



AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

**HAPPINESS, FREE ENTERPRISE, AND HUMAN
FLOURISHING: A SPECIAL ONLINE EVENT
FEATURING HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA**

PANEL II

**UNLOCKING THE MIND AND HUMAN HAPPINESS
(COHOSTED BY THE MIND & LIFE INSTITUTE)**

DISCUSSION:

**HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA
DIANA CHAPMAN WALSH, MASSACHUSETTS
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
RICHARD DAVIDSON, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
OTTO SCHARMER, MASSACHUSETTS
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ARTHUR ZAJONC, MIND & LIFE INSTITUTE**

**10:30 AM – 12:00 PM
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2014**

EVENT PAGE: <http://www.aei.org/events/2014/02/20/happiness-free-enterprise-and-human-flourishing-a-special-online-event-featuring-his-holiness-the-dalai-lama/>

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY:
DC Transcription – www.dctmr.com**

ARTHUR ZAJONC: Welcome to everyone to our second session. My name is Arthur Zajonc so I'm the other Arthur. I don't think you'll be too confused.

Allow me to begin by thanking Arthur Brooks and the AEI for their kind invitation to join this distinguished group of presenters this morning and also a very distinguished audience in order to explore themes of deep importance and common concern.

Your Holiness, as always, it's a great pleasure to also be working once again with you, as we have over many, many years. It's been a source of great happiness and flourishing, you could say, for us to be in dialogue with you for now nearly 30 years.

Many of you have asked, what is the Mind and Life Institute? I think I should take just a minute to say a word or two about it. Back in 1987, his holiness, the Dalai Lama was joined by a neuroscientist Francisco Varela, and a businessman, Adam Engle, in a kind of common interest and enterprise to join the best of the sciences of the day, what it is that neuroscience, physics, astrophysics, consciousness research could bring to the table in the conversations with the great contemplative traditions of Asia, traditions which also explore the nature of the mind and the nature of reality around us.

And so those conversations would last five days – five days. You've got a couple of hours. Imagine sitting in this very small room, his living room for five full days of dialogue on the most esoteric and interesting and important subjects of our time, done not out of curiosity but out of the conviction that ignorance is the source of suffering and that if we can come together across normal divides, the schisms between science and religion which go back centuries, if we can bring those broken parts together, then perhaps together the insights and wisdom will arise that really is necessary for our time today. So we came together not out of just idle curiosity or only out of friendship, although those were also there, our interest in friendship and each other, but also our animated concern for the well-being of our both individual community, and ultimately our planet.

And so Mind and Life's work from that early beginning has spanned now nearly 30 years. In 2003, we made our first public offering at MIT, called Investigating the Mind, where we studied attention, emotion and mental imagery. We did so with a full array of the world's most foremost scientists, psychologists, neuroscientist and the like and, likewise, on the other side, the contemplative scholars and practitioners drawn from various traditions, who could then work together in public around the same theme, of bringing these two worlds together, a kind of undivided life for the first time. We've had 27 such dialogues, many in public, many still in private, and out of that have come over 15 – I think it's now 18 books, four still in production – a wealth of publications.

But, most recently, our work has also begun to take an applied turn; that is to say, not only are we looking at the basic research that underlies human well-being and

flourishing, alleviating the suffering, but actually Mind and Life has now begun to actually work in the fields, for example, of education, secular ethics, which is so close to your heart; working in the area of craving, desire and addiction; working in the area of mapping the human mind, inviting visiting scholars into our Amherst College house and working with them as well as with 150 young people every summer for the last 10 years. I mean, one thing after the next, and it's really grown from this very fertile dialogue with you, Your Holiness, and with the kinds of people you'll experience on this stage today.

You know, when one begins a practice, a meditative practice, as Daniel Loeb said, we begin with an intention. What is our purpose in doing this? Is it selfish or is it selfless? Do we have in mind the connections – the compassion and connections between all of us that link us one to another? Again and again, his holiness has rearticulated that interdependence as central to our ethical lives. I'd say this work, the work here we're doing today must also, likewise, have that intention.

And so we enter into this dialogue with good spirits. You've articulated the same kind of intention at the very close of your summation. So let us begin also the second session with the same heart-felt demon mind. We're here because we care. We're here because we care. Can we care enough? Can we find the means and methods that we can care for one another?

Let me introduce to you the people who are on stage with me, dear friends all.

Of course, there is Professor Richard Davidson, known to you for many years, Your Holiness, as a professor at the University of Wisconsin and the director of the Center for Investigating Healthy Minds. He'll be leading off with a careful scientific treatment of the study of happiness and well-being, human flourishing based in the neurosciences and psychology, and its implications for education.

Our second presenter was for 14 years president of Wellesley College, Diana Chapman Walsh. Diana is also on the executive committee of MIT's board of directors. She was the founding board chair of the MIT-Harvard so-called Broad Institute for Genomic Research, a woman of extraordinary leadership, in fact, chairing our leadership efforts, so-called Academy for Contemplative and Ethical Leadership at the Mind and Life Institute.

And, finally, we have an added new participant, Otto Scharmer. Otto works at MIT and is the founder of the Presencing Institute, and he'll be speaking to the themes of leadership, mindfulness and the new kind of thinking that can work in the complexities of our contemporary society.

I will be acting as the facilitator. And it's a pleasure then to ask Richard Davidson to begin our discussions.

RICHARD DAVIDSON: Thank you. Wonderful to be with you again, Your Holiness. And I'd like to begin by expressing my gratitude to Arthur Brooks and the

graciousness with which the AEI has received us, and it's really been an exciting collaboration for us. So thank you.

