Degree Project

Bachelor's Thesis, Undergraduate Level
Personal Pronouns, Mirrors of Beliefs?

The Usage of Personal Pronouns in the Speech of a Religious Leader

Author: Adelaide Foster
Supervisor: Jonathan White
Examiner: Annelie Ådel
Subject/main field of study: English Linguistics
Course code: EN2043
Credits: 15
Date of examination: January 10, 2017

At Dalarna University it is possible to publish the student thesis in full text in DiVA. The publishing is open access, which means the work will be freely accessible to read and download on the internet. This will significantly increase the dissemination and visibility of the student thesis.

Open access is becoming the standard route for spreading scientific and academic information on the internet. Dalarna University recommends that both researchers as well as students publish their work open access.

I give my/we give our consent for full text publishing (freely accessible on the internet, open access):

Yes ☒  No ☐
This essay analyses the speech of the Dalai Lama and suggests possible effects that core aspects of Tibetan Buddhist philosophy, such as the theory of selflessness, might have when a believer uses the personal pronouns I, you, he, she, we and they. Collected utterances of the Dalai Lama during the Charlie Rose Show has been used in order to conduct a threefold investigation, using pragmatic, discourse analytical and sociolinguistic backgrounds, aiming to understand these effects more thoroughly. Qualitative and quantitative approaches were used for this report based on previous studies with a data-based method. These approaches enabled the researcher to find, for instance, a consistent use of the first-person personal pronoun by the Dalai Lama in the material. Other findings include an acknowledgment of philosophical influence concerning the field of intentionality, when related to religious discourse, as Buddhism establishes religious discourse as being based on the speaker’s motivation alone. The status of the Dalai Lama notwithstanding, his use of personal pronouns was also not found to match the findings of previous research on status and the use of self-mention.

*Keywords:* religious discourse, personal pronouns, Dalai Lama, power, intentionality
# Table of Contents

1. Introduction............................................................................................................... 1  
   1.1. Aim of the Study................................................................................................. 3  
   1.2. Limitations of the Study..................................................................................... 4  
2. Theoretical Background............................................................................................... 5  
   2.1. Philosophical Background................................................................................ 5  
   2.2. Discourse Analysis and Religious Discourse................................................... 6  
   2.3. Pronouns and Power......................................................................................... 10  
   2.4. Intention........................................................................................................... 12  
3. Methodology and Data................................................................................................ 14  
   3.1. Data................................................................................................................... 14  
   3.2. Method of analysis............................................................................................. 15  
      3.2.1. Quantitative analysis.................................................................................... 16  
      3.2.2. Qualitative analysis.................................................................................... 16  
4. Data analysis and Results............................................................................................ 17  
   4.1. Personal Pronoun Frequency............................................................................ 18  
   4.2. Qualitative Analysis......................................................................................... 21  
   4.3. Religious Discourse......................................................................................... 23  
   4.4. Leadership........................................................................................................ 24  
   4.5. Pragmatics and Intention................................................................................ 26  
5. Conclusion.................................................................................................................. 26  
References.................................................................................................................... 29  
Appendices................................................................................................................... 32  
   Appendix 1............................................................................................................... 32  
   Appendix 2............................................................................................................... 44
1. Introduction

*By so many more there are that say ‘ours’,*

*So much the more of good doth each possess* (Dante, 2013, p. 279).

While languages have always influenced civilizations and cultures, the opposite can also be considered correct: languages have been influenced by the people using them. Indeed, languages are not only denotational, which means that a language is not just delivering meaning outside of the written or spoken words; it also conveys social clues (Mesthrie, 2009, pp. 5-6). Owing to this particularity of language, it becomes fascinating to study whether or not a philosophical view could also influence how a language is being used. Yet, it is nearly impossible to fully determine and thus positively conclude how any particular philosophy might influence the use of language of an individual - because it is effectively impossible to ascertain someone’s philosophical views and/or beliefs, despite what their claims might be. Nevertheless, some signs of personal beliefs might be obtainable, for example in the person’s usage of personal pronouns.

A view which has not been extensively studied in linguistics is Tibetan Buddhist philosophy. One of the pillars of Tibetan Buddhism and its philosophy is the doctrine of selflessness. This view, rather than dismissing the existence of a self completely, denies the existence of an independent self. This is clear from the writings of the fourteenth century Tibetan Buddhist scholar and founder of the Gelug lineage of Tibetan Buddhism, Tsong Khapa. Indeed, he introduces this concept in one of his most famous texts, called the *Ocean of Reasoning*, where he explains wisdom to be the understanding that the erroneous notion of selfhood is dependent on the mistaken assumption that the self is ultimately existent (Khapa, 2006, p. 15). Indeed, the self is thought to be merely based on its different parts, linguistic
conventions and also on the objects of its own perceptions; hence it does not exist independently.

One of the most prominent leaders of this Tibetan Buddhist philosophical school of thought is the Dalai Lama. He is perhaps the most internationally famous religious leader of Tibetan Buddhism altogether. Traditionally, the institution of the Dalai Lama has held not only a religious role, but also secular power. The present Dalai Lama is called Tenzin Gyatso; he is the fourteenth of the lineage and is now an 81-year-old Buddhist monk who has been teaching Buddhism and Buddhist philosophy since his teens. He seldom escapes the spotlight and regularly sits on a throne, teaching thousands, and sometimes hundreds of thousands of followers. He is thus consistently in a position of power, and his language is likely to be influenced by his social status.

Previous linguistic research has aimed at investigating the intention behind the utterance by analyzing of the utterer pronouns and their usage. Personal pronouns are usually thought of as a deictic expression which is associated to the speaker, in the case of the first-person singular, for instance (Jaszczolt, 2013, p. 58). In the Dalai Lama’s case, an indexical expression of the self, through the use of personal pronouns, might represent something which is possibly more difficult to single out, because the Tibetan Buddhist understanding of the ethos\(^1\) of personhood is one foreign to most: an un-entity. This unknown is thus also an intriguing field of research into the usage of personal pronouns by the Dalai Lama, and what the Dalai Lama means by it. While this is currently unachievable, it leads to the aim of the present study.

\(^1\) Ethos has been defined as the image of oneself that is being built in a discourse (Amossy, 2009)
1.1. Aim of the Study

The aim of this essay is to analyse the discourses by the Dalai Lama found on the Charlie Rose Show, using models from pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. This aim leads to two research questions:

(1) Are there specific characteristics of religious language and power in the usage and frequency of personal pronouns by the Dalai Lama in the Charlie Rose Show?

(2) If there are specific characteristics of religious language and power in the utterances of the Dalai Lama in the material from the Charlie Rose Show, could these characteristics be linked to the Tibetan Buddhist views on selfhood, based upon the type of religious language involved and what personal pronouns might represent for a supposedly Tibetan Buddhist follower, such as the Dalai Lama?

To attempt to answer these questions, based on the use of personal pronouns by the Dalai Lama, an hour-long TV show in English, and consisting of unread speech, is used. The analysis of the personal pronouns used by the Dalai Lama is a necessary first step towards understanding the possible impact one’s philosophical view, in this case a Tibetan Buddhist view, could feasibly have on one’s language. In an attempt to be as comprehensive as possible during this analysis, the methodologies used are both quantitative and qualitative in a data-based approach.

Both the qualitative and quantitative methodologies incorporated in this thesis, serve as the basis for:

a) an analysis of the Dalai Lama’s religious language, from the Tibetan Buddhist perspective. This examination is mostly a discourse analysis and uses works by Keane (1997) and Cragg (2002), and others for support, in the context of religious discourse;

b) a study on the sociolinguistic issue on whether the Dalai Lama is likely to use more specific forms of personal pronouns than other forms of personal pronouns in his
speech, possibly because of his power status. This study is based on previous research on the relationship between power and pronouns, such as the work of Kacewicz et al. (2014);

c) a pragmatic aspect, where the speaker’s intentions and context are scrutinized, and which uses texts such as Kecskes (2013), and Jaszczolt (2013), as a foundation for this analysis;

Thus, the analysis of the use of personal pronouns in the specific case of a Tibetan Buddhist leader is threefold and can enlighten researchers about the relationship between personal philosophical views and how these might be reflected in the use of personal pronouns. In the case of this study, this relationship is mainly concerned between the philosophy of Buddhist selflessness and its possible effect on the usage of personal pronouns.

1.2. Limitation of the Study

This work, due to its cross-cultural2 nature, contains difficulties that cannot be overcome in the present paper. Religious discourse analysis is usually not understood as any speech act with a religious motivation, for instance3. But, for a Tibetan Buddhist, the ‘three doors’ of religious activities are the body, speech and mind. Furthermore, any activities done with these ‘three doors’ only need a religious motivation to become religious. In this essay, this paradigm is also chosen to define religious language: a religiously motivated speech act is thus understood as the definition of religious language. This understanding of what constitutes a religious discourse broadens the field of religious discourse analysis itself, but also introduces another complication: the inability to truly know anyone’s true motivations. This issue is found in many linguistic and non-linguistic studies. Yule introduces this issue in pragmatics by defining it as “the study of ‘invisible’ meaning, or how we recognize what is

2 Cross-cultural in the sense that the Tibetan-Buddhist understanding of what is a ‘religious discourse’ has been used, as well as what is meant by ‘self’ in this tradition and thus how this view could influence the use of personal pronouns.

3 Gellman suggests that religious language, or “talk about God” has a “profusion” of definitions (1977, p.151)
meant even when it isn’t actually said or written”. He continues to say that speakers “must …) depend on a lot of shared assumptions” (Yule, 2014, p.126). The inability humanity has to truly know anything has been contemplated by philosophers since the beginnings of time. We are left with assumptions we cannot do without. This study is therefore based on the assumption that the actions of this 81-year-old Buddhist monk do indeed reflect Tibetan Buddhism and its philosophy, and consequently some of the specific characteristics of his speech might stem from his beliefs. The present work does not assume these characteristics to be proof of his beliefs and that such beliefs create differences in pronouns usage: it just tries to offer a plausible explanation for the mechanism involved in the Dalai Lama’s own usage of the personal pronouns in English.

2. Theoretical Background

In this section, the three backgrounds of religious discourse from discourse analysis; pronouns and power, from sociolinguistics; and intention, from pragmatics, are introduced. Also, a theoretical background to the philosophical view of the Dalai Lama is essential to the analysis of religious discourse and intentionality in this essay and is thus included as well.

2.1. Philosophical Background

The particularity of the Prasangika⁴ philosophy is its understanding of selflessness. Selflessness, in this school, is taught to be the inherent absence of an independence of any existing thing, including of the individual. Everything, thus, exists based not only on their own characteristics and parts, but also on their perceiver. The self is so thought to depend on

---

⁴ Prāsaṅgika (Tib., thal-gyur-pa). One of the major schools of Madhyamika Buddhism whose main representatives were Buddhapaśīta and Candrakīrti. These authors use a reductio ad absurdum method of argumentation (prasangikā) to derive undesired consequences from the premises of their opponents. Oxford Dictionary of Buddhism. Retrieved from http://www.oxfordreference.com.ited.001.0001/acref-e-1421
other factors as well. Tsong Khapa thus claims, in one of his most famous monographs, often shortened in English to the *Essence of Eloquence*, that reality exists always dependent on linguistic conventions “All existing things are said, numerous times, to be merely based on name, term and linguistic convention” (2016, p. 163, Adelaide Foster’s translation). This view thus greatly differs from what non-Prasangika believers and speakers of English might believe in. This Prasangika belief could possibly be reflected in the use of personal pronouns.

