Buddhism and Postmodernity as the Path of Autonomy Leading to Mutual Understanding and Peace

Uthai Kaewpetch

Faculty of Education Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand.

Email: gtuteacher@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is intended to investigate some teachings in Buddhism encouraging human beings to achieve mutual understanding and peace through the view of postmodernity and vice versa. However, this paper is not willing to propose the claim that Buddhism is superior than other schools of thought but just deliberately to insist that in any fields of discussion religion can meet. Furthermore, this paper is not a comparative religious study. To the researcher, it seems that both Buddhism and philosophy concern in different discussion. In some aspects, no matter whether Buddhism serves as religious task, both Buddhism and philosophy share the same dimension in the sense of emancipation of human beings. In order to achieve this objective, this paper will investigate the content of Kālāma Sutta as to how did the Buddha provide such attitude and how did it become the inquiry of knowledge leading to the mutual understanding and world peace.

The second objective of this paper is to challenge the legitimacy of modernity through the glass of Kālāma Sutta. In multi-society and culture, the problems of legitimacy established in the name of grand narratives, such as science, rationality, and so on. Each, for example science, claims that its stand point is rational and can be emancipation for human beings. This is the trait of

modernity that had tried to persuade people. As a member of society, how can we justify what claim is possible? The expectation of this paper is to achieve more right understanding of the attitude of Buddhism towards the inquiry of knowledge that leads to support the claim that Buddhism and postmodernity is not obsolete but release human beings from dominant mainstream of claims, for example science, in the present time. It probably can be said that both were the postparadigms of thought. The second expectation of this paper is to point out that the attitude of postmodernity can be found in any philosophical paradigms and postmodern [challenging towards fundamentalism] begets progress of living believes. The most important expectation of this paper is to support that the tab inquiries in Kālāma Sutta and the concept of Kantian Enlig htenment can be applied in encouraging autonomous reason and making the world peace. The researcher avoids using the term "rationality" since it might be misleading. The term "mutual understanding" conveys more flexibility and do not claim for any rationality. It opens more channels and looks for sympathy of each person for others. The Kālāma Sutta can serve the path of m utual understanding among various claims of modernity.

To success the task of mutual understanding is to engages on the autonomy of individuals. In order to cultivate the autonomy of individuals, the methodology applicable in this paper bases on the critical investigation and analysis. This paper is divided into two sections: (1) The general background of discussion in the problem of legitimacy and (2) The Buddhist Perspective on Autonomy of Individual. In order to go on discussion, it is necessary to investigate its origin.

Keywords: Modernity, Postmodernity, Autonomy, and Enlightenment.

I. The General Background of Discussion in the Problem of Legitimacy

1.1 Modernism/Modernity

The term "modern," including modernism and modernity, is central important to any understanding of postmodernism because it is a prototype of criticism. It basically refers to advanced development in science, technology, and rational inquiry. Moreover, sometimes, it claims for triumph of science and emancipation of human beings. Therefore, its meanings and standpoints are needed to investigated.

The term "modern" is derived from the Latin modo, means "of today" or what is current. Lawrence E. Cahoone has chronologically analyzed the terms modernism and postmodernism because they are both origin and departure. To explore the meaning of modernism, it will be easy to begin to raise the question "What is modern?" However, it is quite different in some senses. When someone, for example, said that "this man speaks modern English," it is meant contemporary. Here, the term "modern English" merely is used to distinguish recent English from Middle and Old English. On the other hand, modernity is used to refer to the new civilization developed in Europe and North America over the last several centuries and fully evident by the early twentieth century. It implies that this civilization is modern in the strong sense that it is unique in human story (1996). Modernity is described as civilization which is generally characterized as well by other blanches of scientific advances, such as capitalism, liberal democracy, individualism, rationalism, humanism. At this moment, human believes that it is emancipation of human. However, modernity described as civilization is still controversial because in a period of time something called advanced, for example Egyptian civilization, occurred before the scientific advances. On the other hand, modernity is described as the approach which tries to make (modernization) a living standard. By these definitions, it could be concluded that modernity is categorized into three aspects: style, civilization, and approach.

For Cahoone, the obvious picture of modernity born in the eighteenth-century: Enlightenment. The Enlightenment represents the age of scientific knowledge of the world and rational knowledge of value (1996, p. 12). This movement believes that freedom and rationality will lead to social progress through intellectual success and science.