I'm here to talk about happiness and well-being. And over the course of the next few minutes, I'm going to make several distinct points about happiness and well-being from a scientific and particularly a neuroscientific perspective.

So to begin with, scientists are now distinguishing among different components of happiness and well-being, different varieties of happiness and well-being. And happiness, the subjective sense of pleasure we think now is something distinct from well-being, which we define more in an Aristotelian framework that has been described as eudemonia, which is imbued with qualities such as meaning and purpose in life, having positive relations with others, having a sense of personal growth that is being open to change. All of these are constituents of well-being that have been studied in both the psychological and neuroscientific literature.

And one of the most interesting conclusions from this scientific work is that the fleeting experience of happiness is subserved by different circuits in the brain than a more enduring quality of well-being. So that's the first point, that happiness and well-being are distinct.

The second point is a point about genetics. And this is I think a very, very important point because I believe that modern research leads us to a different view of this. According to the most recent, very large-scale studies that have – these are studies that combine across studies. We call them in the scientific literature meta-analyses.

These studies show that somewhere between 20 and 40 percent, as we say in science, of the variance – and I'll explain that in a moment – but 20 to 40 of the variance in well-being is accounted for by genetic factors. Now, what we mean by that is the differences among people in their level of well-being can be attributed somewhere between 20 and 40 percent to their genes. These are heritable factors.

So what conclusion can we draw from that? Can we draw the conclusion that somewhere between 60 and 80 percent is changeable; that is, is the percentage that is caused by our genes something that is immutable, something that cannot be transformed?

And here, I would like to introduce the subject of epigenetics to the audience. And epigenetics is the science of the regulation of our genes. And epigenetics – so epigenetics teaches us that each of our genes has a little volume control that can go from low to high. And that volume control affects the extent to which different genes are actually expressed, the extent to which genes manufacture the proteins for which they are designed.

So we know, for example, that we can take an organism which may have a genetic propensity for anxiety based on its genes, and if it's raised with a mother who is very loving and very nurturing, the very expression of the genes that are involved in

anxiety are transformed so that it doesn't matter that there was a genetic predisposition for anxiety in that case. The environment has actually altered the expression of the genes which are critically implicated in anxiety and shift that regulation.

And so from this perspective, the fact that a certain amount of the variance in our well-being is accounted for by genes really should not be a relevant consideration in discussing the potential impact of training and regulating the environment in its effects on our well-being.

So what are the factors that can promote increases in well-being? Well, Arthur Brooks has actually talked about four, which I think are wonderful. And the four that Arthur Brooks notes are faith, family, community and work, all of which I think there actually is substantial empirical evidence to show that they in fact do play a role in fostering our well-being.

And from the research, the modern research literature, there are two particular factors that I would like to highlight. They are more granular, if you will. They all can be affected by the four factors Arthur Brooks described, but they are generosity and conscientiousness – generosity and conscientiousness. Both of these turn out to be very important in the fostering of well-being.

And, actually, his holiness has written about secular ethics in several books, and his holiness talks about the ethics of restraint, the ethics of virtue, and the ethics of compassion. And I think of conscientiousness as being impacted by the ethics of restraint and generosity being impacted by the ethics of virtue and the ethics of compassion. And so I think that there is some interesting parallel between the Buddhist framework and the conceptions that we're coming up with in modern science.

But I'd like to now turn to the notion that measures of conscientiousness and generosity and other factors that are associated with them early in life are very good predictors of an individual's development over the course of the early decades of life.

Specifically, research indicates that a child's capacity for certain kinds of conscientious behavior when they're four and five years of age predicts outcomes when they're 30 years of age, major life outcomes, including economic success but also drug abuse, physical health and characteristics that are really meaningful for living a life that is filled with flourishing.

So the question that we can now then ask is: is there a possibility through education to actually alter these qualities that are so central to well-being early in life?

And here is where we appeal to the notion of neuroplasticity, the idea that the brain actually is the organ in our bodies that is built to change in response to experience and in response to training. And we know from neuroscience that there are sensitive periods in development where the brain is particularly sensitive to change. And we know

that one of those periods spans the entrance into schooling. It's between four and seven years of age.

And so the question that we and many others and Mind and Life is taking on is, can we develop strategies, interventions, curricula that are targeted to this early period which may then actually foster the qualities like generosity and conscientiousness which are so important to flourishing over the course of development?

And we're beginning to get an answer to that. And the answer suggests that there is absolutely no doubt that these factors can be educated. And they can be educated in part because of our understanding of plasticity in the brain. We can shape the brain during these early periods of development, particularly effectively. In our own research, we have shown gains of 20 percent on measures of delay of gratification from a simple curriculum that we've introduced in the pre-school period. And this measure of delay of gratification is an important element of self-control and conscientiousness.

So we're led then to the conclusion – I'll just summarize here, there are really three points, major points that I've made.

One is that well-being can be learned and from this, we should think of well-being and flourishing more as a skill than as a characteristic that is just fixed within us.

The second is that – and the second is that from neuroscience, we know that the brain is particularly plastic during these early periods of development. And so we could take advantage of these sensitive periods to design interventions in curricula to educate these qualities to educate generosity, to educate conscientiousness.

And the third is that early interventions provide a great return on investment. And the Nobel laureate economist James Heckman from the University of Chicago has calculated that for every dollar that we invest in the pre-school period, there's a return of \$7 on that investment by the time the individual is 30 years of age.

And so I believe that this is an issue that all of us, from all political persuasions should get behind and establish universal education during this period of time where we can really educate the heart in ways that will make a fundamental difference when children develop. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. ZAJONC: Your Holiness, we'd like to take a few minutes to pose a question that draws on what it is the Richie just spoke about. He speaks about the benefit of education and training of those qualities and characteristics such as generosity and conscientiousness and compassion.