### 2.2. Discourse Analysis and Religious Discourse

Discourse analysis is the analysis of language when it is spoken and/or written, and composed of significant constituents (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Yule has therefore defined discourse and discourse analysis in such terms: “the word ‘discourse’ is usually defined as ‘language beyond the sentence’ and so the analysis of discourse is typically concerned with the study of language in texts and conversation” (2014, p. 140). Discourse analysis strives to interpret the deeper meaning of a discourse, rather than study the structure of the discourse. Religious discourse is one amongst the variety of discourses which can be analysed and has been defined here as a religiously motivated speech act composed of significant constituents.

First, it may be necessary to introduce discourse analysis more thoroughly before taking up any explanations of religious discourse. In discourse analysis, it is customary to search for patterns of language use (Wray & Bloomer, 2006, p. 76). In the present work, the patterns which are looked for are in the usage of personal pronouns. This is to offer a broader understanding of their usage, not only by relying on discourse analysis, which also incorporates pragmatics and sociolinguistics.

Gellman offers a definition of religious language as “talk about God” (Gallman, 1977, p. 151). This understanding of religious language cannot be applied to Buddhism, as

---

5 Wylie transcription: yod pa mams kyang ming dang brda dang tha snyad tsam du lan mang por bshad pa’i phyir
there is no creator god in this religion. It is thus necessary to look for other understandings of what religious language is about.

Keane offers another understanding of what constitutes religious language. Indeed, he defines it as having three qualities: distinctiveness of interactions, distinctiveness of textual practices, and distinctiveness of speech situations (Keane, 1997, p. 48). Throughout his work, he assumes religious language to be a form of interaction with invisible entities. This cannot be accepted in this essay either, as the interview chosen is not addressed to an invisible entity, but to a potentially visible audience.

Nevertheless, Keane has very pertinent observations about religious language: it does have a specific form and intentionality (Keane, 1997, pp. 52-55). The potential of specific features of religious language as spoken by the Dalai Lama is too broad to investigate here; however, a possible specificity in his use of pronouns can be investigated.

In the case of this study, the discourse analysed is not a ritual discourse – even if it considered as a religious discourse, as the two are not considered the same thing. Indeed, it consists of a single interview with the Dalai Lama during the Charlie Rose’s Show and some other excerpts also included in the above-mentioned TV show. However, it is to be considered as religious, through Keane’s mention of intentionality. Indeed, the Dalai Lama is a follower of Tibetan Buddhism, which teaches that every instant of one’s life, and any action of the body, speech and mind, should become a religious practice. In his own words: “whatever practice of body, speech or mind we do becomes Buddhist practice” (Gyatso, 2013). This paradigm marks any discourse by the Dalai Lama as a religious discourse.

Cragg considers pronouns to be “the essence of religion” (Cragg, 2002, p. 2). His stance stems from the meaning often conveyed through pronouns, especially personal pronouns. Indeed, for him personal pronouns reflect the sacred because they all refer to I. This I, in turn, incorporates the sacredness of a creator god, just as I is the creator of all personal
pronouns. I thus becomes the creator god. Cragg mentions various texts, across religions - from Judaism to Hinduism, with a stop at Buddhism – which use personal pronouns to convey the ‘truth’ as understood by each tradition.

Cragg explains that we is an inclusive pronoun denoting a “self-aware identity” (2002, p. 4), which, behind its inclusive nature, does create an exclusive sub-culture. We includes others by its meaning itself, but it also creates a sub-culture whereas they becomes essential and included in the meaning of we, but separated from its inclusion. This is similar to Yvert-Hamon’s understanding of a play of inclusiveness and exclusiveness found in the pronoun we (2015, p. 142). Such a sub-culture, says Cragg, is created by religions. Cragg sees the pronoun I, on the other hand, as a temple: a sacred god. All pronouns come, according to him, from the very nature of selfhood.

The concepts given by Cragg is seemingly conflicting with the understanding of the philosophy of Tibetan Buddhism and its relationship to selflessness. As previously mentioned, the self is not denied in this philosophy, but its entity as such is: it is not a unit, but a dependent phenomenon, existing merely through concepts and linguistic conventions. This implies an understanding of that pronouns such as I and we do not entail a reflection of the self, but rather an object constructing the self.

Another point made by Cragg, on the use of personal pronouns and the self, is that, in essence, all personal pronouns are found in I. According to him, all mystical traditions preach the absorption of the self in the ‘One’, or in other word: God. For the case of Buddhism, Cragg defines it as a self-absentness (2002, p.86). This is what he says the meaning of I implies, but while there are many philosophical schools in Buddhism, most Mahayanist and some Theravada schools (see footnote 3) do not imagine an end to individuals. Mental continuums that each sentient being possesses are without end. What is
denied is the existence of an independent self. This point was altogether misunderstood in Cragg’s work, in phrases such as “…Nirvana, or ‘non-being’…, the ultimate ‘not-self’.

Nevertheless, Cragg, throughout his work, imputes the usage of personal pronouns to the nature of the self, that is to say, any personal pronouns rise from the I because it represents the self, and all other personal pronouns include the self. It is possible, because the self does exist in Tibetan Buddhism, that this nature of the self can be considered in the present corpora, as well.

The study of discourse, be it religious or not, needs to present, as was previously mentioned, a consistent part of meaningful language. Nevertheless, the focus of the study is on the choice of personal pronouns used by the Dalai Lama, according to religious discourse analysis, which means that the use of these personal pronouns is studied in the context of each of their utterances. Furthermore, their role in the interpersonal aspect of communication within religion is also taken into account using the interview part of analysed corpora.

One of the studies pertaining to religious discourse and to the use of personal pronouns in them, claims three types of semantical reference possible:

(a) deictic, which is an utterance directly related to a “time, place, or person(s)” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 160);

(b) anaphoric, which is word or phrase which “refers back to another word or phrase which was used earlier” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 26);

(c) reference by default, when the identification is only done by deduction or general interpretation (Yvert-Hamon, 2015, p. 135).

Various personal pronouns are identified as being invariably classified as purely deictic, but not all personal pronouns are seen to be purely deictic (this is illustrated by using examples of personal pronouns from her corpus) (Yvert-Hamon, 2015). An example of a reference by
default could be the pronoun you in general statements such as “You are not a real man, until your father dies”.

It should be noted that these classifications are not mutually exclusive, as it is argued that while most personal pronouns are purely deictic, they can also be anaphoric.

The present study follows these studies in the analysis of personal pronouns in the religious discourses found in corpus 1 and 2, found in the appendices, to see if the choice of personal pronoun affects the discourse in a way that could be linked to the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of this work. I, you, he, she, they are the personal pronouns investigated here.

2.3. Pronouns and Power

Social variation is commonly understood to be one of the factors affecting the speakers’ use of language. Indeed, there are language-internal and language-external factors affecting language variation (Deumert, 2009, p. 427). Amongst them social variation can be found. In the present heading, the main focus is the social variation induced by a religious position of power. “Membership in religious groups can also affect language use and religion has therefore been included as a social variable in sociolinguistics studies” (Deumert, 2009, p. 433). Here, the religious belief that may influence the speaker is the belief in selflessness, which is explained in the philosophical background section of this text, and possibly the power status of the Dalai Lama.

The Dalai Lama belongs to a speech community – that is a “group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language” (Yule, 2014, p. 257); which assumedly shares the same chore principles and religious beliefs. Whether such a community has a clear pattern of language use remains to be seen, as this study cannot possibly conduct such a thorough analysis. Instead, this study concentrates its research on the use of personal pronouns by the Dalai Lama, also as a marker of power.
Kuipers offers various interpretations of what power and authority in languages could be based on. Two such explanations seem to be fitting in this essay: a traditional authority and a charismatic authority\(^6\) (Kuipers, 2013, p. 401). Indeed, the Dalai Lama has been recognized as a spiritual and temporal authority since a young child. There is thus no doubt that he possesses a traditional authority. Due to his numerous international recognitions, such as the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989, and the devotion he generates in his hundreds of thousands of followers around the world, a charismatic authority cannot be denied.

Kacewicz et al. (2014) investigate how the use of pronouns reflects one’s hierarchical status. Their work is inductive because it tries to clarify how the usage of pronouns reflects this social status. Their research suggests that an above-average usage of *I* can possibly be part of a socially submissive strategy. It also posits that the use of first-person plural pronouns could reflect a higher status, because it shows a focus which includes the participants, and thus shows less self-centeredness (Kacewicz et al., 2014). This is seemingly difficult to defend, as generalisations are made without considering variables such as different cultures and languages. It is indeed quite improbable that every culture around the word values the same qualities of speech in a leader. Among English speakers also, such an oversimplification is difficult to accept, as it is possible to detect cultural differences\(^7\), as well as linguistic differences in very small areas already.

Nevertheless, there are still some specific contexts which seem to offer clear patterns in the usage of personal pronouns and leadership position. Indeed, Kacewicz et al.’s

---

\(^6\) Kuipers offers the following definitions of both: “Charismatic authority is based on devotion to an individual who exhibits a particular characteristic, ideal, or exemplary quality that motivates others to adhere to the normative patterns sanctioned by that individual. (…) Traditional authority is established by a belief in the “sanctity of immemorial traditions” (2013, p.401).

\(^7\) Cultural differences may include ones stemming from practices such as the ‘royal we’ for instance, which is the traditional manner a monarch would refer to himself or herself (Allen, 2008)
study finds that the use of *I* is higher for people with lower status, while *we* is used more by hierarchically high individuals. This has been consistent over five different research settings, including a non-English one, and conversations in which participants did not actually meet each other.

A similar pattern of investigation is used in the present study, where first person personal pronouns are systematically counted to allow for a comparison of results within the corpora investigated for this thesis and the results on leadership and the use of first person personal pronouns found by Kacewicz et al. (2014).

### 2.4. Intention

The use of personal pronouns in any discourse, be it written or spoken, can position the reader or listener as a participant in the discourse. Hyland states that uses of the pronoun *we* can include the participants (2001, p. 221; 2005, p. 177). Just as *we* can have such an inclusive effect, it is plausible that each of the personal pronouns used will have an effect and purpose in any uttered discourse, even if the present work does not aim to conduct an analysis on these. The use of the different personal pronouns may indicate how speakers position themselves and their audience. The Dalai Lama therefore positions himself, when speaking as a participant. The full extent of this position is not possible to develop on here due to the limitations of this study. Nevertheless, work towards this end is evident in the religious discourse part of the present essay.

Hyland (2001) shows that the frequency of the pronoun *I* is very high in research articles and students’ thesis, in the academic fields of philosophy and applied linguistics, with around 0.35% of the total number of used words. He also demonstrates that the author’s “personality, confidence, experience, and ideological preference” (2005, p. 191) are at play in such pronoun usage. Nevertheless, this methodology, which is based on a corpus study, does
not give an understanding of the author’s psychology and motivations. Widdowson (2000) has thus considered this method as imperfect, which does not mean that it does not possess redeeming qualities that can be used in the present approach.

Yule defines intention in pragmatics to mean “recognizing what speakers mean by their utterance” (2014, p125). Even though intentionality is an issue which could be dealt with using pragmatics, this essay offers a slightly different interpretation of what religious discourse is, based on the Tibetan Buddhist philosophical interpretation of what constitutes religion and religious activity. Consequently, intentionality is mostly treated in the religious discourse analysis part of this thesis.

An issue with intentionality especially when dealing with deictic pronouns is the level of self-awareness which may or may not be needed in their use. Jaszczolt discusses this and argues that this self-awareness might not be needed, in the use of I, for example (2013, p. 68). Jaszczolt mentions self-awareness thus: “to convey self-awareness and thereby to convey the cognitive access to oneself in the situation described in the sentence” (2013, p.60). This issue of self-awareness, and how it might be understood when the Dalai Lama is speaking, is also explored in the present work.

