Buddhism, ASEAN and the Case of Myanmar

Jeff Waistell

Introduction

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) "is a 10-member international body that represents more than 500 million people living in the region. Set up in 1967 in Bangkok by Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore, it has since been joined by Brunei, Laos, Vietnam, Myanmar and Cambodia" (BBC, 2014). However, the entry of Myanmar, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam without clear admission criteria raised questions regarding their preparedness for ASEAN, namely the legitimacy of some of the governments in power, straining ASEAN's relations with its dialogue partners in these countries (Kraft, 2000). In their relations with one another, ASEAN Member States have adopted the principles of mutual respect for national independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and identity; no external interference, subversion or coercion; settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful manner; no threat or use of force; and effective cooperation (ASEAN, 2014). ASEAN's non-interference policy rests on three important foundations governing international relations (Katanyuu, 2006):

1. Discouraging members from criticizing or intervening in other members' internal affairs.
2. Committing members to deny support or sanctuary to groups that subvert the governments of member states.
3. Discouraging members from providing support deemed subversive to other members to external powers.

ASEAN is a salient topic for the UNDV 2015 conference theme of 'Buddhism and World Crisis' because ASEAN's aims include economic growth, social progress, cultural development, regional peace and stability (ASEAN, 2014). Its Socio-Cultural Blueprint has adopted six goals: human development, welfare, social justice, sustainability, building the ASEAN identity, and narrowing the development gap. ASEAN promotes collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical, scientific and administrative fields.

While member states have made progress, there remain lingering challenges of funding, expertise and human resources, technical expertise, language proficiency, coordination mechanisms, and awareness of the goals amongst government officials. There are also significant challenges in achieving the aims, such as differences in language, culture, and religion (ASEAN, 2014). Moreover, maintaining ASEAN's centrality will require it to address problems of capacity, leadership, consensus, and collective action (Caballero-Anthony, 2014).

What has ASEAN achieved? Set up to promote regional interests, collaboration and co-operation, it has negotiated its free trade agreement, eased regional travel, constructively engaged with Myanmar, promoted peace and stability, and agreed 'no nuclear weapons' and counter-terrorism treaties (BBC, 2014). ASEAN has achieved a degree of political cohesion on some regional and international issues, kept the peace among its members, adopted norms for inter-state relations, advanced regionalism, reduced tariffs on intra- ASEAN trade, established modes of cooperation in dealing with regional problems – but fallen short in driving regionalism and regional economic integration, partly because political cohesion and economic integration have been pursued separately (Severino, 2007). Moreover, ASEAN may not be able to amass the

economic clout commensurate with its position as a key player in East Asia, and the ASEAN Economic Community may not come to fruition (Austria, 2012).

ASEAN economic integration is driven by corporate interests, neglecting working populations, who should be central to their development programs (Ofreneo, 2008). States increasingly intrude into and direct the ASEAN Civil Society Conference (ACSC), restraining civil society organizations' participation, "challenging the view of the ACSC as an independent space for advocacy and indicating the hollowness of ASEAN's commitments to creating a 'people-oriented' Association" (Gerard, 2013, p.411). The prospects are doubtful for building a people-cantered ASEAN Community in which regional governance displays inclusiveness and addresses the interests of the region's ordinary people, instead of what its elites deem appropriate (Nesadurai, 2009). Freistein (2013) questions the promises of the ASEAN Charter of promoting democracy, human rights and the role of the regional populations, arguing that conflict rather than consensus is the ASEAN's dominant mode of politics. ASEAN has no mechanisms devoted to the protection of minorities and indigenous peoples: the ASEAN Charter and the Terms of Reference for the ASEAN Inter-Governmental Commission on Human Rights both refer to human rights and cultural diversity but do not explicitly refer to minorities or indigenous peoples (Meijknecht and de Vries, 2010).

Examining ASEAN's core norms in the context of the global financial crisis, Nair (2011) found that the political will for pursuing the ASEAN Charter's normative agenda was weak and divided. During the crisis, the economic agenda dominated the regional discourse, and capacity-building for governance, political reform, and democracy was constrained by resources. The economic crisis did not spur any challenge or innovation with regard to the traditional ASEAN institutional norms of non-interference and consensus decision-making. However, ASEAN may be pushed toward institutional innovation by the growing participatory norms in the domestic politics of ASEAN's older members, particularly Indonesia, a trend likely to produce tensions with newer members (Nair, 2011).