1.2 Enlightenment Rationality

As long as human beings have searched for knowledge, their searching had come to sum up the end. It was called "Enlightenment." This common idea was believed that human can liberate themselves from agony by Enlightenment. Such idea appears to be Descartes and Kant et al. These philosophers shared the same proposal that Enlightenment is emancipation of human beings. The Enlightenment is the period of western thought which characterized by dramatic revolutions in science, philosophy, society and politics (Bristow, 2010). Primarily, the European Enlightenment was not the work of philosophical discussion. It was a social revolution took place in France. This revolution culminates in politics of French Revolution. This political upheaval begins from the mid-decades of the seventeenth century through the eighteenth century. However, it begins with scientific revolution. This revolution impacts not only the ancient physical conception of the cosmos, but also the philosophical inquiry. It challenges the power and authority of the old paradigm and constructs the new model. This is general origin of Enlightenment philosophy. The late Enlightenment philosophy was developed and well known by German Enlightenment. It is known as Kantian Enlightenment. What is Enlightenment? Immanuel Kant, German philosopher, contributed to this decade as humankind's release from its self-incurred immaturity; "immaturity is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another." The influential quotation of Kant's Enlightenment is well known in 1784 essay "What is Enlightenment." He wrote:

Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its its cause lies not in lack of reason but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. Sapere aude! "Have courage to use your own reason!" (Kant, 1959b, p.85).

For Kant, Enlightenment is and intellectual process of man's self-liberation from "tutelage," where tutelage is the impotence to achieve understanding on one's own, a lack or weakness of autonomous reason. He defines 'Enlightenment' as man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity which means 'inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another. There are two causes of immaturity; internal and external cause. First includes laziness and cowardice. Second includes the guardians referring to state and religious authorities determined on behalf of what is best for them. This means and becomes the restriction of people's freedom. Thus, individual must have courage to overcome their laziness, fear of making mistakes, and fear punishment by state in case of making mistakes along with the motto of Enlightenment "Sapere Aude; dare to know or dare to think." Originally, the term "Enlightenment" is translated from the German term "Aufkl ärung." The German and English terms have been used to describe various activities and movement that reflect different philosophical, Ethical, political, and social thought in European history during eighteen century.

In sum, the Enlightenment relies on the power of human reason and transforms a mysterious, tyrannical and irrational world into comprehensible, emancipated, and rational world (Khaimook, 2007, p.12). She concludes that there are three major and interrelated themes of the Enlightenment. First is man's emancipation; necessarily, his self-emancipation. Second is faith in the power of autonomous reason (which for the writers of the Enlightenment included empiricism) to arrive at truth, final is the close relation between emancipation and reason. For Kant, emancipation derived (is) the autonomous

use of reason. He meant that the use of reason to lead to emancipated actions and to emancipatory changes in the social and political order. Some philosophers, for example Marx, emancipation is the goal of Enlightenment achieved by social totality.

David Clippinger observes that modernism might best be conceptualized as a field of ideas, styles, and concepts to which the postmodern has returned, carried off, and transformed while simultaneously criticizing what it has chosen to transform and leave behind (2005, p.252).

Bill Reading analyzes the traits of modernity that modernism is characterized by the grand narrative of the progressive emancipation of a universal subject (1992, p. xxxiii). Modernity probably is defined as the age of metanarrative legitimation.

Robert Pippin observed that the most important general philosophical issue in all of modernity's self-consciousness involves the problem of autonomy and independent self-legislating. The problem of autonomy is controversy among thinkers in Enlightenment.

In sum, the term "modernity" here means the process of philosophy and of thought from the eighteenth to present where the progress of scientific model seems to be the triumph of paradigm. It is known as Enlightenment movement and its goal emancipation. Modernism means a particular branch of discussion which defines different objectives. For example, modernism in art, architecture, painting, and so on. However, the shared characterization of modernism is totalizing, legitimacy, universality, and rationality. One mode of modernity is associated by new mode of domination and new legitimating. Modernity, as the rational legitimacy and overcoming of narratives; minority of society.

1.3 **Postmodernism/Postmodernity**

The term "postmodern" was understood as contemporary and has become as polemic term in the twentieth century. The term "postmodernism" is used in various blanches, such as philosophy, art, aesthetics, politics, etc. The term "postmodernity" means the process of paradigm that reacts against modernity. These three terms, for this thesis, are used to means methodology and approach in philosophy where reacts against totalizing, legitimacy, universality, and rationality established by modernity. Lawrence E. Cahoone stated that in philosophy it came in the 1980s to refer primarily to French poststructuralist philosophy, and secondarily to a general reaction against modern rationalism, utopianism, and what comes to be called "foundationalism," the attempt to establish the foundations of knowledge and judgment, an attempt that had been a preoccupation of philosophy since Rene Descartes in the seventeenth century [although arguably since Plato] (1996).