A significant feature that is investigated in this study is personal pronouns. These could constitute a sign of a perceptual salience, that is how speakers prominently project themselves (Kecskes, 2013, p. 72), or the image of themselves to their audience, in this case when using personal pronouns rather than other expressions. Kecskes argues that this salience can be dependent on three factors: “naturalness, vividness, and motivation of the speaker” (2013, p. 72), the last one being considered here because of its relationship with intentionality and self-awareness.
3. Methodology and Data

This section describes not only the data analysed here, but also how it was selected, and both the quantitative and qualitative methodologies which have been employed in this work.

3.1. Data

The material used in this thesis consists of the transcripts from all the utterances of the Dalai Lama in a TV show hosted by the American journalist Charlie Rose, in 2005. The two transcripts consist of:

(a) Corpus 1, the manually checked utterances by the Dalai Lama, in the above-mentioned show, which are either part of an interview or fragments of other non-interview utterances examples which were included in the TV-show, as a means of introduction.

(b) Corpus 2, the transcript of the whole show, including both the Dalai Lama and Charlie Rose’s utterances.

The TV-show lasts for fifty-two minutes and is given in English only. There are no utterances read from a text during the TV show. The two variants of the transcripts are found in the appendices, with Corpus 1 in Appendix 1, and Corpus 2 in Appendix 2. Corpus 2 is found on the official webpage of the show. Corpus 1 has been checked against the video recording, with any discrepancies marked in red. It serves mostly for the quantitative phase of the study, while the second corpus contains a wider context which serves better for the qualitative enquiry.

This material was chosen because the Dalai Lama only speaks English in it, and because it consists of utterances which are visibly not read from a pre-written script. It thus gives a better insight into the speaker’s spontaneous choice of personal pronouns.
The subject matter of the interview covers his visit to Washington D.C. in 2005, Buddhism, and Tibetan-Chinese relationships. The transcript is available together with the video recording of the TV show on the internet.

3.2. Method of Analysis

The material was treated in two steps: during the first step, the transcript was taken from the official website of the Charlie Rose Show. It was then copied into a file of a commonly found word processor. The second step of the method of analysis of the studied material consisted of checking the transcript against the video recording of the show. Some inconsistencies were found and additions were added in red to the text in Corpus 1.

Corpus 1 has 3549 words altogether. Each of these were taken from the TV show and were selected from words uttered by the Dalai Lama only. This corpus was analysed using software called AntConc which is freely available on the internet. Using this software, each utterance of personal pronouns was counted. The pronouns searched for were: I, you, he, she, we and they. These personal pronouns were chosen because they offer a standard range of the personal pronouns usually recognized as such, in their most standard form – nominative - as well as refers only to human beings in the present corpora. The accusative was not included because its meaning differs from the simple nominative.

The analysis of this data itself consists of a quantitative and a qualitative analysis. This does not mean that the two are separate, but instead that aspects of both are present in a mixed-method approach. This is in order to offer a broad analysis and understanding of the Dalai Lama’s language use, in its specific usage of personal pronouns in the two corpora.

---

8 Accessible on [https://charlierose.com/videos/18289](https://charlierose.com/videos/18289)
9 Available on Lawrence Anthony’s website [http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/](http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/)
10 You in any of its forms was included to speed the analytical process.
3.2.1. Quantitative analysis

The purpose of taking a quantitative approach is to be able to generate measurable results that are based on the occurrences found in the present corpus. The quantitative analysis can also serve the qualitative analysis which is more interpretative in character.

The material investigated has been processed as two small linguistic corpora. Each occurrence of the personal pronouns was counted using AntConc, then a simple calculator was needed to calculate percentages \( \frac{x}{n} = \% \), whereas \( x = \) given quantity; \( n = \) total quantity. The calculation of personal pronouns percent word used in the corpora were calculated in percent for the sake of clarity.

3.2.2. Qualitative analysis

Although qualitative research might be difficult to define (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 35), it does have some common particularities that will be used in the present work. One of these particularities used in this essay is the attempt to understand the use of pronouns from the utterer’s point of view. Another point Dörnyei mentions is the interpretative aspect of results gained from any studied sample (2007, p. 38). This means that the results a researcher might gain are also influenced by the researchers themselves, in a concept reminiscent of Schrödinger’s cat\(^{11}\). In the present case, the qualitative aspect of this study focuses on these two qualities (the attempt to understand the use of pronouns from the utterer’s point of view and the interpretative aspect of results gained from any studied sample), and are particularly relevant to the three fields used here: pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis.

The methodology used in this part of this essay is thus based on the interpretation of the quantitative results and a careful analysis of the context of each occurrence of the personal pronouns. The main collocations are briefly mentioned but the

\(^{11}\) In quantum mechanics, the Schrödinger's cat experiment offers the paradoxical situation of a cat being fully dead and alive at the same time, until an observer witnesses the state of said cat.
analysis follows Richards & Schmidt and Yvert-Hamon in classifying the pronouns in the three non-mutually exclusive categories:

(a) deictic;

(b) anaphoric;

(c) reference by default.

The qualitative approach to the pragmatic analysis involves, but is not limited to, using and analyzing the speaker’s intention when personal pronouns are uttered, by going through each personal pronoun utterance and then contextualizing their use with respect to religious discourse and power. The sociolinguistic analysis tries, using the same methodology, to find particularities of leadership in the number of personal pronouns found. The discourse analysis approach focuses on religious language and the use of personal pronouns in the corpora. These three fields of research are linked because the intention, per Tibetan treatise, marks the discourse as religious (as previously mentioned, a religious intent is needed to mark the discourse as religious), and the position of the Dalai Lama is a position of power. Thus, it involves and links the three fields in the common research of analyzing the use of personal pronouns.

4. Data Analysis and Results

Because of the two approaches to this work, namely quantitative and qualitative, this section is not only divided into separate pragmatic, religious discourse analysis and sociolinguistic sections, but each of these rely on the first section which forms the quantitative results of this study. The reason why I, you, he, she, we and they were chosen has been previously discussed on page 15.
### 4.1. Frequency of Personal Pronouns

Table 1 shows the quantity of personal pronouns uttered by the Dalai Lama in the material. From this table, it is clear that the most striking result is found in the use of the first person personal pronouns. In this sample, which is not of an interview only, first person singular pronouns form more than 50% of all personal pronouns used. When the segments of corpus 1 which are not part of the interview are looked at, it is possible to see a similar pattern, with 67% (6 out of 9) of all uttered personal pronoun being first person singular. Second person singular pronouns are quite common, too, with around 24% of all personal pronouns used – or 11% for the non-interview part. No she was uttered, but we is quite common, with 12% of all personal pronouns used – or 22% for the non-interview part. Nevertheless, it is possible to see that whether the utterances of the Dalai Lama are part or not of an interactive interview, the results are quite similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Pronoun</th>
<th>Corpus 1 (3549 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{I}</td>
<td>$131 = 53.25%$ of all personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{You}</td>
<td>$58 = 23.6%$ personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{He}</td>
<td>$16 = 6.5%$ personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{She}</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{We}</td>
<td>$30 = 12.2%$ personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{They}</td>
<td>$11 = 4.47%$ personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Raw Frequency and Percentage of Personal Pronoun Use

Figure 1 shows the total percentage of personal pronouns found, against the total number of words used. This gives an idea of the general amount of personal pronouns used. Such statistics could be used in further studies, in order to compare speeches of the Dalai Lama in different contexts, such as in a public or a private venue, for example. The total percentage of personal pronouns at 7% of all words used is somewhat lower than the personal pronouns “people use”, at 14% (Kacewicz et al., 2014, p. 127). It is not considered personal in Kacewicz study, but an impersonal pronoun.

Figure 2 shows the use of the main personal pronouns as a percentage of the total number of personal pronouns used in corpus 1. Both Figure 1 and Figure 2 are included here, to allow the reader to have a broader idea of how the Dalai Lama uses personal pronouns when speaking in English.
Figure 2 Percentage of the Proportions of the Different Types of Personal Pronouns Uttered

The difference between the above-mentioned results from Kacewicz’s study and these percentages, in the use of self-mention through singular or plural personal pronouns should also be mentioned, because some studies have demonstrated that people in a position of power tend to use more plural variants of the first person personal pronouns (Kacewicz et al., 2014, p. 136). The Dalai Lama is one of the main religious figure of Tibetan Buddhists, and is thus in a position of power, whether he is giving an interview or teaching thousands of people. That the Dalai Lama uses more personal pronouns does differ from Kacewicz et al’s results, but his position of power might not be similar to the ones studied in Kacewicz et al. Indeed, he never had to earn his position, but was instead raised above any other Tibetan person. Whether this influences his use of self-mentions is impossible to determine in this essay, however.

Unfortunately, the data analyzed here is limited to a single TV show, and the Dalai Lama’s English fluency may affect the number and the type of pronouns used when compared to previous studies, which were instead based on the speech of native English speakers.

---

12 In the present study, it is considered an impersonal pronoun rather than personal, following Kacewicz et al’s study.
4.2. Qualitative Analysis

The Dalai Lama in this discourse, which is as stated before, not only an interview but also a speech given to a group of scientists, uses personal singular pronouns much more than any other pronouns, with 53% of uttered personal pronouns being first person singular. These most often precede a stative verb, that is a verb which refers to a state of being (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 557). An example of this is:

(1) I think using force of war, or even just war I don’t think now relevant. [Corpus 1]

The Dalai Lama is stating his beliefs and thoughts on issues, maybe to consolidate his position as a thinker, instead of speaking a universal truth. This statement of beliefs, instead of a statement of a universal truth, is quite in accord with the Buddhist principle established by the Shakyamuni: “Just as a goldsmith tries gold by rubbing, cutting and burning, so should you examine my words. Do not accept them just out of faith in me” (Gautama, N/A, p. 63). So there is a prevalence of stative verbs, with I, and amongst them, as in this example, think is the most commonly found verb with 63 utterances of think directly following an I; that is almost half the words uttered after I is think.

According to the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, lexical verbs such as think are most common during a conversational interaction and they are used to frame the author’s own stance (Biber et al., 1999, p. 360). Thus, when uttered together with I, during an interview, it seems the Dalai Lama is interested in sharing his own thoughts and maybe positioning himself as a thinker, for instance.

Example (1) is also an example of how most first person personal pronouns are purely deictic, as they refer to the speaker himself: the Dalai Lama. There is actually only deictic uses made of the pronoun I in the corpus. Nevertheless I is sometimes found not to be purely deictic, but both deictic and anaphoric in its use:
(2) …I pretended as a soldier… [Corpus 2]

Indeed, the *I* does refer to a person, and as such is deictic, but it is also anaphoric, because it refers to a previous question asked by Charlie Rose:

(3) …when you left, how did you get out? [Corpus 2]

There are a few instances such as these, which all are part of the same answer given by the Dalai Lama in (2). But overall, most utterances of *I* are purely deictic.

*You* is less common, but differs in its use from *I*. Indeed, while *I* was mostly used in a deictic manner, *you* does not fit that pattern, as most utterances seem to be a reference by default, or according to Yvert-Hamon a generalisation of facts (Yvert-Hamon, 2015), such as in:

(4) And through calm mind, *you* can see the picture more clearly. [Corpus 1]

As previously explained, the distinction between a reference by default and an anaphoric or deictic expression seems blurry, as in example (4). Nevertheless, it is difficult in this example to claim that the use of *you* refers to a specific person, and even a would-be person, but instead, it seems to be used as a fact emerging from a stated fact and situation. Thus, this would be a more generic use: a reference by default, according to Yvert-Hamon.

*He* is always a deictic expression in this corpus, even if it is not commonly used – with only 16 utterances. One such utterance is:

(5) *He* almost treated me as his son. [Corpus 1]

Nevertheless, this and the other utterances of *he* also fit the anaphoric category, as this refers back to Mao who was previously mentioned, and others occur in much the same context.