Looking ahead, key issues include forming a Southeast Asian regional bloc that links members' combined economies of more than $2 trillion by 2016, reducing trade barriers and easing labor movement (although there are challenges in cutting non-tariff barriers, harmonizing regional labor regulations, and mitigating impacts on local economies), expanding external relations beyond the region with potential trading and investment partners, engaging more with G-20 and emerging global economies, increasing foreign direct investment as a measure of gross domestic product across the region, and preserving the strategic autonomy of the region (Ben, 2014).

Myanmar and ASEAN:

In 1997, Myanmar became a member of ASEAN for several reasons: political alliances and legitimacy, prestige, and access to markets (but without reciprocating the necessary economic reforms necessary for encouraging economic growth). Equally, the ASEAN group gained from access to Myanmar's natural resources. However, foreign investors discovered that the country's regulations, corruption, and poor infrastructure limited profit margins. As investors withdrew and international pressure increased, the economic attraction became overshadowed by the need for increasing ASEAN pressure on Myanmar (McCarthy, 2008).

A collective position on Myanmar was difficult to achieve, given the constraints of the non-interference doctrine, although ASEAN arrived at a consensus position in 2005. Instrumental in the change were the five founding members: Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore and the Philippines. These members relaxed the principle in order to support national reconciliation in Myanmar. Once refraining from criticism of

Myanmar's human rights abuses, ASEAN later denounced the deteriorating situation (Katanyuu, 2006).

Myanmar-ASEAN relations were influenced by intense international pressure and ASEAN's desire to maintain regional credibility (McCarthy, 2008). International catalysts left ASEAN no other choice but to pressurize the Myanmar junta to engage in democratic reform and political dialogue with opposition and ethnic groups. The transition from non-intervention was evident at the eleventh ASEAN summit in 2005: Myanmar was pushed towards democratic reform and to release political detainees. This reflected ASEAN's increasingly collective approach toward Myanmar and the group's willingness to review its once sacrosanct non-interference policy (Katanyuu, 2006).

The international pressure that comes from increased international awareness of events inside Myanmar is of concern to ASEAN but Myanmar's domestic politics have also had a more direct impact on its ASEAN neighbors, as cross-border problems cause regional instability: drug production and addiction; the spread of HIV and bird flu; and border area conflicts, forced relocations, poverty, and suppression of dissent all increased the flow of illegal immigrants or refugees into other ASEAN countries (McCarthy, 2008).

The ASEAN community has favored diplomacy and peer pressure in order to influence Myanmar's military government to release Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, free other political detainees and to promote national reconciliation (Haacke, 2008). ASEAN's efforts were not proving very successful, although Myanmar moved beyond extraconstitutional rule. Different positions on promoting political change in Myanmar were held within ASEAN. Significant differences characterized the Myanmar policy of individual ASEAN countries according to their different interests and pressures, and dissimilar views on how to help Myanmar democratize; Indonesia was originally the only ASEAN country to have posited a regional diplomatic initiative (Haacke, 2008).

Katanyuu (2006) analyses factors that compelled ASEAN to relax its policy of non-interference towards members and to intervene in Myanmar's internal affairs. Such factors included pressure from the international community and ASEAN individual members and the group as a whole. The situation in Myanmar with regard to human rights abuses and democratic reforms led ASEAN to review its policy. Myanmar "presented ASEAN with an opportunity to relax a doctrine that had been necessary during the early years of the organization but that had become unworkable as an ongoing policy for dealing with human rights and cross-border threats" (Katanyuu, 2006, p.826). ASEAN's long-term corporate attempts to constructively engage Myanmar's military may be an area where ASEAN has to revise adherence to the twin traditional norms (Nair, 2011).