Historically, in the 1960s philosophy in France underwent a major change: the academic and political establishment. The new French philosophers in the most influential of the age were Gilles Deleuze, Jacque Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Jean François Lyotard. They wanted to fight the political and academic establishment. Cahoone observed that the core endeavor of postmodernism tries to argue against what modernist philosophy have regarded as unity, a single, integral existence or concept, is plural. This denial of the single norm in society is the most important key to postmodernism. For example, political philosophy might use the idea of justice to judge a social order. Postmodernist philosophers regard that idea as itself is the product of the social relations that it serves to judge; that is, the idea was created at a certain time and place to serve certain interests, and is dependent on a certain intellectual and social context, etc (1996). Moreover, postmodernist philosophers argue that modernity is at an end, or is undergoing a deep transformation. Nietzsche, somehow, was recognized as precursor of postmodernity who reacts

against modernity. He stands against structural idealism in society. Almost, his writings emphasized on, some saying, anti-foundationalism.

Postmodernity therefore challenges the fundamental assumptions of modernity and Enlightenment. The assumption of modernity becomes fundament and tutelage that rules modern thoughts. The general idea of self-determination or self-understanding is the principle of modernity. As fundamental, the standpoint of postmodernity is to argue against modern fundament. In short, modernity is defined as the age of grand narrative. By contrast, postmodernity is defined as the age in which grand narratives have become bankrupt.

As the standpoint of postmodernity observed above, postmodernity argues against modernity's fundament. The modern fundament becomes structural main streaming philosophy in society that was used to dominate all other rational agents. The Enlightenment has been criticized by postmodernist philosophers. The urgent argument is that the abuse of scientific discovery and revolutionary based on reason will bring the dehumanizing and legitimacy.

Another postmodern philosopher who argued against modern structural philosophy is Jean François Lyotard and some other postmodern philos ophers would be taken as counter argument. Their thesis raises not only the problems of ideology; Enlightenment, but also the definitive reason and rationality. It is true that reason is not necessarily an instrument of dehuma-nization, but was used for dehumanization in the name of legitimacy.

1.4 The Problem of Autonomy and Legitimacy of Modernity

As much as the concept of modernity and Enlightenment have been analyzed above, the critique of both is closely associated. The delivery of the problem and critique of both started form legitimacy. In the present, we are faced with the legitimacy of knowledge without questioning. Some narratives were established as knowledge in terms of legitimacy and totalization. The problem of legitimacy naturally arises when the various dimensions of the

modern project are advanced and established by grand narratives. The problem grand narrative has effected on philosophy because of its legitimacy that any schools call for. The problem can be traced back to the ancient Greek time when philosophers have started to elucidate reality known as ultimate truth. After that, they had established it to public. For example, the form of syllogism (1) all men are mortal, (2) Socrates is man, and therefore (3) Socrates is mortal. In this sense, we follow up the game of language which gives the clue of the final conclusion. It is undoubtedly accepted that this form of logic is rational and designates unquestioned legitimacy. In the case of Protagoras, for example, a story is told of the time Protagoras demanded his fee (mistos) from Euathlus, a pupil of his.

Legitimacy was designated by discourse, logical statement, and phrases in term of rationality. In the case of knowledge, for example, Copernicus stated that the path of the planet is circular. At that time, this proposition was validated as true. But we have no proof to prove what Copernicus stated. Therefore, this proposition becomes knowledge because it was proved by scientists. The problem is that something was proved not because of reality but due to the way it was said. This statement was legitimated to be scientific knowledge. Therefore, it was accepted as true at the moment. Furthermore, in the computer age the question of knowledge is not merely the question of anyone. The questions are: what is knowledge, who decides what knowledge is, who decides what knowledge is worth storing, what is legitimate knowledge, who has access to this database, who will determine which channels or data are forbidden, and who knows what needs to be decided?