Could you speak from your perspective, from this perspective of a practitioner yourself, what kinds of education and training would you recommend be adopted in order to promote just these qualities in children and young adults?

DALAI LAMA: My long-time friend, you mentioned (foreign phrase).

THUPTEN JINPA (translator): Richie mentioned about the sensitive period of four to seven year old.

DALAI LAMA: So I just want to know further more learn. My own case I think, at three, four years, there was no interest about these things. And even I think seven, eight, around 10, you see no interest about – (inaudible) – these things. So actually, my daily lessons start more (worried ?) – or classes, like that. It's a greater – (inaudible).

Then age 12, 13, 16, then gradually sort of more interest developed so I was thinking of the certain sort of idea mentioned in the text and make relation with your own sort of experiences. Then, my age, I think late 20s and 30s, 40s, I think the more rigorous the study and analyze – or contemplation – so really effect. So that means the (foreign phrase).

MR. JINPA: So the sensitive period doesn't seem to be limited to just the early childhood. His holiness is saying that even as a grown-up, there seems to be hope.

MR. : (Inaudible.)

DALAI LAMA: Now my age, you see 70 – 79, nearly 79 but still I meditate – analytical meditation. So I think every day I meditate. It's embedded in the whole day, the whole week. So getting older, no hope, that I don't think. (Laughter.) Whole life. So long the human brain lives in there, I think we can develop further, further, further. What do you think as a scientist?

MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. So there's no question, Your Holiness, that plasticity is present throughout life. That's the great news. So it persists until we die and there's good scientific research to show that. So although there are these sensitive periods, there still is plasticity. But, Your Holiness, I know that on many occasions you have talked about the importance for you of the affection that you received from your mother very early on in your life.

DALAI LAMA: That's right.

MR. DAVIDSON: And that may have set the conditions which then allow you to study and to do these analytic meditation and contemplation once you're older. So that early sense of love and security may be important.

DALAI LAMA: Right. That's absolutely right. (Laughs.)

MR. ZAJONC: Your Holiness, the curriculum and pedagogy that Mind and Life is developing has three modes of care. And the very first is we, all of us, have received care in the early childhood to remember the care that we have received and to honor and to appreciate that more fully is a way of deepening your appreciation and then the

transformation so that we can not only care for ourselves, but also ultimately care for others. So these three modes of care, receiving care, self-care, and extending care to others becomes then a curriculum and pedagogy that can be effective, we think, even at the early ages.

I'd like to introduce our second presenter, Diana Chapman Walsh, of course is known to you as well.

And, Diana, I'd like to invite you to speak.

DIANA CHAPMAN WALSH: Thank you. Thank you so much, Arthur. I am very happy to be here in this happy fest with Your Holiness, in your company again. What a great pleasure it is, as always, to be with you, and this group of intelligent and undoubtedly happy people, (brought ?) by the clarifying insights that have emerged from the mountains of evidence that our friend, Arthur Brooks, has amassed, and mastered, and is spreading across the land. Arthur, your joy and exuberance over the past two days, I love. They are really infectious. So thank you very much for having us here with you. (Applause.)

I also need to say that one of the things I've learned from studying Arthur Brooks' writings, including his op-ed piece in the "New York Times" is that women are happier than men. (Laughter.) So I'm very glad to be here on this stage as the lone representative of the happiest sex. (Laughter, applause.)

I have come in the spirit of warm-hearted – again, warmhearted is a word his holiness uses often and lives. I've come in the spirit of warm-hearted inquiry I so admire in Your Holiness and have so relished in my encounters with you since joining the Mind and Life board just two years ago. It's been an enormous privilege.

Those encounters have demonstrated the power of a particular form of dialogue – and I think we're beginning to nibble at its edges here – a dialogue in which all are invited to come, prepared to learn and potentially to be changed by respectful engagement with the other and perhaps to emerge with ideas that are surprisingly new. That kind of discourse requires artfully designed containers with ground rules and touchstones and intentions that welcome honesty and vulnerability based on reciprocity and earned trust.

This is a meeting of a less intimate sort. And so I bring questions for now, as you'll see. But perhaps we might hope in time to meet again for the deeper dialogue that moves minds and hearts. I hope so.

I want to learn more about how Glen Hubbard would mend the social safety net, more from Dan Loeb about how we can build on the success of the Success Academy and reintroduce the rule of law into our casino markets. I would like to learn more from John Haidt about his encouraging third story, and ask him how deeply are we willing to dig beneath the symptoms into fundamental causes, and really, really study the need for

profound systems change rather than simply focusing on the symptoms. So thanks to all three of you for your extremely thought-provoking presentations.

So my questions, I have many, but I'll just mention two for starters. First, what price do we pay in happiness when we focus too sharply on ourselves? His holiness has told us that it starts with the self, with the individual, but it doesn't end there. We in the West are so preoccupied with working on ourselves that it becomes almost an end in itself. Could that be a distortion of thought, a psychological grasping, an inner materialism akin to the overheated outward materialism that surrounds us at every turn? What if the fundamental error is to seek happiness through accumulation of any kind, material or psychological?