Any intervention in Myanmar would need to take into account the interests of four key players – USA, Thailand, China and India - and their capabilities (Guilloux, 2010). However, the peculiar mix of these interests and capabilities conspires to paralyze intervention. Firstly, although America has strong capabilities and considers any type of intervention, Myanmar does not offer it any significant material or strategic interest. Secondly, Thailand's interest is high (given the disruptions that flow across its borders) but it has limited military capabilities and is constrained by ASEAN's non-interventionist stance. While China and India have important capabilities they will refrain from intervening unless they perceive that their interests are threatened. Furthermore, future intervention in Myanmar would be risky because of Myanmar's internal situation, its geostrategic location, the reciprocal suspicions of China and India, and the unclear boundaries of the responsibility to protect policy (Guilloux, 2010).

Moreover, the Myanmar government is resistant to political change, whether it be internal or external, and is suspicious of attempts by other countries to alter the political situation. It believes itself and its military to be the saviors of the national interest. However, the military have little incentive to accommodate change, preferring to retain domestic political power rather than appeasing the international community (Ganesan, 2006).

ASEAN has been criticized for "being big on words and short on action" in the pursuit of members' consensus: "its staunch support for the principle of non-interference has reinforced regional stability and, paradoxically, authoritarian governance, despite commitments to promoting human rights and democratic ideals" (BBC, 2014). Although it should not be overlooked that ASEAN has forsaken war as a way of resolving conflict by establishing intramural relations within its region, the institution has simultaneously hindered democratic reform and so it is seen as an 'illiberal peace': indeed, "the association is a long way from shunning illiberal politics for the sake of democratic values" (Kuhonta, 2006, p.337). Ironically, the same principles of sovereignty and non-interference that maintain intra-regional peace also support illiberalism in the region. It has not been able to reconcile tensions between democratic norms on the one hand and respect for sovereignty on the other. Nowhere is this ASEAN tension more evident than in the case of Myanmar. The non-interference norm has been compromised but ASEAN has still not discarded illiberal politics for the sake of democratic values in Myanmar. ASEAN tensions between the norms of sovereignty and democracy are challenging to surmount, not only because that involves challenging vested interests but also because it challenges the structural reality of its established principles that have also brought intra-regional peace and security (Kuhonta, 2006). Sukhumbhand Paribatra, a former deputy minister of foreign affairs for Thailand (but now is the current Governor of Bangkok), articulated this structural tension as follows:

> "ASEAN was created as and remains a framework and mechanism for cooperation in a region of great political, social, cultural, and economic diversity. It was never intended to be a collective security regime, which has a collective vision of what is right, just, and moral in all things and can impose changes at will upon its member countries in accordance to this vision. From the beginning, the principle of non-interference, along with perceptions and conceptions of common interests, has been the glue keeping ASEAN together. All principles can of course be modified through changing time and circumstances . . . But modification is one thing, abandonment quite another. We believe that the principle of non-interference should be adapted to suit the changing times and circumstances. But to abandon it is to tear ASEAN asunder. The reality is that ASEAN cannot be a proactive promoter of changes in the existing political arrangement of any member country. To advocate such a role is to misinterpret the genesis and nature of ASEAN in a very fundamental way" (Sukhumbhand Paribatra, cited in Kuhonta, 2006, p.355).

Buddhism and ASEAN

It would be remiss of the author to promulgate Buddhism as a solution to the problems of ASEAN, given its constituent multi-cultural and multi-faith communities. Nevertheless, Buddhism can inform ASEAN's development. Concepts of the middle way and non-dualism suggest the need to avoid political extremes. The notion of interdependent co-arising highlights how ASEAN is a mutually interdependent web of cause and effect. Finally, the Noble Eightfold Path teaches right intention (freedom and

harmlessness), right speech (in a truthful and non-hurtful way), right action (in a non-harmful way), right livelihood, and right effort (making an effort to improve). These principles are commensurate with those of ASEAN and can help it to reflect and act on where it falls short. Now follows a selection of Buddhist approaches that could be beneficial to ASEAN.

Mindfulness

As noted above, the ASEAN community is guided by its self-understanding (Sukhumbhand Paribatra, cited in Kuhonta, 2006) and mindfulness could help explore and expand ASEAN's view of itself. Mindfulness can be contrasted with mindlessness, which can be "characterized by reliance on past categories, acting on 'automatic pilot,' and fixation on a single perspective without awareness that things could be otherwise" (Weick et al., 1999, p.90). Defined as a learning process that benefits from heightened awareness and enabling questioning, it originally developed as an individual concept, although it has since become also an organizational one (Jordan et al., 2009). For example, mindful organizations are claimed to "induce a rich awareness of discriminatory detail and a capacity for action" (Weick et al., 1999, p.88) and "pay close attention to what is going on around them, refusing to function on 'auto-pilot'" (Ray et al., 2011, p.188).