The crisis of legitimacy have been argued in the work of Robert B. Pippin. He argued that single modernity problem in German tradition [Kantian Enlightenment] is "autonomy." Most generally constructed, such an ideal simply expresses the oldest classical philosophical ideal: the possibility that human beings can regulate and evaluate their beliefs by rational self-reflection, that they can free themselves from interest, passion, tradition, prejudice and

autonomously "rule" their own thoughts, and that they can determine their actions as a result of self-reflection and rational evaluation, an evaluation the conclusions of which ought to bind any rational agent (1995, p. 12-13). This claim begets controversy and self-defeating because it promotes possibility of freedom, autonomy, and self-dependence. Simultaneously, it establishes determination that harms autonomy of human beings. The assumption that human beings can free themselves without tutelage goes along with Lyotard's suggestion that human beings in postmodernity should have freedom to consider incredulity towards grand narratives: assumption made by modernity, enlightenment.

The problem of legitimacy is identical with the problem of autonomy. If the individual is to be emancipated by reason from the falsehood that enslaves men, society itself must be one of the institutions from which man is to be emancipated. At the meanwhile, this leads to the problem how ethical norms are to be grounded and how the social order is to be maintained. In short, if there is absolute autonomy, there is no possibility of norms and social order. For Enlightenment, men are radically autonomous individuals with an identically structured universal human essence. That is, autonomy of individual is identical with universal human essence. Social norms and order cannot be grounded without autonomy of individuals. By contrast, autonomy of individuals was not guided by social order because, if it is so, it becomes self-defeating. The autonomy of individuals in ideology that shapes individual thought is merely "psuedoindividual" and "psuedoautonomy". Therefore, this [Kant's solution] conceives of the truly man as residing in the isolated individual regardless of the social order in which he happens to find himself (man as isolated individual does not surrender to social order). This means and leads to the problem how social order is to be grounded and to be maintained. Therefore, it seems that those who argue against universality to fail to manifest the universal human essence or who fail to participate in universal history.

In summary, there are Enlightenment and rational consensus may have given rise the problem in the name of legitimacy. The influential claim that Enlightenment and rational consensus can emancipate man become legitimacy without questioning. The legitimacy of ideology is unilateral authority and violence to autonomy of the will. Since the autonomy of the will is necessary and essential to individual and morality, what legitimated for individual cannot be called as autonomy: obedience to authority is not moral. The crucial critique against Enlightenment is that "Is reason a kind of tutelage?" Does necessity of man's release from self-incurred tutelage affect the principle of government? In the case of democracy's independence, does man undermine authority of government if when people encumber to legislations of government? Since Enlightenment, for Kant, is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage; man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another, such claim does not yield an universal norms and ethic. Is it necessary that "To be human is also to be social?" The problem here is not ambiguity in the concept of autonomy based on ambiguities in the concept of man inherited from the Enlightenment, but the concept of autonomy in Kantian Enlightenment independently focuses on releasing and understanding without direction from another. These are the problems delivered by legitimacy and become its crisis.

II. The Buddhist Perspective on Autonomy of Individual

2.1 The Origin of Kalama Sutta and the Challenge of Buddhism

Kālāma Sutta is a set of discourses of the Buddha appeared in Suttanta Pitaka (A.I. 189). Kālāma is small clan living in Kesaputta village and seeking the Buddha for advice because they were confused by the conflict doctrines of religious teachers who visited their village. Since each of these religious teachers claimed that their own views were true and all other views false. Then, the Kālāmas wished to know what criteria they should accept and use to

distinguish the true views from the false. Therefore, this sutta provided the 10 inquiries to accept knowledge or any believes. It is necessary to quote the message from the sutta:

'Come Kalamas. Do not go upon what has been acquired by repeated hearing; nor upon tradition; nor upon hearsay; nor upon authority of texts; nor upon mere logic; nor upon an inference; nor upon specious reasoning; nor upon agreement with a considered and approved theory; nor upon seeming possibilities; nor upon the consideration, "This is our teacher." Kalamas, when you yourselves know: "These things are good; these things are not blamable; these things are praised by the wise; undertaken and observed, these things lead to benefit and happiness," enter on and abide in them' (A.I. 189).