In October, I had the pleasure of participating in one of those Mind and Life Institute dialogues that Arthur described to you, in Dharamshala, the home of his holiness. And we were there with an interdisciplinary group of experts on the topic of craving, desire, and addiction. An underling problem, we learned from the Buddhist scholars who were with us, is that our human tendency to fill an uncomfortable emptiness by clinging to thoughts, feelings, things that are inevitably impermanent as are our lives, is part of our problem. The struggle to come to terms with our mortality is the vulnerability that makes us human. If we seek happiness through acquisition of gadgets, prestige, advantage, then aren't we looking for completion outside of ourselves, seeking a permanence or a perfection that is never ours to attain? Can we learn to be more present to others, including those we most love without possessing them? Can we love them for who they are, not for who we want them to be?

My second question is related to the first. How much of this interest in individual happiness is a sophisticated diversion, a distracting overlay of a simplistic model of social action onto a complex world as we deflect our gaze from frightening signs of instability and danger?

I can hardly bear to allow myself to imagine how our children and theirs, my sweet five-year-old grandson, Shaun (sp), will look back years from now and make any sense of this moment in history when we had compelling evidence that we were doing irreparable harm to the earth's life support systems and yet failed to mobilize, to protect their inheritance?

The head of MIT's anthropology department, a friend, Susan Silbey, explains the error we commonly make when we look to individual agency choice and personality as the causal factors in a world that is far more accurately explained by social context, organizational forms and design, culturally structured opportunities and motives. An over focus on individual cases, she writes, obscures the patterns among them and protects the grand narrative, the story we tell ourselves that our institutions are functioning well enough to meet our needs.

From this perspective, as one example, instead of asking how the individuals experience of earned success at work conduces to personal happiness, we would widen

the aperture and ask how the birth lottery, the economy, the educational and social structures support or undermine the individual's opportunities to experience earned success, and the panelists just before us alluded to those considerations.

Think unemployment, for example, and 30 years of wage stagnation as the weakening of unions has denied workers the opportunity to bargain for decent working conditions and their fair share of the profits of rising productivity. We could argue even, I would assert, in this place that it's the unions, not the free enterprise system that offer the freedom, freedom from wage slavery. Now I know I won't get an applause for that. (Applause.)

Many scholars working to shape what they call a new economy, many of them – and they're quite brilliant and they are on the margins; they are not in the center of our academic bastions where I have spent most of my life – they would place my questions squarely at the feet of the American free enterprise system AEI is here to uphold.

They are asking with Canadian economist Mark Anielski, quote, "Why does the capitalist process and system of economics, accounting and politics, continue to defend or ignore its many forms of social injury and ecological destruction"? That's John Haidt's story number three. I had a list here, a quick list here of some of those injuries or externalities. John spared me having to read it to you. He gave it to you himself. But I think we could say and maybe he would agree that Adam Smith might not recognize where we are right now as his version of the system he viewed as moral.

If we're going to address these problems, these intertwined problems that we heard described this morning, we will need a new kind of leadership, and that's the second half of what I want to talk about this morning, a different kind of leadership in every sector of society, next generation leaders who are equal to today's challenges in all their complexity, who are skilful at leading themselves with compassion and equanimity, with love understood as connection in the way Paul Tillich defined it, the unifying impulse, the recognition of our interweaving with all living beings.

The primary message we have been hearing from his holiness yesterday and today so very clearly, the transformative power of holistic and analytical minds that are informed by warm and inclusive hearts. Love, we'll call it love.

Arthur Zajonc mentioned the Academy for Contemplative and Ethical Leadership that the Mind and Life Institute is beginning to design with strong encouragement from you, Your Holiness. Thank you for that.

We held our first planning meeting just two weeks ago, and we see the way ahead for a safer and saner future in a leadership that's grounded in connection, in love. We want to explore how to sculpt leaders who are gifted in the ways of community and connection. Can we grow up leaders who lead from within, as Parker Palmer has written, who understand that they have a special responsibility to manage their own inner shadows lest they cast more shadow than light on those around them.

The rejoinder comes. These are times for muscular leadership. We are told to be afraid, be very afraid, and to place our faith in heroic figures offering simple comforts. But, surely, these nervous times call for Einstein's new levels of thinking. The more urgently, if we believe that we're entering a period of profound change, what kinds of people do we want leading our vital institutions through historic transformations? How do we want them to lead? What should we expect of leaders we can trust?

We'll need leaders who can bridge and balance tensions without collapsing them, who can hold contradictions creatively so that they open our minds and our hearts to wider syntheses rather than shutting us down. We'll need leaders that can hold contradictions between power and love. Power without love is reckless and abusive, said Martin Luther King in the last weeks of his life. And love without power is sentimental and anemic. The collision of immoral power with powerless morality constitutes the major crisis of our time.

I learned while leading Wellesley College for 14 years that my power, the power of the presidency existed for the essential purpose of enabling others to find their purpose, their authority, their self-authorship. And I learned that to achieve that, I would have to remain open to others in a way that is the essence of love as the drive to sustain unity and maintain connection. I would have to respect the other persons' reality, the other person's yearning, the other person's path of growth, to be open to influence back from others and their different realities, and this in turn taught me the value of diversity as a resource for learning.

I learned to hold another tension there too – this one was even harder – to honor my inner life in the face of all that was swirling around me. It took time and concerted effort to hone the skills to manage external realities and yet maintain a quality of attention in the present that could enfold past and future, embrace complexity, and help me try to meet each moment with equanimity. I didn't always succeed at this. Far from it. But I learned to find my way back when I was lost and to know this quality of mindful presence as a capacity I wanted for myself and for my leadership team because I wanted it for our students.

It's been said that this new generation escaping into social media as their world spins out of control is being raised on information without context, butter without bread, craving without longing. And yet, we have good evidence and solid, as Richie's evidence, that today's youth are longing for more nourishing fare. The disciplines they will need in the years ahead are the ones we will need and they are a life's work never fully mastered, always requiring conscious cultivation.