*We* is not as common as *I*, with only 30 utterances, compared to 131 *Is*. They often refer to Tibetans as a group, such as in:

(6) *We* already have elected political leadership [Corpus 1]
This is another example of a deictic use of pronouns, because it refers to Tibetan people as a whole. This use is inclusive of Tibetan people, but also exclusive of non-Tibetan people. There are other uses of we in the discourse analysed, such as:

(7) Whether we accept religion or not… [Corpus 1]

Example (7) could be interpreted in various ways, such as a deictic of Humans and therefore be of the same generic use found in example (4). It could also be thought as a reference by default, because it can be understood as a general statement, refering to a general reality.

*They* is much less common, and every utterance refers either to individuals or bodies, such as a government in example (8):

(8) *They* accept a difference… [Corpus 1]

In this example, *they* is not deictic, but again a reference *by default*, because it is possible to understand it only through the context of its utterance.

These examples show the relationship between the use of the personal pronouns and their anaphoric, deictic or *by default* uses. The implications are not many when a deictic usage is not included, but when the usage of these pronouns is deictic and/or anaphoric, it always refers to a person, and thus an ethos. This, in turn, refers back to the intentionality involved in their usage, from the points of view of sociolinguistics, religious discourse and pragmatics.

### 4.3. Religious Discourse

In Tibetan Buddhism, the intention of the speaker marks the text as a religious discourse, as previously explained. This means that the two topics of religious discourse analysis and pragmatics can be difficult to distinguish. Nevertheless, personal pronouns have been shown previously to possibly represent an ethos. In the case of Tibetan Buddhist philosophy, this is an existing entity which is dependent on linguistic conventions.

This doctrine of selflessness does not seem to negatively influence the speaker
into using fewer self-mentions. For instance, in example (1) the usage of self-mention in the form of the first person singular pronoun is repeated twice within the same sentence. Nevertheless, it is not conceivable to deny a possible influence. Indeed, it seems that such self-mentions are striking because of the amount of their recurrences, as in this example. Indeed, the Dalai Lama’s utterances contain many first-person personal pronouns.

Such usage possibly stems from the recognition of the existence of a self instead of its denial. As written earlier, the theory of selflessness does not deny its existence, but rather denies the existence of a self as an independent entity. There is thus no reason to avoid self-mentions once this view is accepted.

Overall, the marked usage of first-person singular pronouns is consistent with the idea that the teaching of Buddhism often relays: an experiential understanding of reality, that is not to say that it cannot be consistent with other factors as well. In example (9), the experiential understanding seems to be even emphasised by the repetition of I and by the choice of the verbs directly following each instance of I.

(9)  I think -- I feel, due to lack of education or awareness, that we carry certain action as a result of our past thinking [Appendix 1]

The Dalai Lama seems to be mostly conveying his own understanding and experience when addressing others. He also switches from I to we in what could be an effort in inclusiveness.

By taking all these points into account, a broader study might be able to identify patterns of the use of personal pronouns in religious discourses of various religious denominations to extract clear patterns and compare the uses of personal pronouns across religions and personal beliefs.

4.4. Leadership

In this essay, it is argued that a TV interview is a social interaction, happening in a social group, because there are three quite definable participants: the interviewer, Charlie Rose, the
interviewee, the Dalai Lama, and the viewers. The participation of the first two contributors is quite self-evident, as they are both talking to each other, while the participation of the audience might be more difficult to fathom. Nevertheless, when participating in such an interview, it is impossible to forget the various cameras and staff, whose sole purpose is to enable a connection to the audience. Thus, the interviewee is most probably always aware of the audience and modulates his utterances accordingly.

This understanding is concordant with Kacewicz et al.’s own methodology, as texts between only two participants were also included in their corpus, and form part of their analysis (2014, p. 135). The present work offers also a similar setting during the interview. In this setting, the audience does participate, even if indirectly, because they have some power over the answers given. Indeed, the interviewee can be assumed to be aware of the audience because the interview is part of a popular TV programme, and thus the interviewee possibly modulates his answers accordingly.

In this corpus, a traditional and charismatic leader – the Dalai Lama – more often uses I than any other pronoun. This seems at odds with Kacewicz et al.’s results (2014). Nevertheless, variants in their studies were found, and the setting here might induce such a difference. Indeed, the Dalai Lama is clearly from a different culture and background. This could be a factor influencing his choices of utterances. Other factors could include the fact that he was raised as a leader, that is, in a position where he never had to defend his status.

While the pronoun I is the most used personal pronoun in the answers given by the Dalai Lama, there still are instances where we is uttered, in the same characteristic fashion of leaders’ utterances. In example (7), we is indeed used as a very inclusive pronoun, where the Dalai Lama seems to be including his audience, and is thus more typical of Kacewicz et al.’s conclusions (2014) on the use of personal pronouns by leaders.
Altogether, it is difficult to generalise the possible reasons behind a choice in the use one has of their uttered personal pronouns. Possible factors inducing a definite pattern are so immeasurable it seems somewhat presumptuous to pick one over the others. The lack of comparable material is also detrimental to the present study.

4.5. Pragmatics and Intention

As mentioned previously, Kecskes suggests that motivation is one of the causes of a salient (noticeable) usage of some words (Kecskes, 2013). In the present case, first-person singular personal pronouns are salient because of the sheer amount of them, which is much more important than what it should be in how people actually speak. The explanation of what exactly constitutes this kind of speech is something which is left quite vague in Kecskes’s own work.

The issue of self-awareness mentioned in Jaszczolt’s work is a difficult aspect to analyse because it is challenging to differentiate between what the researcher actually projects in the results and what are scientifically based conclusions. Even a thorough investigation into cognitive neuroscience cannot yet answer the question of awareness and self-awareness. Then again, the utterances in the present corpus are all part of what Jaszczolt posits as self-aware. Example (2) even acknowledges a time when the Dalai Lama had to flee Tibet, and pretended to be a soldier. This point offers an excellent opportunity to wonder what the self, which is arguably based on the personal pronouns themselves, is really as the I in this example represents different roles and thus different selves of the same person.

5. Conclusion

Throughout this essay, the Dalai Lama’s use of personal pronouns has been analysed. This was accomplished by using an interview from the Charlie Rose Show. The small scale of this
study does not allow for a deeper analysis, nevertheless it is quite clear that the Dalai Lama uses personal pronouns in a way that may be influenced by his personal beliefs and status and other factors as well. It seems that the Dalai Lama tends to use more specific personal pronoun than other personal pronouns, especially first-person personal pronouns.

The aim of this essay, that is to analyse the discourse by the Dalai Lama found on the Charlie Rose’s Show, using pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis has been achieved. Its broad aspect could enable researchers to not only understand the possible impact Tibetan Buddhist philosophy could potentially have on speakers’ language, but also to analyse the Dalai Lama’s similar discourses, by using pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Nevertheless, it is not possible to draw general conclusions on the Dalai Lama’s usage of language, and thus pronouns. To be able to draw such conclusions, a very large amount of data would have to be carefully scrutinized.

The topic of selflessness per Tsong Khapa’s understanding of the view of the Prasangika is not well-studied in linguistics, and very few papers cover it accurately. The influence of this view on daily language use is also absent in the academic world. It is to remedy this that the topic was decided for this essay. The fact that the view of the Prasangika posits all existing things as dependent on name, term and linguistic conventions, which precedes poststructuralists by more than a thousand years, is a subject which needs to be more thoroughly studied, because it is an important part of human knowledge, be it in linguistics or other areas, and as such its possible contributions needs to be acknowledged, understood and carefully studied.

The two research questions have also been answered in this thesis, and they have been quite conclusive in displaying some of the specific characteristics of religious language and power based on the speaker’s intention and the usage of personal pronouns by the Dalai
Lama in the Charlie Rose’s Show; and the possibility that these characteristics could be indicative of the Tibetan Buddhist views on selfhood.

Further studies might consider using additional data, such as other discourses of the Dalai Lama in similar and dissimilar settings, as well as in Tibetan, to obtain more reliable results, which need to be supported many times, before being accepted. It would also be of benefit to compare how other Buddhist teachers might use personal pronouns, since the Dalai Lama’s speeches might reflect his power status more than any other, because of his social status.

Unfortunately, the lack of available data here meant that general conclusions could not be made. Indeed, it is limited to a single TV show, and the Dalai Lama’s English fluency may affect the number and the type of pronouns used, especially relative to the usage of personal pronouns in his native language (Tibetan). The intention of the speaker is also a vast subject that could benefit being integrated to other fields, such as neuroscience, etc.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 – Corpus 1

I think one of the unique thing about Bodhidharma Buddhism, particularly in Sanskrit tradition, the investigation, experiment is very, very important -- important part. So the reason many trouble comes out of ignorance. So the only -- the antidote to ignorance is knowledge. Knowledge means clear sort of understanding about the reality. In modern times, with help of equipment, the another way to find out the reality. So science and Buddhist --what say? Investigation, I think both are actually trying to find the reality. So in the initial stage, out of my curiosity when I look outside into space, there are many things. How these things happen? That kind of curiosity. We look at our own body. Some hair, a lot of hair, and underneath skull, so-called skull. Unlike other part of the body, there is some kind of special protection. Why? So usually, we believe soul or self is here in the heart, in the centre of heart. Now, seems whether soul can be identified or not, seems the soul is here, not here. My participation here, I have nothing to offer, just to listen, to learn myself from these great sort of experienced scientists.

So I'm always eager to see, although the language problem there, and also my memory problem also there. Sometimes at the session, it seems I learned, but after the session, there is nothing left there. So there's a problem. But anyway. Anyway. So that's all, thank you.

Of course I have three commitments. Number one, about promotion of human value. Then number two, the promotion of religious harmony. That wherever I go, I always sort of talk about these things. Then the -- here, visit Washington, third commitment that’s about Tibet, Tibet issue. So since the United States here, like many other country, there are many people very sympathetic, and particularly the both houses and administration all are very supportive, so they always willing to help. So then, my main sort of reason meeting with president --
firstly, I consider him as one of my old friend. Then -- the -- although last three years, we already have renewed direct contact with Chinese government, which is very good, however so far no concrete sort of result or development. Although our side, both sides, the main effort is try to build confidence. Still, however, inside Tibet, no sign of leniency or improvement. So I ask president, please ask Chinese leaders -- firstly, I'm not seeking independence. Within the Chinese constitution framework, some kind of mutually agreeable solution we will find. That's our sort of confidence. We are trying to do that. So please convey to the Chinese government, no need suspicion.

That's right. That's right.

Although in the Chinese constitution, there are certain rights provided to minorities or ethnic groups, but particularly in the case of Tibet, the main decision in the hands of han-Chinese who have no knowledge about Tibetan culture, about Tibetan delicate environmental situation and Tibetan spirituality. So therefore, you see they simply -- you see, they carrying a policy which in China proper usually you should do. So it is different, vast differences. culture differences. And then environment also. You see, Tibet, high altitude, dry climate. You need special care. So because of lack of you see, that knowledge, now last 40, 50 years, much damage already done. So for example, the ecology. Now now Chinese government recently, you see, realized, because of large scale of deforestation, due to carelessness of the...in ecology, so more flood now happen in China as well as Bangladesh. These are related. So now -- so there's the problem. So we are asking, they accept difference in foreign affairs, and the rest of the affair, like education or religion or culture, and then environment issue, or all these Tibetan, they have better sort of knowledge and better sort of -- better sort of knowledge. Therefore, they can manage I think more realistically. So that's why we are asking give us some kind of meaningful self-rule.

Oh yes.yes Yes.
Right. Although we prefer direct communication with Chinese government, Chinese leaders, but we haven't find sort of proper opportunity. meantime, like the United States president you see want to do something. So then I ask, please convey these things

That's right.