It would be easier to enumerate this 10 inquiries of knowledge in the passage into following categories:

Do not go upon by

1. repeated hearing [anussavena]
2. tradition [paramparaya]
3. hearsay [itikiraya]
4. authority of texts [pitaka sampadanena]
5. mere logic [takkahetu]
6. inference [nayahetu]
7. specious reasoning [akaraparivitakkena]
8. approved theory [tithinichanakkhantiya]
9. seeming possibilities [bhavyarupataya]
10. consideration "This is our teacher" [samano no garu].[1]

In the ancient time of India, these inquiries of knowledge have been legitimated as authority because they have been habituated and claim by

---

[1]This paper uses the translation of P.A. Payutto Bikkhu (1989). Dictionary of Buddhism. Bankok: Mahachulalongkorn Press, p.274-275.

people and the prophets. For example, the Veda was sacred text which any lower class cannot read even touch. The words quoted from the Veda become the truth of society that anyone cannot question. Beside these 10 legitimacies, the Buddha gave both criterion of rejection and criterion of acceptance. These legitimacies are the criterion of knowledge which the prophets in ancient India used for proving their teachings. 1), 2), and 3) belong to ancient Indian theory of knowledge which known as Vedic authority or Bharmin tradition. The 4) is testimony referring to Veda scriptures which can be excessed by Bharmin only. The 5), 6), 7), and 8) is the process of logic which can be proved by reasonable arguments. The 9) and 10) are personal views which is merely possibility and without references.[2]

In ancient Indian tradition, Vedic society, it is easy to use no. 1), 2), 3), and 4) to support one's teaching for accumulating disciples. This is the reason why the Buddha warn people to aware of this authority. In the case of 4), if someone refers to the words in the Veda, people easily might be led, since at the ancient time there is less public communication media and literacy. Reading the Veda was prohibited for ordinary person. These 1), 2), 3), and 4) are fallacies of logic which called abandon reason. The 5), 6), 7), and 8) cannot be always validity in the sense that some religious practices cannot be proved by showing merely the process of good argument. For example, all kinds of poultry can fly. Ostrich belongs to poultry spicy. Therefore, Ostrich can fly. The no. 9) and 10) is merely reliable possibility of individual which depends on person such as teacher, leader, politician, and so on.[3] This easily can lead to be dictator and tyrant in democratic society. By contrast, if we believed in difference, it is plausible that human dignity would be easily acceptable.

---

[2]For more details in various interpretation, see George D. Bond (1982). *The Word of the Buddha: the Pitaka and its Interpretation in Theravada Buddhism*. p. 9-13

[3]Teacher in this sense means either wandering religious teacher or ascetic in the Buddha's time who claimed himself as the prophet.

In sum, the 10 legitimacies in Kālāma sutta can be divided into three groups: 1) traditional norm, 2) rationalist theory which claimed by various teachers, and 3) personal possibility.[4] Another word, it can be said that Buddhism warn Kālāmas to challenge the authority of tradition and authority of rationalist approval [reason]. These became the attitude of Buddhism towards the inquiries of knowledge in ancient Veda tradition. It can be said that we should have incredulity towards any dominant/fundamental believes/theories.

How can man emancipate or release without social relation? Buddhist teaching on the concept of self have faced this dilemma. Furthermore, it seems that Buddhism provided society anarchy. However, in fact, at the end of passage in Kālāma sutta, the Buddha provided the criteria proving the truth. The passage says that, "Kālāmas, when you yourselves know: 'These things are good; these things are not blamable; these things are praised by the wise; undertaken and observed, these things lead to benefit and happiness,' enter on and abide in them." This attitude goes along with the conception of Kantian Enlightenment which encourages autonomy of individuals: Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. The individual consideration in the passage could be considered as autonomy of individual in Kantian Enlightenment. Human beings have freedom to judge whatever based on their own reason.

---

[4] The third is divided by this paper but Jayatileke divided into two groups.

2.2 The Contradiction of Enlightenment of Individual and Self-release

The most important notice here should be stated is that the concept of the Buddhist and Kantian Enlightenment is not the same.[5] The controversy and contradiction of Enlightenment of individual and eternality of self is that individual as man cannot release nothing to emancipation or Enlightenment. For Buddhism, there are two kinds of truths: 1) Paramattha sacca; ultimate truth and 2) Sammati sacca; conventional truth (AA.I. 95: KvuA. 34). How are ultimate and conventional truth related? How can human understand universality? The problem of autonomy in modernist Enlightenment shares the same question against Buddhist teaching of non-self. In communication, human beings have made agreement together. This agreement was called as convention in society. How can human beings understand and make agreement without convention? Without conventional agreement the ethical criteria is impossible. Can Buddhist perspective on autonomy in Kālāma sutta be applied as a path leading to world peace: emancipation of human beings?