We'll need the strength to stare down our demons of fear and despair so that we can engage the world with curiosity, opening our minds and freeing ourselves of regret, recrimination, and the defeat of shame and blame.

We'll need to hear and tolerate the diversity within ourselves to recognize our own inner voices, their cacophony in there, our own inter-voices and identities and moods to notice how flood and ephemeral they are so that we can see and appreciate differences in others and use the practice of self-discovery to move beyond ourselves.

We'll need to move beyond dualities, beyond either/or and even beyond the simple corrective of both/and, move to true multiplicities of seeing and of knowing, multiple lenses that acknowledge how competing language gains and inequalities of power create lived realities that never even intersect unless we stretch ourselves to try to bring them together.

And as we stretch, perhaps, finally, we may find our path to happiness in our immense capacity as humans, under the right conditions, the ones of which his holiness has spoken for his whole life, our immense capacity as humans to find and awaken the best in ourselves and in one another, radiating outward in widening circles of compassion and care to the seven billion human beings you hold in your heart, Your Holiness, and all the living beings with whom we share this planet. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. ZAJONC: Your Holiness, Diana Chapman Walsh has spoken about a new kind of leadership, a leadership that really is directed towards our future, a future which, on the one hand, is filled with possibilities and positive possibilities; on the other hand, also, filled with dangers and jeopardy. You yourself have been a leader of a people, your country. You've been a spiritual leader for your monastic community, and you have become a kind of leader for the world community as a whole. Is there some way you could speak out of your experience of a leader who has combined these three elements in a way that might be of some value as we go forward? I know you're a simple monk.

DALAI LAMA: Actually, I spent most part of my sort of life in exile as a refugee so, in a way, simpler.

MR. ZAJONC: Really?

DALAI LAMA: I think.

MR. ZAJONC: OK.

DALAI LAMA: India is our now second home for the last now nearly 35 years. So the government of India are very, very helpful. They're very supportive. So then, my own case (foreign phrase).

MR. JINPA: Things that I need to do.

DALAI LAMA: Of course, you see, the period, in early period, you see (foreign phrase) sometimes you people live that are sort of demoralized, without encouragement. So I usually say self-confidence is something very, very important. I often tell anyone my story.

One time, in South Africa, the Soweto town, you see, I met a local black family. There was one young African, a black African who joined that family, and had a conversation. He introduced himself as a teacher. And I always tell – (inaudible) – talking, they're Africans. I mentioned, now you've already got democracy, equal. The constitution now gives you that. Now you mentally, emotionally, you see, should develop, oh, we are same. Where the white people (foreign phrase) can reach, the black people also can reach. So self-confidence and hard work is very important, I just mentioned that. Then he responded, difficult. We black people, our brain is inferior so we cannot compete.

And I feel – I felt very sad, if that kind of – (inaudible) – attitude is there, they never can be equal. So self-confidence is so important. Then I explained to him, no. If you ask all the scientists, brain specialists if there are any differences in brain because of differences of color, you know what they'll say? Our brain is 100 percent the same. And then, I also mentioned our own case – (inaudible) – that when we have opportunity, you see, we can be equal with everyone, anyone. And then, a lot of sort of talk, explained, then, finally (foreign phrase).

MR. JINPA: With a sigh, a sigh of relief –

DALAI LAMA: Then he said, now, he's convinced we are the same. So at that moment, I really feel a sense of relief. At least I helped, you see, to change one person's mind and develop inner self-confidence, inner strength. So the self-confidence is very, very important.

Quite often, you see, poor people, outwardly of course big differences, the richer family or richer community and the poorer, but if you look inward, same ability, same ability, same potential. So you see, with self-confidence and hard work – in India or Africa, you see, whenever I talk with poor people, I always emphasis, you also have the same potential, work hard.

So the early period, I simply should give some kind of encouragement, and then, of course, maybe a little bit self – (inaudible) – right from the beginning. You see, many Tibetan refugees, you see, they are expecting within a few years can return. Then I telling them, no, we should not think that way. I usually tell them, hope for the best, prepare for the worst. It's something very important. So we carry that way, and then, now, 35 years passed, new Tibetan refugee generations emerge, the second generation now third generations. So we have sort of separate sort of Tibetan settlement and separate Tibetan school, all helped by Indian government. So now the refugee community, as a refugee community we are quite well established.

So then, then meantime, right from the beginning, I'm fully committed to the promotion of democracy since my childhood. You see, the old system, there's something wrong and outdated so we must sort of change that, not just as the decision, to change by decision, it will not work, so step by step work for democratization since '60s, 1960s we

start. And then, 2011 – 2001, 2001, we already achieved elected political leadership. Then my position (assumed ?) that position. Then, in 2011, I now completely retired from political responsibility.

So in the meantime – (inaudible) – I take sort of a lot of responsibility, effort to educate younger Tibetans, you see, our sort of 1,000 year old knowledge, which comes from India, Nalanda tradition, I quite often, you see, challenging: some Western author describes Tibetan Buddhism as Lamaism. It's totally wrong, out of their ignorance. And how? I think the Tibetan themselves, you see, in the popular, they very much sort of – (inaudible) – Lama not much sort of differences about their knowledge. (Laughs.) So I think the constant impression of Tibetan – too much emphasis on the importance of Lama, not study. So I think the people eventually got the impression Tibetan Buddhism is something like Lamaism so Lama have the final authority, Lama has some kind of freedom. That's totally wrong.

So that's why I always describe myself as a simple Buddhist monk, just one of the Buddhist monks. According also to our sort of monastic system, 253 rules, 253 precepts, all monk, no exception Dalai Lama; have to follow the same way and study, rigorous study.