I think generally speaking, I think positive.

Yes, comparatively. OK.

I don't --

I don't know. I don't know. I think, actually, he spent some time in Tibet as the first party secretary. But due to what do you say, health reasons, I think he spent a few months in Tibet, but usually in China proper. And then of course you see sometimes I do feel the system is such, the top leaders, they may not have full sort of awareness about the real thing. That's you see difficulties. And within Tibetan community, like some other country, the elite sort of people and their relation with masses sometimes lacking. Although the communist party is the party of the working-class people.

But sometimes you see lacking that relation.

And everything secret, secret, secret.

There's the problem.

Yes. Among Tibetan, not only among the youth, but also among the elder. Some criticize about my stand. And my stand little too soft. That kind of criticism is there. But I have full confidence my approach is the realistic and look broadly. Our own…I feel that Tibet backward, materially, very, very backward --

Yes, materially, yes, economically, backward. Spirituality very rich. So therefore, in order to development in material field, that there Tibet remain within the People's Republic of China, we will get greater benefit. That's my view.

Yes, this is my sort of my view, my feeling.
That's right. Provided Chinese government give us meaningful autonomy, which is the best guarantee for preservation of Tibetan culture Tibetan spirituality and Tibetan environment.

That's right.

That's right.

That's right.

That's right.

Yes, I believe, I believe so. Because, you see, my approach not seeking separation, but seeking genuine autonomy. That give us some satisfaction. Therefore, you see, that is I think very, very important for development of stability and unity and prosperity with Chinese government. The top sort of concern or periodicity is stability, the unity and prosperity.

Oh, but you see prosperity on the basis of unity and stability. That, the -- unfortunately, some of the Chinese sort of officials, they believe these sort of goals can achieve by force. I do not believe that. You see, Stability and unity must come from within. So in order to get that, Tibetan should get more satisfaction today. Sometimes you see the people describe entire Tibetan people become like a slave.

No, right, everything.

Oh, yes, now growing. Now growing. Now --

Including Buddhism, and Christianity and Muslim, and also Chinese traditional sort of religion, Taoism, these also I think is reviving.

Now, today's, the Communist Party of China seems I think more liberal. In a certain field so I think too much liberal. Therefore, Communist Party without a communist ideology. So don’t care about capitalism or socialism, these things. So therefore, this gap, rich and poor, now growing very rapidly.

So I think the Chinese people, I think historically, intelligent, hard-working.

And realistic, I feel. So I feel last now -- almost now 60 years, I feel that during during Mao
Mao’s era, the emphasis on the importance of ideology. Then Deng Xiaoping’s era, more concerned about economy. So now, today’s China now, much more sort of economic development, although some other drawbacks also you see developed, but I think overall, the China gain I think much benefit out of Deng’s policy. Then Jiang Zemin. New reality. Now there are wealthy people, or middle-class people, number increasing. Their influence is also increasing. Therefore, now the Communist Party no longer as a pure sort of representative of working-class people. So this sort of concept tri-representative tri-represents. So these are I think clear sign the party thinking according the new reality. So I'm hopeful.

That's right.

That's right.

That's right. That's right. That’s right, that’s right.

So in Chinese also interest -- of course, China most populous nation. Now becoming economic power. So the China becoming more sort of, what do I say, open society. I think then, that's in the interest for everyone. And Tibet issue, easy to solve. No problem. This is my feeling.

But the Chinese leadership, of course, understand it really, you see. Their – their approach more cautiously, because if something, some careless situation develops, like the former Soviet Union, collapse of the former Soviet Union.

That kind of situation happens, then I think too much chaotic situation may arise, so that's in nobody's interest. So the smooth transition is I think interest for everyone.

Yes. Yes.

Yes.

What, please repeat?

Did they object to that?

Of course sometimes little unhappy words also necessary. Of course I always, you see, have
the belief -- I am Buddhist. Firstly, I'm a human being who believes truth, honest -- honesty and justice. And furthermore, I'm a Buddhist monk. So when things -- something wrong, I have to speak. So sometimes I

That's right. So I believe, you see, truth is something I think very important. Honesty, saying something, doing something different is absolutely wrong. And something even you see -- I always admit past Tibet, there are a lot of mistakes. We have to accept that, admit that. But then since the Chinese sort of have come to Tibet, everything not positive. So that also we have to say. These are difficulties. And then those -- like, for example, the connection of railway we link. In principal, I welcome, but some Tibetans and some of our supporters a little reservation or a critical view about my stand. I welcome these things. These are the sign of development. But then if you -- now, much depends on how to use these things. Some other objective, for example, bringing more Chinese or more built-up military, then of course, negative.

Otherwise, the railway is most welcome.

That is right.

That is right. Actually, one of my dreams eventually Tibet should be zone of peace, demilitarized, so that, firstly, for ecology reasons, better. Second, most important the Sino-Indian relations --.

Yes. I think then, genuine friendship on the basis of mutual trust can develop, so long the last of them Chinese soldier stationed in Tibet. Naturally, the India side sometimes is a little -- Because of the past experience. Some expected -- unexpected things happened in the past. So naturally there is some uncomfortable feeling about Tibet.

Oh, yes.

Oh, Mao, of course, at that time I'm young, around I think 19 -- 20 -- around I think 20. So Mao -- actually I have genuine respect or admiration --
Mao Zedong You see, my personal sort of contact, interview or audience, several occasions and meeting several occasions. He almost treated me as his own son.

And then, then -- then he advised me, he said, I think many positive things. And then I think regarding about Tibet. Now, one time he told me, the very purpose of sending Chinese army and civilian officials to Tibet is helping to you, helping to Tibetan. Once you develop and become capable to manage all these things, these Chinese will withdraw. He told me that.

That's right.

He told me like that.

I think everybody knows now.

And even Yaobang, I think in 1980, you see, came to Lhasa

And he publicly, you see, admits their past mistake, and he seriously thinking to withdraw I think 80 percent of han Chinese from Tibet.

I think today, I think the Tibet issue would be resolved, I think. The early '80s, you see, Deng Xiaoping and Hu Yaobang, I think they are -- I mean, their view I think very broad and very realistic.

Who?

Oh, Yaobang, oh.

Eventually, I think should do. Because --

Oh, yes. No doubt.

Oh, yes, of course. Every Tibetans. To see one's own country, or one's own sort of birth place.

I think so.

I think so.

Quick? You mean five years or 10 years?

I don't know.

So that also -- if I live another 15, 20 years, I think things will change.
Oh, with one stick.

Oh, that's a long story.

Yeah.

That was in 1959.

That's right.

As a soldier. That particular day -- or night, when I leaving Norbulinga, my place, that night, of course, I acted like one soldier, one gun.

Yeah. One rifle, quite heavy. Carried it this side. Then another -- another carried on this side. So then the worst thing is, since I pretended as a soldier, a soldier, so my glasses, without my glasses.

It was night. Night. So, meantime little sort of -- and then -- then just outside the wall, Norbulinga's palace wall, one small river.

We have to pass that river on small sort of, how say that --

Yes, yes. So without the glasses, and nobody help, that heavy rifle. I really find very difficult.

Oh, yes. Of course, of course.

I'm nothing special. I'm just like you. I think you have more experience than me.

Experience I think in many fields.

You see, I believe -- and one of my I think firm belief is, everyone, you see, has I think some very positive sort what potential.

Now, sometimes we forget about these things, and look too much at the external thing. Money or power or beautiful house or car, like that.

And then something wrong. Something not come as expected, as expectation. Then we want to complain. A lot of resentment. So that time, think. Inner value. There is sufficient sort of strength to face these sort of unexpected sort of difficulties.

Yes.
I think compassion -- we should not look just word compassion, just that way. I think they say -- I usually explain, the compassion is important, because more compassionate mental attitude there. You can see everything more better, more clearly, because compassion bring us some -- some kind of, sort of I say calm mind. And through calm mind, you can see the picture more clearly. Much sort of the emotions such as hatred, anger, attachment. Then your normal mind or calm mind, not there, no longer there. Too much sort of hatred, too much anger, or too much attachment. So these afflictive emotion, then become obstacle to see the reality. So then, with these emotion, your actions become unrealistic. Therefore, this -- I think nobody want trouble. But but there are a lot of trouble. Why? Man-made trouble. Why? Our approach is not realistic. This is my view. So therefore, the compassion bring us a certain deeper sort of value, firstly open our mind, and that bring more inner strength, more self-confidence, and that bring more calm mind. Through that way, whether in politics or economy or education or anything, even warfare -- I think warfare can carry with calm mind is better than full of hatred.

Yes, I think. And firstly, the calm mind may not start war. And in case you start if necessary - If through compassion -- compassionate sort of attitude, if you really convinced some kind of what say, of force necessary to use, then limit destruction. Certainly.

Difficult. I think in ancient time, maybe just war. But now today, world, new reality. Now the whole world has become like one small planet. So everything inter-dependent. Now the United States economically or ecology or many things depend on other continent. So that's a new reality. If -- at the ancient time, the reality is more or less is that each continent are independent. And not only that, but nations or even you see community to community, more or less independent. Then, according to that reality, destruction of your so-called enemy, who creates some trouble or disagree with you, destruction of that may be your victory. Now, today, whole world is just one body. So therefore, according that reality, the destruction of
your neighbour is the destruction of yourself.

That’s right. So therefore --

So now today, I think the whole world treated as a part of your own body. As one just -- one big human family. So within the family, disagreement, different interests or different views always happen. Then, you have to solve them in the atmosphere of some kind of spirit, a one-family spirit, not killing. So similarly, I think today’s -- according to today’s reality, I think using force or war or even just war I don’t think now relevant.

The compassion side. We'll win.

We will win.

Through education, through awareness. I think -- I feel, due to lack of education or awareness, that we carry certain action as a result of our past thinking, so that old-fashioned or old way of thinking still in our mind, but the reality where we are dealing is different. Changed. So a gap: Reality and our perception, sometimes gap. So we’re still using old methods. That's my feeling. So these are lack of knowledge, lack of awareness, of the reality of the new picture. So through education, through media, I hopefully through education sort of program, I think introduction or explanation about the new reality, I think very necessary. And through that way, I think people getting deeper awareness. As a result, their whole sort of perception more broader, more realistic, then the concept of war, there is no room.

Oh, yes.

That's right.

Right.

That’s right.

Yes.

You can’t blame science as a whole. Science is just a method, or knowledge. So the thing is how to use that. Now Nuclear physics itself, wonderful. Now, their mistake is our motivation.
We use that knowledge for destructive, for destructions, destructive force. It's our mistake, not science mistake. And also these --

Yes. That's right. I think similarly, religion. Sometimes you see people manipulate religion and use wrong way. Religion used for what do you say, possibly -- for promotion of hatred sometimes.

That's not fault of religion, but fault of people.


So the religion also can be dirty religion. Science also can be dirty science. If we use, utilize wrong way.

That's right.

That's right.

That's right.

This I can recall, reminds me -- one Chilean scientist. Now, he once you see told me --

Chilean scientist.

I think one physicist. He once told me he, as a scientist, his field science, although his whole life he was involved in the science, the scientific sort of work, but he himself said he should not have attachment to the science. So me, too. I'm Buddhist, but I should not have attachment towards Buddhism. Attachment then brings biased attitude. So I think sometimes you see the people believes certain religion, too much attachment. And because of the attachment, not seeing the reality or consequences. So then secondly, I feel -- I always telling people, whether we accept religion or not, it's up to the individual, up to the individual, even you do not believe any religion.

Yes, choice, yes. If you want to be no faith, no believer, OK. No problem. But if you accept
any faith, then you should be serious and sincere. Then all major religious tradition, in spite of different philosophy, all carry same message, message of love, compassion, tolerance, forgiveness, self-discipline, contentment. These things. So all major religions traditions have same potential to create better human being. So usually we are -- sometimes we are not that much serious. Also one’s own religion, one’s own sort of tradition, teaching good things, but sometimes we you don’t care.