The most important standpoint of teaching in Buddhism on the concept of self and non-self have been articulated in the Three Characteristics of Things (Tilakkhaṇā 1) Aniccatā; impermanance, 2) Dukkhatā; suffering or dissatisfactory, and 3) Anattataā; non-self) (S.IV.1; Dh.227-9). The controversy and contradiction of Enlightenment of individual and eternality of self is that individual, as man, cannot release nothing to emancipation or Enlightenment. For Buddhism, there are two kinds of truths: 1) Paramattha sacca; ultimate truth and 2) Sammati sacca; conventional truth (AA.I. 95: KvuA. 34). Therefore, the individual can communicate the others through convention. Language and ethical, political,

---

[5]See more Phramaha Pairat Khiewwong (2015). *Kant's Concept of Enlightenment and Buddhist Yonisomanasikāra: An Analytical Study.* Doctoral Dissertation. Assumption University.

and social concern could be provided and understood as convention. However, these conventional concerns must not legitimate as totalization or ultimate truth.

The warnings in Kālāma provide the solution on the problem of autonomy of individual. The individual can challenge any legitimacies. This view does not dehumanize the essence of human beings; autonomy. At the end of the sutta, the Buddha still gave the resolution of interpretative faculty of thought between individual and society through autonomy of consideration. The Buddhist teaching in Kālāma sutta and the concept of "self-release from tutelage" relies on the power of human reason and transforms a mysterious, tyrannical and irrational world into comprehensible, emancipated, and rational world. Another important notice should be announced here is that the position of Buddhism and postmodernity is not the same. Furthermore, it is not necessary to be the same. The value of postmodernity can be seen in the work of Jean Francois Lyotard: the incredulity towards grand narratives. The requirement of postmodernity for man is to question the legitimacy of discourse. The position of postmodernity on the concept of autonomy shares the same idea of Kantian Enlightenment. If man has freedom to challenge the legitimacy of belief, the tolerance is possible. The people could stand away from domination of legitimacy. What the both Buddhist teaching and postmodernity share with each other is the concept of autonomy of individual and the challenge against authority, legitimacy, and totality of main streams in society. This perspective opens for ethical discourse and world peace in terms of autonomous reason of individual. The human essence is freedom. By the autonomous reason and freedom, the world peace is possible.

Conclusion

The questioning against authority in Kālāma sutta and the concept of Kantian Enlightenment can provide the emancipation of human beings. The autonomous reason and independence of individual seems to violate social norms, especially ethical concern. But it provides the path leading to the autonomy. By the autonomous reason, the path of ethical concern is possible through self-consideration. The process used by the Buddha in Kālāma sutta and by postmodernity based on incredulity towards legitimacy which dominates human beings in society. The perspective on incredulity towards legitimacy, as dominating tutelage, of postmodernity did not contradict to the Kantian Enlightenment. If people studied the Buddhist teaching on legitimacies in Kālāma sutta, they could release themselves from domination and finding peace. Therefore, the Buddhist teaching in Kālāma sutta and the concept of "self-release from tutelage" relies on the power of human reason and transforms a mysterious, tyrannical and irrational world into comprehensible, emancipated, and rational world. Furthermore, as human being, we should not surrender for any injustice legitimated by evils.

Note:

The Abbreviations of Buddhist Texts:

A.   Aṅguttaranikāya

AA.   Aṅguttaranikāya Aṭṭhakaṭhā (Manoraṭhapūraṇī)

Dh.   Dhammapada

KvuA.   Kathāvatthu Aṭṭhakaṭhā (Paramatthadīpinī)

S.   Saṁyuttanikāya

References

Bristow, 2010, URL=http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/enlightenment/.

Cahoone, Lawrence, (1996), (Ed.). **From Modernism to Postdernism : An Anthology**. London: Blackwell Publishers.

Gary Aylesworth, (2005) in http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/postmodernism/

Gregory Bruce Smith, (1996). **Niethzsche Heidegger and the Transition to Postmodernity**. USA: The University of Chicago Press.

http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/soma/wheel008.html

Jayatileke, K. N., (1963). **Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge**. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.

Kant, Immanuel. (1959). **What is enlightenment?**. (L. W. Beck, Trans.). In I. Kant, Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals (L. W. Beck, Trans.). Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois, (1984). **The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge**. Translation from the French by Geoff Bennington and Brain Massumi. USA: Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois, (1988). **The Differed: Phrases in Dispute**. (Georges Van Den Abbeele, trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

P.A. Payutto. (1989). **Dictionary of Buddhism**. Bangkok: Mahachulalongkorn Press.

Pippin, Robert B. (1995). **Modernism as a Philosophical Problem**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Press.

Sarup, Madan. (1993). **An Introduction to Post-structuralism and Postmodernis**. USA: The University of Georgia Press.