I think yesterday I mentioned, I had the sort of name Dalai Lama, remain – in the ceremony, I remain on throne, but as my study is concerned, the same, so my tutor keep weep, no exception as a Dalai Lama or – (inaudible). (Laughs.) They treated me like lazy student. I think it's very good.

So, therefore, I really put emphasis on study, rigorous study, traditionally 20, 30 years study, memorize the most sort of important root text. Then explain each word according to the commentary, again as the Indian – wrote by Indian masters.

So that knowledge, now I notice as far as Buddhist philosophy, Buddhist – (inaudible) – is concerned, I think the Tibetan study is the best. I think we kept, I think, intact over 1,000 years the knowledge of Nalanda. So I ask, my long-time friend, you see, whether my brain something useful or sufficient sharpness or not? (Laughter.) All this comes from, you see, Tibetan study which comes from Nalanda.

Yesterday also I mentioned, you see skeptical – skepticism, not easily accept, analyze, analyze and look at various factors. That ought to particularly develop holistic view. That brings realistic sort of view. Realistic view then carries realistic action. Then satisfactory results come, so this I felt very, very useful.

And also can – I mean, there's some potential, can make a little contribution for well-being of humanity. Never think in conversion, never think in sort of (propagating Buddha dharma ?). I think our last many years, I never sort of mentioned about next life or Buddhist, certain Buddhist concepts. We're simply discussing about mind, about emotion, and how to deal this – (inaudible).

So part of Buddhist science, not Buddhist religion, so right from the beginning some people, some concerned people used the word dialogue between Buddhism and modern science. And I say no, this is the wrong word. I say, our dialogue is science which comes from Buddhist literature so we can call Buddhist science or ancient Indian science and modern science dialogue. Science, not religion, not faith.

So I think I made (foreign phrase) mentioned maybe, you see, that out of 300 volumes which actually are text, so I divided – first, I felt content of these 300 volumes, we can divide into three parts, science, matters, and minds, or external world, or internal world, that part is science, not talking positive or negative, simply what is the reality? That we can treat as a science. Then, on that basis, Buddhist concept, concept of impermanence, concept of interrelated or relativeness, these things, that is Buddhist concept of Buddhist philosophy. On that basis, Buddhist practice, training of mind, that part is Buddhist religion. So philosophy – no. Science and philosophy and religion. So as far as science concerned – (inaudible) – last about three years, you see, we compiled –

MR. JINPA: We're creating a compendium from the classical Indian sources.

DALAI LAMA: So now already completed, almost completed, so March we finalize. Then immediately we start to translate, translation, English translation, Hindi translation, Chinese translation, then many of our friends, Mongolians, Koreans, and Vietnamese, they also are ready to translate, and Russian, like that. So therefore, that's my main job –

MR. : That's your main job.

DALAI LAMA: Not sort of political thing. Administration right from the beginning, you see, the appointed person, you see they carry. If I carry sort of the administration, I think everything – (foreign phrase).

MR. JINPA: Everything would be confused.

DALAI LAMA: That's sort of – actually, my sort of commitment, go to different countries, different places and to show you my teeth. That's all. One time, the vice – later he was the Indian president – (inaudible) – very good scholar and with modern education in – Oxford educated and also great philosopher, so one time were sitting together, you see, looking at some pictures and everybody was smiling. And he mentioned, we are advertising our teeth. (Laughter.) He mentioned that. So that's one of my jobs, like that.

I think that job also, you see, quite useful. That job brings more friends, more smiles from others, except in some cases – in Germany – I want to share with you as a joke. You see, one time in Germany, you see, one function, I've been there. Then I was in a car. Of course, as my nature, whenever I met, I see something, someone, I always smile. So that particular day, one quite young lady was coming. As usual, I smile. I think that lady got some suspicion. (Laughter.) Why, why does this strange person in the car,

just – (inaudible) – smiling? So I think she may have gotten some suspicion and distrust. (Laughter.) So she looks very negatively. Then I also turn. (Laughter.)

So – (inaudible) – not very sure, you see, give smile, sometimes negative response. Although, basically, even animals shine, sincerity, animals, poor animal, no intelligence, very limited intelligence, they also respond.

MR. ZAJONC: Thank you, Your Holiness.

DALAI LAMA: So the only question since many years whether the mosquito has the ability to show appreciation or not, still – the discussion still remains so – mosquito. I think the last – I think more than 20 years, I ask quite often some scientists, one occasion in Oxford, had scientists or philosophers, professors in the front line. So I asked them, nobody said – nobody answered. So now, this is – your work – you see, the tiny insect, which level of brain size have the ability to show appreciation? That still I don't know. So answer must come from you. So you have to sacrifice more insects. (Laughter.) (Inaudible) – isn't it, to experiment. Thank you. Thank you.

MR. ZAJONC: If I summarize –

DALAI LAMA: I'm so sorry. I'm wasting, wasting your time. Sorry. Sorry. (Laughter.)

MR. ZAJONC: Not at all. Not at all. I think concerning leadership, endurance, self-confidence, study, clarity of thought, and good teeth.

DALAI LAMA: Good teeth and, you see, bald head. (Laughter.)

MR. ZAJONC: I'd like to pull our final presenter into the hilarity.

Otto Scharmer, why don't you join us by presenting your thoughts, which will include thoughts concerning leadership and what is called for. Thank you.

OTTO SCHARMER: Your Holiness, Arthur and Arthur, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to express my deep appreciation for being part of this conversation this morning. And I would like to add a few remarks on the beginning conversations of leadership, systems thinking and mindfulness that we can observe in many areas today.