Sometimes you see

Yes. I believe that. I think there are many, I think, signs or many potentials to become better world. But meantime, we need more effort with fuller awareness. I think then, our century, 21st century, I think will be more happier century than 20th century. I have no doubt. I don’t know. Actually, as early as ’69, one of my public statements, I made clear, whether the very institution of the Dalai Lama should continue or not, up to the Tibetan people.

Oh, yes. If Tibetan people feel this institution not much more relevant, then the institution should cease. Then no need to bother about the next reincarnation. And also, now since last four years, we already have elected political leadership. So as the political field is concerned, the Dalai Lama institution is not much now importance. So my position since then is semi-retired.

I don't think any particular mission, I don’t think any particular sort of responsibility, I don't know. I am -- I always consider I'm another human being. And within the Buddhists, I usually describe, simple Buddhist monk. So whatever is, I can make some -- if there's any possibility to make still a little contribution for betterment of humanity among religious people, or Tibetan people, whatever way, that's my sort of wish or my desire to make small contribution. So that means my life becomes something useful. That's all.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you.
Appendix 2

00:00

Charlie Rose: The 14th Dalai Lama was born Tenzin Gyatso. He is the spiritual and political leader of the people of Tibet. The Dalai Lama fled his country in 1959, when the Chinese army invaded. Since then, he has led the Tibetan government in exile from India. He is a Nobel Peace Prize laureate and one of the world's most famous advocates for compassion and nonviolence. Last week, he spoke at a science conference in Washington. And here is a part of what he said.

00:46

Dalai Lama: I think one of the unique thing about Bodiharma (ph) Buddhism, particularly in (INAUDIBLE) tradition, the investigation, experiment is very, very important part -- important part. So the reason many trouble comes out of ignorance. So the only -- the antidote to ignorance is knowledge. Knowledge means clear sort of understanding about the reality. In modern times, with the help of equipment, the only way to find out the reality. So science and Buddhist -- what's that?

01:38

Unidentified Male: Investigation.

01:42

Dalai Lama: Investigation, I think both are actually trying to find the reality. So in the initial stage, out of my curiosity when I look outside into space, there are many things. How these things happen? That kind of curiosity. We look at our own body. Some hair, a lot of hair, and underneath (INAUDIBLE), so-called skull. Unlike other part of the body, there is some kind of special protection. Why? So usually, we believe soul or self is here in the heart, in the center of heart. Now, seems whether the soul can be identified or not, seems the soul is here,
not here. My participation here, I have nothing to offer, just to listen, to learn myself from these great sort of experienced -- what's that?

02:48

Unidentified Male: Scientists.

02:52

Dalai Lama: Scientists. So I'm always eager to see, although the language problem is there, and also my memory problem also there. Sometimes at the session, it seems I learned, but after the session, there is nothing left there. So there's a problem. But anyway -- (through translator): Anyway, it may leave some imprints in my brain. So that's all, thank you.

03:23

Charlie Rose: Many people have been on this broadcast, have talked about the Dalai Lama. Here are two: Actor Richard Gere and professor Robert Thurman.

03:33

Richard Gere: I think part of what gives me joy of having some resources that I have now is being able to help His Holiness talk to people around the world, create these situations where people can encounter him. And I was -- I think it's important for people, as it was for me, to be in the presence of someone as developed as he is. His mind and his heart.

03:53

Charlie Rose: How has he changed you?

03:54

Richard Gere: Changed me?

03:56

Charlie Rose: Yes, you.

03:58

Richard Gere: Well, that level of patience we were talking about before is a big thing.
Charlie Rose: Because you take this seriously. You go over there and stay for --

Richard Gere: Well, this is my life.

Charlie Rose: Right.

Richard Gere: So.

Charlie Rose: It's your life.

Richard Gere: Exploring the mind. There's nothing more to do with one's life than exploring the nature of your mind. That's the root of it all. We live in a kind of hallucinogenic, superstitious world which is based on dream images, essentially -- most of the negative, which are based on a false belief in ego, in me, as separate from you, and a belief that that self is concrete and exists from its own side in a solid kind of way. The one that was there yesterday will be there tomorrow. And as you start to explore the nature of things, the nature of reality, the nature of your mind, you see that none of it actually exists in the way it appears to exist.

Charlie Rose: And you found this through Buddhism or you found this through your intimate association with him?
Richard Gere: Both. I mean, there's an enormous amount of study that goes into this. But when you encounter someone, a world teacher like the Dalai Lama, or I might say Jesus Christ, or any other great teachers who --

05:11

Charlie Rose: Mohammed.

05:14

Richard Gere: -- have been on this planet -- Mohammed or whoever, absolutely, great teachers -- you are able to give yourself in a different way to the philosophy, in a very emotional, kind of open way. Your heart literally opens up. And when your heart opens up, your mind opens up. In fact, Tibetans, when they say "mind," they point to their heart. Hatred and anger can be changed into love and compassion. And that's the voyage here. So even with the Tibetans, ultimately they're not loathing the Chinese, they are not bent on revenge. They're bent on helping the Chinese remove their ignorance so that they don't create millions of lifetimes of pain.

05:52

Charlie Rose: It's a very big mountain to climb.

05:54

Richard Gere: It's the only mountain to climb, ultimately. The only one. That's the only way we get out of this mess.

06:02

Charlie Rose: What does he expect realistically to happen during his lifetime in Tibet?

06:07

Richard Gere: OK. You have to understand that His Holiness is a practical person as well as a visionary. He's looking for genuine autonomy. Genuine autonomy.
Charlie Rose: Not independence, autonomy.

06:22

Richard Gere: It's a position he's had now for eight or nine years. Genuine autonomy. He's not talking about independence. And he's genuine when he says that. This is a man you can trust.

06:32

Charlie Rose: Tell me how you see the Dalai Lama.

06:34

Robert Thurman: The Dalai Lama?

06:36

Charlie Rose: Yes.

06:37

Robert Thurman: The Dalai Lama is -- well, he is a great guy. I've known him since 1962. And he's a wonderful person, but as far as the world goes, he is someone who has a really wonderful message to the world, that these kinds of situations must be solved nonviolently. He is not an enemy of China's. They try to say he's their arch enemy. And they try to stop people from getting him visas. They almost had a fit when the Norwegians gave him the Nobel Peace Prize. But he's not their enemy. He doesn't want China to fall apart or anything. He wants simply them to behave honestly in Tibet, and behave honestly with the rest of the world. And then he feels things will work out for them. You know, he, of course, they trashed his country completely, and yet he does not nurse a grudge or wish for vengeance against them. The Tibetans have never resorted to terrorism. And it's a very remarkable thing, that a world leader like that would want international liberation in the case of severe repression and even genocidal repression, and yet he's not preaching terrorism or violence. This is an amazing example, and really, our people should listen to him.

07:36
Charlie Rose: Tell me what it is you admire the most about the Dalai Lama?

07:40

Robert Thurman: About the Dalai Lama?

07:41

Charlie Rose: Yes.

07:43

Robert Thurman: Well, what I like about the Dalai Lama is that he's always thinking how to improve himself and everyone else. He's not sitting back and resting on his laurels like I'm the Dalai Lama, I should be cool, you know. He's always working at it, totally, all the time for 40 years I've known him. And he's always working on something new, and he's thinking through each situation. And he's always attentive to the situation, you know? Like my wife said the other day, when someone asked her, because she thinks of things better than I do, they asked her like if she had ever seen the Dalai Lama do anything miraculous.

08:12

Charlie Rose: Yeah, exactly.

08:14

Robert Thurman: You know, they were looking for a story. And she said, yes, she had. And then I was surprised. And then -- because usually you don't talk about anything in case you did. And then she said what was miraculous was she had never seen him fail to give his full attention to whomever he was with, no matter what the other circumstances and however busy he was.

08:33

Charlie Rose: So his powers of concentration and dedication are superb.

08:38
Robert Thurman: That's right. And people are like, you know, wonderful. And I admire that about him. I really do.

08:46

Charlie Rose: On Monday, I went to see the Dalai Lama in Washington, and here is that conversation. His Holiness, thank you very much. It's my pleasure to have you on this program. We have looked forward to it for many years. I want to talk about science and this book, "The Universe in a Single Atom: The Convergence of Science and Spirituality" later. First, tell me about your visit to Washington. What have you accomplished and what have you hoped to accomplish?

09:23

Dalai Lama: Of course I have three commitments. Number one, about promotion of human value. Then number two, the promotion of religious harmony. That wherever I go, I always sort of talk about these things. Then the -- here, the visit to Washington, (INAUDIBLE) about Tibet, Tibet issue. So since the United States here, like many other countries, there are many people very sympathetic, and particularly the both houses and administration all are very supportive, so they always are willing to help. So then, my main sort of reason meeting with the president -- firstly, I consider him as one of my old friends. Then -- the -- although last three years, we already have renewed direct contact with Chinese government, which is for good, I have so far no concrete sort of recent developments. Although our side, both sides, the main effort is try to build confidence. Still, however, inside Tibet, no sign of leniency or improvement. So I ask president, please ask Chinese leaders -- firstly, I'm not seeking independence. Within the Chinese constitution and framework, some kind of mutually agreeable solution we will find. That's our sort of confidence. We are trying to do that. So please convey to the Chinese government, no need suspicion.

11:29
Charlie Rose: You're also asking for not independence, but autonomy, cultural autonomy.

11:34

Dalai Lama: That's right. That's right.

11:40

Charlie Rose: And what else? What would be, in your judgment today, an appropriate relationship between China and Tibet?

11:54

Dalai Lama: Although in the Chinese constitution, there are certain rights provided to minorities or ethnic groups, but particularly in the case of Tibet, the main decision in the hands of Chinese who have no knowledge about Tibetan culture, about Tibetan delicate environmental situation and Tibetan spirituality. So therefore, they simply -- you see, they are carrying out a policy which in China proper usually you should do. So it is different, there are lots of differences. There are cultural differences. And then environment also. You see, Tibet, high altitude, dry climate. You need special care. So because of the lack of that knowledge, now in the last 40, 50 years, much damage already done. So for example, the ecology. Now Chinese government recently, you see, realized, because of large scale of deforestation, due to carelessness of the ecology, some more flood now happen in China as well as Bangladesh. These are recent (ph). So now -- so there's a problem. So we are asking, we accept deference (ph) in foreign affairs, and the rest of the affairs, like education or religion or culture, and then environment issues, all these Tibetan, they have better sort of knowledge and better sort of -- better (INAUDIBLE). Therefore, they can manage I think more realistically. So that's why we are asking to give us some kind of meaningful self-rule.

13:56

Charlie Rose: Did the president say he would carry your message?

14:01
Dalai Lama: Yes.
14:03
Charlie Rose: To Hu Jintao?
14:04
Dalai Lama: Yes.
14:06
Charlie Rose: He did.
14:08
Dalai Lama: Yes.
14:10
Charlie Rose: So your concerns will be raised directly by the president of the United States, who the Chinese are very much interested in having an understanding.
14:17
Dalai Lama: Right. Although we prefer direct communication with the Chinese government, the Chinese leaders, but we haven't find sort of proper opportunity. In the meantime, like the United States president is the one to do something. So then I ask, please could we (INAUDIBLE).
14:35
Charlie Rose: Hu Jintao, the most powerful man in China, has an experience in Tibet.
14:40
Dalai Lama: That's right.
14:43
Charlie Rose: Is it positive or negative?
14:46
Dalai Lama: I think generally speaking, I think positive.
Charlie Rose: He knows the Tibetan people?

Dalai Lama: Yes, comparatively. OK.