Mindfulness has a positive impact on ethical decision making because it entails self-awareness and is non-judging, open to, and accepting of ideas which might otherwise be perceived as threatening to the self (Reedy and Schweitzer 2010). Similarly, on an organizational level, Valentine et al.'s (2010, p.455) study found that "perceived ethical values and a shared ethics code were associated with...increased mindfulness."

Duerr (2004) develops the notion of the 'contemplative organization', which strives to incorporate contemplative practices into work, embodies organizational values, moves between cycles of action and reflection, balances process with product, and whose circular non-hierarchical mandala-like structure reflects a contemplative philosophy. Loy's (2003) Buddhist social theory similarly contends that structure makes transnational corporations into defective economic institutions, arguing for corporate charters with clauses mandating that profit will not take precedence over social impacts. If Duerr's contemplative model of organization is possible, then Buddhism – with its focus on meditation – can also help to change the nature of ASEAN and its member nations. Furthermore, Buddhism is changing, becoming increasingly engaged in social projects and protests, enhancing its capability of challenging and changing ASEAN.

Nirvana of Society

Engaged Buddhism privileges the role of the Bodhisattva, one who primarily aims to relieve others' suffering and vows not to enter nirvana until that has been achieved. It is informed by the idea that there is no independent self, in which the search for individual enlightenment ceases and the focus moves to helping others (Shen-yen, in Brazier, 2002). The preoccupation is no longer private liberation from suffering but the "nirvana of society" (Dalai Lama, in Brazier 2002, p.97).

In Engaged Buddhism, the level of analysis broadens, shifting the blame for suffering from individual psychological attachment to collective social greed and exploitation. Accordingly, Buddhism's traditional three poisons of greed, anger and ignorance apply not only to individuals but also to large-scale social and economic forces (Kraft, 2000). Internal and external liberation are simultaneous and reciprocal

processes – and awakening begins with a practical understanding of the Four Noble Truths within a person's community (Ariyaratne, 1982):

1. A concrete understanding of suffering in terms of poverty and oppression.
2. Suffering is caused by greed, competitiveness and egoism.
3. There is hope that this suffering can cease.
4. Suffering is addressed by resolving these problems within the community.

As class conflict and exploitation of the poor cause human suffering, liberation is seen in terms of prerequisite material conditions and social relationships (Ambedkar, 1984). While dualism gives rise to grasping, greed, and class distinctions, Buddhism's goal shifts from personal rebirth to social reform and, in order to resolve the class struggle, to liberate the deprived and propertyless classes, using methods that exclude violence (Lin, 1929).

Capitalism emphasizes competitive selves and is therefore incommensurate with the non-self of Buddhism, whose interdependency is more aligned with socialism (Buddhadasa, 1986). Buddhism opposes capitalism, with its notions of property, ownership and possessions as ends in themselves, because they are non-conducive to freedom but instead reinforce and perpetuate the ignorance that Buddhism tries to eliminate (Puligandla and Puhakka, 1970).

No-self

Member states only benefit when ASEAN operates collectively. The notion of no-self can reinforce ASEAN's collective approach. There is no independent self in Buddhism. Suffering results from constructing a self that is independent from others and objects, resulting in alienation from them, the resolution of which is fallaciously attempted through clinging to other people, objects or conditions, in order to bolster this sense of self. The self attaches to that which appears to secure it and averts itself from that which it perceives as threatening. Dualistic thought about self versus others/things leads to other distinctions, such as that between 'us and them'. In Buddhism, dualism is reversed in two related ways; by not clinging to the people and things that are perceived to be outside the self, and through meditation, which gradually erodes the distinction between self and not-self.