I'm an action researcher at MIT. I spent the last 20 years of my professional work in the context of organizational learning, innovation, and change. And during that time, I had the possibility to work in a lot of underground change projects across cultures and sectors. And I also had the opportunity to do research projects among others, kind of interviewing 150 thought leaders on innovation, leadership, and change. And many of them were practitioners. So listening to, you know, to the practitioners and listening to the experiences in the field, I would like to summarize my own learnings from that with four simple points that I would like to add to the conversation this morning.

The first one is that there are two different sources of learning: learning from the past and learning from the emerging future, learning by leaning into, sensing and actualizing emerging future possibilities. And when you look into my field, organization learning, almost all the methodologies and all the kind of best practices that I've done in consulting companies and so forth are based on the first learning model, the experiential learning model, which is basically learning by reflecting on the experience of the past.

However, in working with leaders in business, government and civil society, I noticed that more often than not, leaders are facing challenges that you cannot address just by reflecting on the experience of the past. Sometimes the experiences of the past that we have are not very useful. Sometimes the experience of the past that we have in a team, for example, is the very obstacle to come up with a new way of framing a situation.

So that then led the question to me, is there a second source of learning, learning by sensing, leaning into, and then actualizing emerging future possibilities? And if yes, how does it work?

Which leads me to my second point and leads me to the process that I have seen being at work when these situations, learning from the emerging future happened.

So in order to sense, lean into and actualize emerging future possibilities, leaders have to engage in a process that is moving through the following three stages: one, you know, after clarifying your intention, observe, observe, observe, kind of go into a deep emergent journey where you go to the stakeholders and the places that can teach you most about the situation and listen with your mind and heart wide open.

Number two, you know, everyone coming back and sharing what they experience and then retreat and reflect, allow the inner knowing to emerge, kind of synthesize everything that you heard and connect that with our own deeper senses of knowing, with who you are, and what's the kind of change, or what's the kind of story we want to be part of. And then, when the spark or inspiration of the future shows up, number three, act in an instant so not putting it into long-time planning process but exploring the future by doing through rapid, small-scale experiments that generate feedback from other stakeholders.

The third thing that I learned is that to do that well, for leaders to do that well, leaders have to engage in a new type of leadership world which is an inner cultivation world by cultivating three inner instruments of knowing, which are the open mind, the open heart, and the open will.

What I mean with open mind is the capacity to suspend our habits of judgment and to attempt to look at a situation with fresh eyes. What I mean with open heart is the capacity to empathize, the capacity of looking at a situation not from my angle but from the view of other stakeholders in that situation. And what I mean with open will is the

capacity to access the deep creative and entrepreneurial core that is dormant in every single human being.

Your Holiness, you were – yesterday you said action is more important than praying and blessing. So this process that, you know, that I just outlined is basically trying to link these three by kind of linking contemplation, observation, with rapid cycle action.

There are many leaders today that – or there are several leaders today that embody these principles.

Steve Jobs is well – you know, how has been a practitioner – (inaudible) – practitioner himself is well known kind of for his claim that the only way to do our best work is by following your heart, do what you love and love what you do.

Another leader I learned a great deal from, the late CEO of Hanover Insurance, Bill O'Brien kind of summarized his own kind of transformation change experienced as a CEO with the following sentence. He said: the success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervener. So what he meant is the success of what I do as a leader, as a change maker depends on the inner place from that I'm operating. It depends on the quality of attention and intention that I bring into a situation.

One leader that I see also greatly embodying these principles is Eileen Fisher, the founder and CEO of Eileen Fisher, very successful women's clothing company, who not only, like Steve Jobs is kind of using practices, cultivation practices herself as an individual but who also, like Twitter co-founder Evan Williams kind of does in his company introduces kind of mindfulness practices on an organizational level. And Eileen Fisher, every single business meeting is – at the beginning, there is a moment of mindfulness. It's not too long. It's maybe just a minute and it gives everyone in that meeting the possibility to connect with the present moment, with my own experience, and with what we're here for to do together with my own intentions.

My fourth and final point relates – comes back, Your Holiness, to your various remarks yesterday and today when you talked about the larger situation, the global crisis situation we are in. You know, Diana also talked about that earlier in other – at the earlier panel, kind of other co-panelists. And you said everything is interrelated. And you also said that taking care of others is the best thing also for ourselves, for our own future, so it's not really an alternative.

So my fourth and final point relates to the global pressing challenges that we face as a community today. I have over the past few years been involved in multi-stakeholder work in education, in health, in business, in sustainability. And from my experience, the key leadership challenge in all these projects and all these huge in part very large multi-stakeholder projects is the same.

And it deals with – it begins with the fact that no single organization, be it government or business, can solve the big challenges that we face in education, health and so on alone. So we have a collaboration challenge really. And in all these systems, what we need to do as leaders is something very simple, which is we need to bring together all the key stakeholders, including business, government, civil society.

And we need to move them through a process where they begin to make sense of the larger situation together, identify some of the key systematic issues that we need to address, develop kind of, you know, a vision, an intention of better ways of operating and then exploiting that in small scale hands-on prototypes where we can learn from experience, and then scale what's working.

So that – so what I'm saying here is – Richie, you were talking about neuroplasticity this morning, and when you said that, I thought, well, what is really the leadership challenge today? Leaders are the stewards of the neuroplasticity of the collective brain, kind of that, you know, should be switched on in terms of the collaborative opportunities that we need today across all the silos that our kind of current way of institutionalizing things has created. And that's really – I believe kind of the core leadership challenge that we face, kind of how, you know, we – what we can do to be good stewards of switching on, of activating kind of the neuroplasticity of the collective field of collaboration and interaction that we have.