Charlie Rose: So he should appreciate Tibet's culture, and whatever spirituality could come from Tibet to benefit all the Chinese people?

Dalai Lama: I don't --

Charlie Rose: That would be too much?

Dalai Lama: I don't know. I don't know. I think, actually, he spent some time in Tibet as the first party secretary. But due to what it is, health reasons, I think he spent a few months in Tibet, but really in China proper. And then of course sometimes I do feel the system is such, the top leaders, they may not have full sort of earnest about their really think (ph). Those are the sort of difficulties. And within Tibetan community, like some other country, the elite sort of people and their relation with masses sometimes lacking. Although the communist body is the body of the working-class people.

Charlie Rose: They may not have the relationship with the masses --

Dalai Lama: But sometimes it is lacking that relation.

Charlie Rose: Yes. Behind walls too much.
Dalai Lama: And everything is secret, secret, secret.

Charlie Rose: Exactly.

Dalai Lama: There's the problem.

Charlie Rose: But do you have some countervailing force in terms of young Tibetans who think you are becoming soft, you are too willing to compromise? That conflict is the only hope for the real future?

Dalai Lama: Yes. Among Tibetans, not only among the youth, but also among the elder. Some criticize about my stand. And my stand --

Charlie Rose: Away from independence?

Dalai Lama: -- (INAUDIBLE) too soft. That kind of criticism is there. But I have full confidence my approach is the realistic and look broadly. I feel that Tibet backward, materially, very, very backward --

Charlie Rose: Economically and materially.

Dalai Lama: Yes, materially, yes, economically, backward. Spirituality very rich. So therefore, in order to development in material field, that there Tibet remain within the People's Republic of China, we will get greater benefit. That's my view.
Charlie Rose: So you argue to your friends in Tibet, your followers in Tibet, we'll be better off because China is economically strong and it will benefit us.

Dalai Lama: Yes, this is my sort of (INAUDIBLE) view, my feeling.

Charlie Rose: The rulers in China should appreciate that.

Dalai Lama: That's right. Provided Chinese government give us meaningful autonomy, which is the best guarantee for preservation of Tibetan culture --

Charlie Rose: Culture.

Dalai Lama: -- Tibetan spirituality and Tibetan environment.

Charlie Rose: The ecology and the environment.

Dalai Lama: That's right.

Charlie Rose: The environment in all of China is a real problem.

Dalai Lama: That's right.

Charlie Rose: Certainly in the big cities, it's a huge problem.
Dalai Lama: That's right.

18:27

Charlie Rose: I mean, just dark.

18:29

Dalai Lama: That's right.

18:32

Charlie Rose: Do you believe that because of their economic prosperity and the fact that China is reaching out more and more to the world as a growing economic power, certainly, that they're more secure and may be moving towards some kind of accommodations on Tibet?

18:50

Dalai Lama: Yes, I believe, I believe so. Because, you see, my approach is not separation, but seeking genuine autonomy. That gives us some concession. Therefore, you see, that is I think very, very important for development of stability and unity and prosperity with Chinese government. The top sort of concern or periodically is stability, the unity and prosperity.

19:21

Charlie Rose: Stability especially, I mean --

19:25

Dalai Lama: Oh, but it's prosperity on the basis of unity and stability. That, the -- unfortunately, some of the Chinese sort of officials, they believe these sort of goals can achieve by force. I do not believe that. Stability and unity must come from within. So in order to get that, Tibetans should get more satisfaction today. Sometimes the people describe entire Tibetan people become like a slave.

20:04

Charlie Rose: Today.

20:08
Dalai Lama: No, right, everything.

20:12


20:18

Dalai Lama: Oh, yes, now growing. Now growing. Now --

20:24

Charlie Rose: Buddhism?

20:26

Dalai Lama: Including Buddhism, and Christianity and Muslim, and also Chinese traditional sort of religion, Taoism, this also I think is reviving.

20:35

Charlie Rose: Are they scared of that, I mean, because of their communist ideology? Are they scared of that growth of religion, because it suggests an independent --

20:47

Dalai Lama: Now, today's, the Communist Party of China seems I think more liberal. (INAUDIBLE) too much liberal. Therefore, the Communist Party without a communist ideology. -- about capitalism or socialism, these things. So therefore, this gap, rich and poor, now growing very rapidly.

21:09

Charlie Rose: What was it Deng Xiaoping said about buying something? He said about buying a cat, "I don't care if it's a white cat or a white cat, I just care that it will kill mice." Do you remember that?

21:23

Dalai Lama: So I think the Chinese, I think historically, are intelligent, hard-working.

21:31
Charlie Rose: Clearly that.
21:35
Dalai Lama: And realistic, I think. So I feel last now -- almost now 60 years, I feel that during Mao's era, the emphasis on the importance of ideology. Then Deng Xiaoping's era, more concerned about the economy. So now, today's China. Now, much more sort of economic development, although some other drawbacks also have developed, but I think overall, the China gain I think much benefit out of Deng's policy. Then Jiang Zemin. New reality. Now there are wealthy people, or middle-class people, the number increasing. Their influence is also increasing. Therefore, now the Communist Party no longer as a pure sort of representative of working-class people. So this sort of concept (INAUDIBLE) representative (INAUDIBLE) represents. So these are I think clear signs the party now possibly (INAUDIBLE) new theology. So I'm hopeful.
22:49
Charlie Rose: Because it's opening up.
22:51
Dalai Lama: That's right.
22:53
Charlie Rose: Because of economic.
22:54
Dalai Lama: That's right.
22:56
Charlie Rose: And it's becoming part of the world, it has to, because of its economic growth.
22:59
Dalai Lama: That's right. That's right.
Charlie Rose: And it's changing.

23:04

Dalai Lama: So in Chinese also interest -- of course, China most populous nation. Now becoming economic power. So the China becoming more sort of, what do I say, open society. I think then, that's in the interest for everyone. And Tibet issue, easy to solve. No problem. This is my feeling.

23:25

Charlie Rose: When?

23:29

Dalai Lama: But the Chinese leadership, of course, understand it really, you see. Their -- their approach more cautiously, because they say if something, some careless situation develops, like the former Soviet Union, collapse of the former Soviet Union.

23:47

Charlie Rose: They went for freedom before they went for economics.

23:53

Dalai Lama: That kind of situation happens, then I think too much chaotic situation may arise, so that's in nobody's interest. So the smooth transition is I think in the interest for everyone.

24:05

Charlie Rose: They say to everybody who visits them, give us time. Give us time. It takes time to create --

24:12

Dalai Lama: Yes. Yes.

24:18
Charlie Rose: --you know -- you, you, with courage, understanding the implications and the ramifications at the time of Tiananmen Square, said I have to be with those brave young men and women who are protesting on behalf of freedom.

24:31

Dalai Lama: Yes.

24:34

Charlie Rose: Did that hurt you with the Chinese? Did they push back?

24:41

Dalai Lama: What, please repeat?

24:44

Charlie Rose: Did they object to that?

24:47

Dalai Lama: Of course sometimes little unhappy words also necessary. Of course I always, you see, have the belief -- I am Buddhist. Firstly, I'm a human being who believes truth, honest -- honesty and justice. And furthermore, I'm a Buddhist monk. So when things -- something wrong, I have to speak. So sometimes I --.

25:17

Charlie Rose: Because you're a human being and because you're a Buddhist monk.

25:24

Dalai Lama: That's right. So I believe, you see, truth is something I think very important. Honesty, saying something, doing something different is absolutely wrong. And something even -- I always admit past (INAUDIBLE), there are a lot of mistakes. We have to accept that, admit that. But then since the Chinese have come to Tibet, everything not positive. So that also we have to say. These are difficulties. And then those -- like, for example, the concern of where we link. In principal, I welcome, but some Tibetans and some of our
supporters a little reservation or a critical view about my stand. I welcome these things. These are the signs of development. But then if you -- now, much depends on how to use these things. Some other objective, for example, bringing more Chinese or more built-up military, then of course, negative.

26:40

Charlie Rose: Right.

26:43

Dalai Lama: Otherwise, (INAUDIBLE) is most welcome.

26:46

Charlie Rose: If they had nothing to fear, they could take the military out of Tibet. If they didn't fear --

26:54

Dalai Lama: That is right.

26:58

Charlie Rose: -- losing Tibet.

27:01

Dalai Lama: That is right. Actually, one of my dreams eventually Tibet should be zone of peace, demilitarized, so that, firstly, for ecology reasons, better. Second, most important the Sino-Indian relations --.

27:17

Charlie Rose: Between China and India.

27:20

Dalai Lama: Yes. I think then, genuine friendship on the basis of mutual trust can develop, so long the last (INAUDIBLE) Chinese soldier stationed in Tibet. Naturally, the India side sometimes is a little --
Charlie Rose: Right, right.

Dalai Lama: Because of the past, has feelings. Some expected -- unexpected things happened in the past. So naturally there is some undoubtable (ph) feeling there.

Charlie Rose: You knew and talked to Mao about Tibet.

Dalai Lama: Oh, yes.

Charlie Rose: What did he believe?

Dalai Lama: Oh, Mao, of course, at that time I'm young, around I think 19 -- 20 -- around I think 20. So Mao -- actually I have genuine respect or admiration --

Charlie Rose: For Mao Zedong?

Dalai Lama: (INAUDIBLE). You see, my personal sort of contact, interview or audience, several occasions and meeting several occasions. He always treated me as his own son.

Charlie Rose: As his son?

Dalai Lama: And then, then -- then he advised me, he said, I think of many positive things. And then I got into Tibet. Now, one time he told me, the very purpose of sending Chinese
army and civilian officials to Tibet is helping to you, helping the Tibetan. Once you develop and become capable to manage all these things, these Chinese will withdraw. He told me that.

Charlie Rose: Once Tibet could manage everything --

Dalai Lama: That's right.

Charlie Rose: The soldiers would go back.

Dalai Lama: He told me like that.

Charlie Rose: To China. What happened?

Dalai Lama: I think everybody knows now.

Charlie Rose: They never were going to leave.

Dalai Lama: And even Xiaoping, I think in 1980, you see, came to (INAUDIBLE) --

Charlie Rose: Yes.

Dalai Lama: And he publicly, you see, admits their past mistake, and he seriously thinking to withdraw I think 80 percent of Chinese from Tibet.

Charlie Rose: If he had continued, then you might have been in a different situation.
Dalai Lama: I think today, I think the Tibet issue would be resolved, I think. The early '80s, you see, Deng Xiaoping and Hu Yaobang, I think they are -- I mean, their view I think very broad and very realistic.

Charlie Rose: My impression is today, today they're beginning to treat him with more respect, the Chinese are.

Dalai Lama: Who?

Charlie Rose: The memory of Yaobang.

Dalai Lama: Oh, Yaobang, oh.

Charlie Rose: Yeah. Because for a while, he was set aside.

Dalai Lama: Eventually, I think should do. Because --

Charlie Rose: Because you believe if he had stayed, if he had power, Tibet would be OK today.

Dalai Lama: Oh, yes. No doubt.

Charlie Rose: Do you -- I know you've been asked this a thousand times. You know what I'm going to ask. Is it your greatest dream to go back to Tibet?
Dalai Lama: Oh, yes, of course. Every Tibetans. To see one's own country, or one's own sort of birth place.

Charlie Rose: Do you think it will happen?

Dalai Lama: I think so.

Charlie Rose: You do?

Dalai Lama: I think so.

Charlie Rose: That quick?

Dalai Lama: Quick? You mean five years or 10 years?

Charlie Rose: Ten years.

Dalai Lama: I don't know.

Charlie Rose: You'll still be a young man of 80-something.

Dalai Lama: So that also -- if I live another 15, 20 years, I think things will change.