Buddhism's concise message is; 'wake up to reality!' This is realized through the demise of clinging; "since there is no self which does the possessing, there simply cannot be any possession" (Puligandla and Puhakka, 1970, p.346). Liberation consists of entering a non-egotistical state and experiencing the interdependent nature of all beings (Mishra, 2004). Collapsing dualism addresses the underlying causes of selfishness, merging the self with others, and thereby informing relationships with them. Reunification with others leads to compassion and the focus of liberation becomes not the self but all beings. Jones (1989) argues that alienation from other beings is delusion but, when we are freed from egocentricity, we experience unity and are at one with their suffering. So the notion of self-liberation becomes delusive because there is no longer a separate self from which to be liberated; liberation becomes freedom of all beings from suffering. Buddhism's notion of interdependence requires active engagement in social action. Accordingly, it has much to say about the transformation of ASEAN, as follows.

The Process of Change in ASEAN

Buddhism can contribute to redefining and perceiving the problems of ASEAN, prior to any change effort. According to Buddhist philosophy, the mind creates and

sustains conditions but the notion of impermanence questions accepted analyses. National leaders apply their own preconceptions to a change situation – but conceptualization can result in an incorrect picture that is divorced from reality. Conversely, Buddhism privileges awareness of a situation and concrete experience. The emphasis is on enhancing mindfulness of the region's internal and external environments, increasing awareness, and connecting meditation with skillful action.

Given Buddhism's non-dualistic framework, all phenomena possess no independent reality but are interdependent, suggesting the need for systems thinking, whereby each part of a nation's environments are analyzed in the context of a unified whole. Such a systems analysis goes deeper than the presenting symptoms and leads to a more comprehensive solution that addresses a range of underlying causes, evaluates various possible options, and reviews the intended and unintended consequences of the change program.

The Buddha taught that phenomena do not arise from a single cause but from a complex concurrence of many mutually-reinforcing conditions (Bodhi, 1999). In diagnosing the need for change, Buddhism warns against early conclusions, privileging instead the investigation of underlying root causes, complex conditions, multiple levels of causality, and the relative contribution of each cause. Account should be taken of the 'specific gravity' of various types of causation, according to their relative contribution to the whole problem, the most significant causal factor being the mind, which fashions all conditions. Thus, Buddhism encourages not just a comprehensive perspective of a nation's environments – but also a reflexive turn, prompting leaders to critically examine their own assumptions and perspectives when diagnosing change.

Buddhism's emphasis on awakening can contribute to the generation of ideas, while the twin methods of meditation and deep listening can help develop new insights. In critically evaluating ideas, Buddhism also warns of the poisons of anger, greed and ignorance, and invites leaders to cultivate loving-kindness and to work for the well-being of their societies. Furthermore, non-dualism suggests that ideas must be tested by their practical application (Suzuki, 1949) and not through abstract reflection.

Change implementation can founder on fear and resistance. Fear can be dispelled through meditation amidst impermanence and suffering. As for resistance, notions of unity and interdependence imply that leaders should consult, engage and – so far as possible – benefit everyone in the change process. Buddhism encourages collaboration (Marques, 2010) and discourages absolute truth and attachment to views (Nhat Hanh, 1987). Accordingly, leaders should try to understand the positions of others, be open to new ideas and be critical of their own.

Buddhism encourages acceptance of change (Marques, 2010), positing that reality does not comprise of fixed entities but is in a process in constant flux. From this, leaders can learn the importance of non-attachment to the change, allowing intuition to come to the fore, sensitizing them with an enhanced gut-feel about implementation issues, while enabling a more critical evaluation of the merits and demerits of the change process and outcomes.

The Five Precepts

The Five Precepts of Buddhism are no killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, lying or taking intoxicants. Nhat Hanh (1987) reinterprets and renames these precepts as the 'Five Mindfulness Trainings', with changed emphases from prohibition to constructive action, and from individual to broader levels of analysis. For example, Nhat Hanh interprets the first precept that prohibits killing as protecting the lives of people and not supporting killing in thoughts or ways of life.

The second precept prohibits stealing. Nhat Hanh (1987) interprets this as suffering caused by exploitation, social injustice and oppression. He encourages the cultivation of loving-kindness and working for the well-being of people. In the context of transforming ASEAN, this would specifically prohibit profiteering from cheap labor in developing economies.

The third precept prohibits sexual misconduct and Nhat Hanh (1987) comments that this includes a commitment to cultivating responsibility and learning ways to protect the safety and integrity of individuals, couples, families and societies. The regional and national implications include a renewed commitment to managing diversity.