So there are many examples of that, you know, including kind of the Sustainable Food Lab here in America, with over 70 companies in Africa in a project that significantly improved the health of all the stakeholder in Namibia, and also, kind of in Southeast Asia around the Coral Triangle Initiative, which is convening hundreds of stakeholders from all three sectors to address the biodiversity and the marine sustainable fishing and food security challenges in the region and globally.

And so, in summing up, and in all these challenges, the base – the fundamental challenge for leaders is the same, which is to move the system that currently interacts based on ego-system awareness, which is – a narrow definition of ego-system awareness that I'm only aware of my own kind of view of the situation so a different way of operating, where the interaction and the collaboration is based on a shared ego-system awareness, and with ego-system awareness, I mean an awareness that is focusing not only on my own well-being but also on the well-being of all other stakeholders in the system. That in my view is the key leadership challenge today and (decides ?) is the causal factor that determines the quality of results that we generate in these systems.

So in summing up, I tried to – I tried to make three points. The first one is that there are two different sources of learning, learning from reflecting the past and learning by sensing, leaning into, and actualizing emerging future possibilities.

Secondly, leaders, in order to activate this second type of learning, need to cultivate three new leadership capacities: the open mind, mindfulness, paying attention to

our attention, the open heart, compassion, and the open will which is activating the deeper creative and entrepreneurial core that is dormant in every human being.

And the last one, the last point is that the number one leadership challenge in my view today is to shift the field of interaction from the current mode that is mainly based on ego-system awareness or a narrow definition of that to one that's more based on a shared awareness of the whole and that is designed to create results that address the key challenges that we face as a community today.

Your Holiness, my question to you is this. So we have seen many great examples of benefits applying the power of mindfulness and compassion as individuals, and yes, that's where the starting point is. But what we also see today is that we face major challenges that require to use the power of mindfulness and compassion also on a systems level, on kind of how we evolve the system as a whole. And I would be just very interested in your view, your thoughts or your experience in that.

DALAI LAMA: I think you know better. You already have the experience. My thinking is emphasizing the education so that's the fundamental approach. I think people who never sort of experience these things, then all the sudden, you see – (inaudible) – do that, they're burdened.

MR. JINPA: It becomes a burden.

DALAI LAMA: So through education, I think like – (inaudible) – taking care of one's sort of physical health, for example, the exercise of these things, from childhood, they sort learn that, and then that becomes part of their habit. So these things I think should start, as you mentioned, from a young age. That also not sort of something like imposing but for their own interest, even take this life student, you know, with these sort of experiences much happier. Even among students some quarrel, a few moments fight, but then forget.

So, you see, the students themselves see the benefit so through that way then grow, then, eventually, and the society, and getting job, and eventually become leadership. Then I think the real effect comes, otherwise I don't know, pockets here and here. I don't know. So you know better.

MR. ZAJONC: It's my impossible task to pull this all together just a few seconds really.

You know, we've come together across extraordinary divides. We've come from the left, we've come to the right; we've come from the world of science, the world of contemplative spirituality, from the world of leadership and organizational systems, redesign, and re-imagination. We've entered into a heart-felt and truly open dialogue.

To me, this is a kind of politics of compassion that does not recognize – does not recognize party lines, individual differences but recognizes that we all care about each

other. We care about this planet that supports our good life. You know, Mind and Life, and I'm sure AEI and many people who may be hearing this from around the world on the web stream are also united in this commitment and conviction to truly care for each other and for our world, to practice a politics of compassion as opposed to one of division and argumentation.

So it's been a great pleasure and privilege to be part of this conversation. Just as one sets an intention at the beginning of a practice so that it may be fruitful not only for one self, but for others, that selflessness, I always think one should practice gratitude and dedication at the end of such practice and perhaps this dialogue we can also be grateful to Arthur Brooks and his staff for generously hosting this, to those sponsors who supported it, and, of course, to you, Your Holiness, for the courage and the inspiration to speak to all communities, to even as a Marxist – (laughter) – to join us here to learn something about capitalism, to critique, to practice that dialogue with respect and good heart.

And, Arthur Brooks, I'd love to invite you up here to close the session for us as well. (Applause.)

ARTHUR BROOKS: Thank you. Thank you, Arthur. And thanks to all of you. One person that we haven't had a chance to show a little bit of gratitude is Dr. Jinpa, the wonderful translator for his holiness, the Dalai Lama. (Applause.)

We've reached the end of our session. And his holiness, the Dalai Lama, is off to bless others for the rest of the day today. As we close out the session, please just take a quick moment to stay seated as he leaves the stage.

And I do want to reiterate what Arthur just said to all of you. The founding principle of the American Enterprise Institute is that the competition of ideas is fundamental to a free society. We learned here today from his holiness, the Dalai Lama, and our wonderful colleagues, new colleagues from the Mind and Life Institute, that to consider differing ideas with an open mind and a warm heart is a real virtue and it's a blessing to all of us.

This is important because we've also learned some of the secrets to happiness. The secrets to happiness lie within, according to his holiness and according to the scientific evidence but we can also improve happiness in our lives and the lives of other people through visionary institutions and visionary public policy. This is what we are dedicated to mutually.

And I think that the most important point of all is the blessings that we all received today, the blessing that we received from open dialogue, the blessings that we received from the human solidarity that's completely apparent in this room and that will continue as we leave today, and the blessing, most of all, from the wisdom of the most wonderful man that we have met in so much time, his holiness, the Dalai Lama.

Please join me in thanking his holiness as we thank all of you, and say, God bless you, and thank you. (Applause.)

(END)