Charlie Rose: So if you live into your 90s, you can go back to Tibet.
Dalai Lama: Oh, with one stick.

Charlie Rose: With a stick. How, when you left, how did you get out?

Dalai Lama: Oh, that's a long story.

Charlie Rose: Tell me, though. Just tell me.

Dalai Lama: Yeah.

Charlie Rose: You went to the border.

Dalai Lama: That was in 1959.

Charlie Rose: Dressed as a soldier or --

Dalai Lama: That's right.

Charlie Rose: As a soldier.

Dalai Lama: As a soldier. That particular day -- or night, when I leaving Norbulinga, my place, that night, of course, I acted like one soldier, one gun.

Charlie Rose: Ah, had a gun.
32:09
Dalai Lama: Yeah. One rifle, quite heavy. Carried it this side. Then another -- another carried on this side. So then the worst thing is, since I pretended as a soldier, a soldier, so my glasses, without my glasses.

32:29
Charlie Rose: Because you see --

32:33
Dalai Lama: It was night. Night. So, meantime little sort of -- and then -- then just outside the wall, Norbulinga's palace wall, one small river.

32:48
Charlie Rose: River.

32:51
Dalai Lama: We have to pass that river on small sort of, how say that --

32:56
Charlie Rose: Pebbles? Rocks?

33:02
Dalai Lama: Yes, yes. So without the glasses, and nobody help, that heavy rifle .

33:12
Charlie Rose: But you'll fly back when you go back?

33:16
Dalai Lama: Oh, yes. Of course, of course.

33:23
Charlie Rose: The essence of what you want to bring not only to the Chinese, the essence of your own core belief as a Buddhist monk is what?

33:32
Dalai Lama: I'm nothing special. I'm just like you. I think you have more experience than me.

33:40

Charlie Rose: More experience at?

33:43

Dalai Lama: Experience I think in other fields.

33:47

Charlie Rose: Oh, no, no.

33:51

Dalai Lama: You see, I believe -- and one of my I think firm belief is, everyone, you see, has I think some very positive sort what was that -- potential.

33:58


34:05

Dalai Lama: Now, sometimes we forget about these things, and look too much at the external thing. Money or power or beautiful house or car, like that.

34:15

Charlie Rose: And we forget our core.

34:18

Dalai Lama: And then something wrong. Something not come as expected, as expectation. Then we want to complain. A lot of resentment. So that time, think. Inner value. There is sufficient sort of strength to face these sort of unexpected sort of difficulties.

34:42

Charlie Rose: So if we -- you speak about compassion a lot.

34:48

Dalai Lama: Yes.
Charlie Rose: You speak about emptiness and compassion. If we have compassion, how do we have compassion in a world that is so brutal? Brutal? How do you come to believe in compassion?

Dalai Lama: I think compassion -- we should not look just the word compassion, just that way. I think they say -- I usually explain, the compassion is important, because more compassionate mental attitude there. You can see everything more better, more clearly, because compassion brings us some -- some sort of I say the calm mind. And through calm mind, you can see the picture more clearly. Much of the emotions such as hatred, anger, attachment. Then your normal mind or calm mind, not there, no longer there. Too much sort of hatred, too much anger, or too much attachment. So these difficult (ph) emotion, then become obstacle to see the reality. So then, with these emotion, your actions become unrealistic. Therefore, this -- I think nobody wants trouble. But there are a lot of trouble. Why? Man-made trouble. Why? Our approach is not realistic. This is my view. So therefore, the compassion bring us a certain deeper sort of value, firstly open our mind, and that brings more inner strength, more self-confidence, and that brings more calm mind. Through that way, whether in politics or economy or education or anything, even warfare -- I think warfare can carry with calm mind is better than full of hatred.

Charlie Rose: So if you have a calm mind, you're more likely to find victory even in war?

Dalai Lama: Yes, I think. And firstly, the calm mind may not start war. And in case you start if necessary --
Charlie Rose: What if they had compassion in the beginning, they wouldn't start war.

37:57

Dalai Lama: If through compassion -- compassionate sort of attitude, if you really convinced some kind of force necessary to use, then limit destruction. Certainly.

38:10

Charlie Rose: So there are things -- a good war -- there is something called a good war? A just war? A just war?

38:19

Dalai Lama: Difficult. I think at the same time, may be just war. But now today, world, new reality. The whole world has become like one small planet. So everything inter-dependent. Now the United States economically or ecology or many things depend on other continents. So that's a new reality. If -- at the ancient time, the reality is more or less is that each continent are independent. And not only that, but nations or even community to community, more or less independent. Then, according to that reality, destruction of your so-called enemy, who creates some trouble or disagrees with you, destruction of that may be your victory. Now, today, the whole world is just one body. So therefore, according to that reality, the destruction of your neighbor is the destruction of yourself.

39:19

Charlie Rose: Destruction of your neighbor is the destruction of yourself.

39:23

Dalai Lama: That's right. So therefore --

39:27

Charlie Rose: Because it does damage to you as well as to them.

39:31
Dalai Lama: So now today, I think the whole world treated as a part of your own body. As one just -- one big human family. So within the family, disagreement, different interests or different views always happen. Then, you have to solve them in the atmosphere of some kind of spirit, a one-family spirit, not killing. So similarly, I think today's -- according to today's reality, I think using force or war or even just war I don't think now relevant.

40:09

Charlie Rose: So in this competition between on the one hand hatred, conflict, war; on the other hand, compassion, family, treat others as you would want to be treated, who is winning that?

40:20

Dalai Lama: The compassion side. We'll win.

40:23

Charlie Rose: You think?

40:25

Dalai Lama: We will win.

40:27

Charlie Rose: What is the evidence that compassion side will triumph?

40:35

Dalai Lama: Through education, through awareness. I think -- I feel, due to lack of education or awareness, that we carry certain action as a result of our past thinking, so that old-fashioned or old way of thinking still in our mind, but the reality where we are dealing is different. Changed. So a gap: Reality and our perception, sometimes there's a gap. So we're still using old methods. That's my feeling. So these are lack of knowledge, lack of awareness, of the reality of the new picture. So through education, through media, hopefully through education sort of program, I think introduction or explanation about the new reality, I think
very necessary. And through that way, I think people getting deeper awareness. As a result, their whole sort of perception more broader, more realistic, then there's, for the concept of war, there is no room.

41:55

Charlie Rose: For the concept of war.

41:58

Dalai Lama: Oh, yes.

42:01

Charlie Rose: As they come closer to a new reality.

42:05

Dalai Lama: That's right.

42:08

Charlie Rose: Science has led us to atomic power. In some cases, a good thing; in other cases, a terrible thing.

42:13

Dalai Lama: Right.

42:16

Charlie Rose: Science.

42:19

Dalai Lama: That's right.

42:21

Charlie Rose: Every day we are making strides in molecular biology, science.

42:25

Dalai Lama: Yes.
Charlie Rose: We're understanding of what makes us physically human. We understand cloning. All kinds of ethical problems. Where do you come down, as someone with an understanding of science and a strong spiritual, philosophical, religious stance? To allow for science to do all that it can, and yet maintain on the other hand, a moral quality.

43:03

Dalai Lama: You can't blame science as a whole. Science is just a method, or knowledge. So the thing is how to use that. Nuclear physics itself, wonderful. Now, their mistake is our motivation. We use that knowledge for destructive, for destructions, destructive force. It's our mistake, not science mistake. And also these --

43:39

Charlie Rose: So that was not the fault of science. That was the fault of human beings who used that science.

43:44


44:03

Charlie Rose: We see that today in the world.

44:07

Dalai Lama: That's not fault of religion, but fault of people.

44:10

Charlie Rose: Who kidnap religion -- people kidnap religion and make it into a sword. A sword.

44:18

44:42

Ok: So the religion also can be dirty religion. Science also can be dirty science. If we use, utilize wrong way.

44:50

Charlie Rose: But what is common to both of these is the responsibility --

44:56

Dalai Lama: That's right.

44:59

Charlie Rose: -- of human beings to step forward. The responsibility of the true believers to step forward and say, your use of my religion violates that religion.

45:07

Dalai Lama: That's right.

45:09

Charlie Rose: It's blasphemous to that religion.

45:12

Dalai Lama: That's right.

45:16

Charlie Rose: And we see it happening today. People are saying, I'm committing suicide missions because I believe it will put me into some religious place. And so you ask where are those people who are responsible for carrying on the core of that religion. And it's incumbent on them to speak out, to maintain the integrity of whatever the religion is, not just -- not any particular religion, but all religions, to make sure that religion does not --
Dalai Lama: This I can recall, reminds me -- one Chilean scientist. Now, he once told me --

Charlie Rose: A Chilean?

Dalai Lama: Chilean scientist.

Charlie Rose: Yes, yes.

Dalai Lama: I think one physicist. He once told me that he, as a scientist, his field is science, although his whole life he was involved in the science, the scientific sort of work, but he himself said he should not have attachment to the science. So me, too. I'm Buddhist, but I should not have attachment towards Buddhism. Attachment then brings biased attitude. So I think sometimes people believes certain religion, too much attachment. And because of the attachment, not seeing the reality or consequences. So then secondly, I feel -- I'm always telling people, whether we accept religion or not, it's up to the individual, up to the individual, even you do not believe any religion.

Charlie Rose: Belief is an individual choice.

Dalai Lama: Yes, choice, yes. If you want to be no faith, no believer, OK. No problem. But if you accept any faith, then you should be serious and sincere. Then all religious tradition, in spite of different philosophy, all carry same message, message of love, compassion, tolerance, forgiveness, self-discipline, contentment. These things. So all major religions have same
potential to create better human being. So usually we are -- sometimes we are not that much serious. All these religion, all these sort of tradition, they say good things, but you don't care.

48:03

Charlie Rose: We don't care about --

48:06

Dalai Lama: (INAUDIBLE).

48:14

Charlie Rose: In the end, with all of those values, with a person who was -- had to leave his country because of fear for his life and at the urging of your people, you live with the hope that you'll be able to go back to Tibet. Every day, you get up believing and hoping for that. You believe in values that are common to your religion and to other religions. Are you in the end believe that we're getting better, that with all of the education and all of the intelligence and all of the science and all of the good people, that we're making progress towards becoming better people?

48:56

Dalai Lama: Yes. I believe that. I think there are many, I think, signs or many potentials to become better world. But meantime, we need more effort with fuller awareness. I think then, our century, the 21st century, I think it will be more happier century than 20th century. I have no doubt.

49:28

Charlie Rose: Where will the next Dalai Lama come from?

49:32

Dalai Lama: I don't know. Actually, as early as '69, one of my public statements, I made clear, whether the very institution of the Dalai Lama should continue or not, up to the Tibetan people.
Charlie Rose: Let them vote on it.

Dalai Lama: Oh, yes. If Tibetan people feel this institution not much relevant, then the institution should cease. Then no need to bother about the next (INAUDIBLE). And also, now since last four years, we already have elected political leadership. So as the political field is concerned, the Dalai Lama institution not much now importance. So my position since then is semi-retired.

Charlie Rose: Semi-retired.

Dalai Lama: Uh-huh.

Charlie Rose: I have great envy for someone who has known since they were a child what their purpose was, what their mission was, what their life was to be. I mean, you have known since they came to you and said, you're the one, what your mission in life was, what your life was about, what you had to do. That puts great responsibility, but it gives you --.

Dalai Lama: I don't think anybody would be -- anybody would have thought of responsibility, I don't know. I am -- I always consider I'm a human being. And within the Buddhists, I usually describe, simple Buddhist monk. So whatever is, I can make some -- if there's any possibility to make still a little contribution for betterment of humanity among religious people, or Tibetan people, whatever, that's my sort of wish or my desire to make a small contribution. So that means my life becomes something useful. That's all.

51:29

Dalai Lama: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you.