The fourth precept prohibits lying, explicated by Nhat Hanh (1987) as unmindful speech and the inability to listen to others, together with a positive commitment to cultivating loving speech and deep listening. Accordingly, leaders should be offered training in conflict resolution skills, and be direct with citizens about democratic processes of social change. Externally, nations should provide the whole truth about their policies to ensure transparency and accountability.

Nhat Hanh (1987) interprets the fifth precept, which prohibits intoxicants, as discouraging unmindful consumption and, conversely, a commitment to cultivating good mental and physical health. Commensurate with this precept, "Buddhism had a positive influence on the consumption of fair trade" and "Buddhists used their religious beliefs more commonly as a criterion in consumption decisions than other religions" (Doran and Natale, 2011, p.12).

Conclusions

The key limitation of this paper is that it is not empirically based. Future research should study to what extent Engaged Buddhism can influence the implementation of ethical change processes and help to transform ASEAN and its constituent nations, how the philosophy of Buddhism has affected their actions, and how effective and ethical those change processes have been, from the perspective of key stakeholders. The specific role of mindfulness should also be scrutinized, as its expansion of attentional breadth could either help ethical issues to be taken into account, by looking beyond a given frame, or it may encourage self-interest (Dane, 2011).

Non-dualism enables Buddhism to engage with regional change, as it emphasizes interdependence, both of people and of events (so that it illuminates and informs change). This collectivist philosophy can also help to alleviate egotistical power struggles during the change process, encourage leaders to see all of their citizens as indispensable to their nations, and to relieve suffering and meet needs.

Buddhism can help leaders to embrace change through increasing awareness of underlying causes, sharpening perception of the need for change, awakening insight to innovative approaches, encouraging skillful action, and reinforcing reflective practice. The recognition of interdependence and the practice of deep listening encourage a responsive and participative change process. Engaged Buddhism challenges nations to change in terms of 'right action' towards citizens.

With its emphasis on meditation, Buddhism also supports Duerr's (2004) call for a contemplative organization, by restraining mindless and heedless change, while emphasizing the importance of deep reflection prior to, during and following the change process. Buddhism's emphasis on meditation, wisdom, ethics and skillful action represents not only a call for mindful change but also a call to reflection on the part of ASEAN leaders.

References

Ambedkar, B.R. (1984) The Buddha and His Dhamma. Bombay: Siddharth.

Ariyaratne, A.T. (1982) In Search of Development: The Sarvodaya Movement's Effort to Harmonize Tradition with Change. Moratuwa, Sri Lanka: Sarvodaya Press.

ASEAN (2014) Association of South-East Asian Nations. http://www.asean.org (accessed on 4 November 2014).

Austria, M. (2012) Moving Towards an ASEAN Economic Community. East Asia: An International Quarterly, 29, 2.

BBC (2014) What is ASEAN? 13 November 2014. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-30015680 (accessed on 4 December 2014).

Ben, O. (2014) ASEAN Summit: Southeast Asian Leaders Discuss Regional Trade Bloc; Terrorism Threats, Territorial Disputes Also are Focus of Start of Two-Day ASEAN Summit. Wall Street Journal (Online) [New York, N.Y] 12 Nov 2014.

Bodhi, Bhikkhu (1999) A Buddhist Social Ethic for the Next Century. In: P. Udomittipong and C. Walker (Eds.), Socially Engaged Buddhism for the New Millennium. Bangkok: Sathirakoses–Nagapradipa Foundation and Foundation for Children.

Brazier, D. (2002) The New Buddhism: A Rough Guide to a New Way of Life (2nd Edn.). New York: Palgrave.

Buddhadasa (1986) (ed. D.K. Swearer) Dhammic Socialism. Bangkok: Thai Inter-Religious Commission for Development.

Caballero-Anthony, M. (2014) Understanding ASEAN's Centrality: Bases and Prospects in an Evolving Regional Architecture. Pacific Review, 27 (4).

Dane, E. (2011) Paying Attention to Mindfulness and Its Effects on Task Performance in the Workplace. Journal of Management, 37 (4).

Doran, C.J. and Natale, S.M. (2011) Empatheia and Caritas: The Role of Religion in Fair Trade Consumption. Journal of Business Ethics, 98.

Duerr, M. (2004) The Contemplative Organization. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17 (1).

