t-prime or something that stands for now, so we

talk about time, but we don't know what now is. Flipping that over, culturally, we often are very absorbed in now and we don't have a very good sense of time.

00:25.18

So, one question I would pose for our panelists here or maybe some of the other panelists would be regarding- in regard to our historical perspective. One point that I've learned listening to Alan and listening to Bob is that at various times in history, we've had- there have been great schools of introspection and vast numbers of people engaged in those practices.

00:25.45

There's certainly many other periods of history where that was not true. My question would be with regard to first-person investigations with regard to the kinds of questions that are being raised here - where do we stand now, in a bit of a historical perspective? What's different about now? Why do we think we can approach this, the problems we've raised here, differently? Will we

approach them in the same way? So, I just would address that to any of our panelists here, or maybe some of the other panelists, as well.

**TEED ROCKWELL**

00:26.21 Throw it out to the audience.

**PAUL GAILEY**

Yeah, maybe it's- if the panelists don't have a-

**ALAN WALLACE**

00:26.39 Whenever I think about now I think of the very recent past. In that context. And the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it strikes me that it presents us with an awesome koan. That in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there was exponential growth of knowledge and power - the greatest success in the history of humanity in terms of this extraordinary growth of knowledge of power, the great, fantastic success of science and technology, which in a way can give us- gives rise to enormous celebration, as we've heard.

00:27.09 Who wants to go back and die at the age of 40 and so forth and so on, on the one hand. And then the

koan part is the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the worst century in history for the environmental degradation, for man's inhumanity against man, the sheer slaughter in the genocides - one after another - two major World Wars. How we could know so much and be so powerful and be so maliciously idiotic.

00:27.33

Is a great koan I think. And so, we- if we follow this trajectory, which we seem to be now for the first six years of this century, then it seems quite clear we're bent on self-destruction and bringing down a lot of the planet with us. So clearly, this is a time of crisis and a time when on a great, big, bulky level, there's a rise of very militant, religious fundamentalism and so forth and so on. Very, very dire, very deeply concerning issues on the one hand.

00:28.00

But if we come right to the present, as well, I think there are other truths that are not as large and bulky, but maybe just as important in

which I see bright light. And that is in the history of religions as so many people pointed out - religions have a really long, terrible history with each other.

00:28.15

Of either dominate, kill, subjugate or ignore. Or convert. Those are kind of the options. And now, we're finding more and more people in this gathering right here - but I go to these type of gatherings quite often - where people of different religious contemplative traditions, religious traditions coming together to learn from each other. This is really odd.

00:28.35

I mean, we debated with each other for a long time. That's pretty benign. But it's always to win. You lose, I win. I lose, you win. But now, actually, coming together to learn from each other? This is very unusual. And then science and religion - it's a very complex relationship. Clearly, we had these great architects of poor Galileo, poor Bruno, poor Darwin, poor-

this conflictual relationship and we've seen it just recently in Dover, Pennsylvania.

00:29.01

Who- somebody won, somebody lost. But now, what's happening again in this rather unprecedented way are people very committed to a scientific paradigm and others very committed to various religious or spiritual paradigms coming together not to see who wins and who loses - how can we learn together. How can we learn from each other? And again, for alleviation of suffering, but as Owen and Thubten Jinpa bring out - can we re-conceive and bring out a fresh vision that is ancient and unprecedented of human flourishing.

00:29.33

Something that is so important that nobody's got a monopoly. I'm a Buddhist, I think it has a lot to contribute, but does Martin Seligman and so does Aristotle and so do the Taoists and so do the Vedantans. And that we're actually coming together. This strikes me as being breathtakingly

hopeful in the face of an extremely dire, bulky situation.

\*\*\*APPLAUSE\*\*\*

**PAUL GAILEY**

00:30.06

I have a sense that that was a note to end on. So, let's stop there. That's a nice way to do it. But now, I'd like to ask Bob Pollack who is here today to make a few comments as the director of the CSSR, who has hosted this wonderful conference.

**ROBERT POLLACK**

00:30.29

Well, thank you all. I am first of all happy to say that I'll be the last speaker at this symposium. And on behalf of all the speakers, I want to thank you all to come hear us. On behalf of Paul Gailey and myself, I want to thank you all for confirming the wisdom of the ongoing collaboration between the Fetzer Institute and the CSSR at Columbia.

00:30.56

On behalf of Chris Kelley and Annabella Pitkin and Katie Gerbner and Fiona Baigrie and Laura