Freistein, K. (2013) 'A Living Document': Promises of the ASEAN Charter, Pacific Review, 26 (4).

Ganesan, N. (2006) Thai-Myanmar-ASEAN Relations: The Politics of Face and Grace. Asian Affairs: An American Review, 33 (3).

Gerard, K. (2013) From the ASEAN People's Assembly to the ASEAN Civil Society Conference: The Boundaries of Civil Society Advocacy. Contemporary Politics, 19 (4).

Guilloux, A. (2010) Myanmar: Analyzing Problems of Transition and Intervention. Contemporary Politics, 16 (4).

Haacke, J. (2008) ASEAN and Political Change in Myanmar: Towards a Regional Initiative? Contemporary Southeast Asia, 30 (3).

Jones, K. (1989) The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Political and Social Activism. London: Wisdom Publications.

Jordan, S., Messner, M., and Becker, A. (2009) Reflection and Mindfulness in Organizations: Rationales and Possibilities for Integration. Management Learning, 40 (4).

Katanyuu, R. (2006) Beyond Non-Interference in ASEAN: The Association's Role in Myanmar's National Reconciliation and Democratization. Asian Survey, 46 (6).

Kraft, H.S. (2000) ASEAN and Intra-ASEAN Relations: Weathering the Storm? Pacific Review, 13 (3).

Kraft, K. (2000) New Voices in Engaged Buddhist Studies. In: C.S. Queen (Ed.) Engaged Buddhism in the West. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Kuhonta, E. (2006) Walking a Tightrope: Democracy Versus Sovereignty in ASEAN's Illiberal Peace, Pacific Review, 19, 3.

Lin, Q. (1929) Class Struggle and Buddhism. In X. Li 1991. Taiwan's Revolutionary Monk, Lin Qiuwu, Taiwan Bentu Xilie 1st ser., no.9. Taipei: Zili Wanbao She.

Loy, D. (2003) The Great Awakening: A Buddhist Social Theory. Somerville, MA: Wisdom.

Marques, J.F. (2010) Toward Greater Consciousness in the 21st Century Workplace: How Buddhist Practices Fit In. Journal of Business Ethics, 92 (2).

McCarthy, S. (2008) Myanmar and ASEAN: Estranged Bedfellows. Asian Survey, 48 (6).

Meijknecht, A., and de Vries, B. (2010) Is There a Place for Minorities' and Indigenous Peoples' Rights within ASEAN?: Asian Values, ASEAN Values and the Protection of Southeast Asian Minorities and Indigenous Peoples. International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, 17 (1).

Mishra, P. (2004) An End to Suffering: The Buddha in the World. London: Picador.

Nair, D. (2011) ASEAN's Core Norms in the Context of the Global Financial Crisis. Asian Survey, 51 (2).

Nhat Hanh, Thich (1987) (Ed. F. Eppsteiner) Interbeing: Commentaries on the Tiep Hien Precepts. Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Nesadurai, H.S. (2009) ASEAN and Regional Governance after the Cold War: From Regional Order to Regional Community? Pacific Review, 22 (1).

Ofreneo, R.E. (2008) Neo-liberalism and the Working People of Southeast Asia, Asian Journal of Social Science, 36 (2).

Puligandla, R. and Puhakka, K. (1970) Buddhism and Revolution. Philosophy East and West, 20 (4).

Ray, J.L., Lakami, T., Baker, L.T. and Plowman, D.A. (2011) Organizational Mindfulness in Business Schools. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 10 (2).

Reedy, N.E. and Schweitzer, M.E. (2010) In the Moment: The Effect of Mindfulness on Ethical Decision Making. Journal of Business Ethics, 95.

Severino, R.C. (2007) ASEAN beyond Forty: Towards Political and Economic Integration, Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs, 29 (3).

Suzuki, D.T. (1949) Essays in Zen Buddhism: First Series. London: Rider.

Valentine, S., Godkin, L. and Varca, P.E. (2010) Role Conflict, Mindfulness, and Organizational Ethics in an Education-Based Healthcare Institution. Journal of Business Ethics, 94.

Weick, K., Sutcliffe, K.M., and Obstfeld, D. (1999) Organizing for High Reliability: Processes of Collective Mindfulness. Research in Organizational Behavior, 21.