

# On The Ethical Challenge of the Predicament of AI and the Perspectives Offered by Buddhism: A conversation with Peter D. Hershock

Theodoor Richard<sup>1</sup> & Peter D Hershock<sup>2</sup>

Address: <sup>1</sup>National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan;

<sup>2</sup>Asian Studies Development Program & Initiative for Humane AI, East West Center, Honolulu, Hawai'i, USA

Correspondence: [trichard@telfort.nl](mailto:trichard@telfort.nl); [hershockp@eastwestcenter.org](mailto:hershockp@eastwestcenter.org)

**Editorial Review:** This article has been subject to an editorial review process



**Copyright notice:** This article is issued under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits use and redistribution of the work provided that the original author and source are credited.

You must give appropriate credit (author attribution), provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Abstract

*In this article, I will explore the debate on the ethical challenges posed by AI. I will do so by engaging in conversation with Dr. Peter Hershock who is expert in Modern Buddhism and Ethics. Dr. Hershock has recently published a landmark study on the matter called Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future. He argues that the main challenge that AI poses, is not technological, but ethical. And that we need to establish an ethics that will foster a shared flourishing for all on this planet if we want to resolve the predicament of value conflicts embedded in the technologically driven advancement of AI. This could be done through development of what Dr. Hershock calls virtuosic relational dynamics, a relational way of organizing our society that goes beyond individualism. To reach there, the perspectives offered by Buddhist philosophy will be discussed and explained. In conclusion, we will propose that Buddhist philosophy can offer insights and practices that may enrich our pursuit of sustainable AI ethics.*

**Keywords:** AI; intelligent technology; ethics; Buddhism; governance; education

## Introduction

Algorithmic or Artificial, Intelligence (AI) has become pervasive in our social-economic order. The areas in which AI tools are being applied have become so extensive that daily lives do not afford us perspectives from which to have an overview of which and how many phenomena in our society are influenced or even driven by AI or AI powered systems. Whether this development and the technological feat it represents, is to be lauded or regretted, remains to be seen.

The crucial factor in this debate on ‘AI – Panic or Panacea?’ is however, as we will entertain in this conversation, not a technological one, but an ethical one. For the first time in the history of technology driven human progress, the technology concerned is not a ‘dumb’ mechanical or passive computational extension of human values. As Peter Hershock argues in his latest book, *Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future* (2021), the greatest perils of AI are embedded in its greatest promises and even in its biggest successes. Where AI might be celebrated and marketed as a means for attaining what we desire as machine learning systems gain facility with identifying, anticipating, and delivering to us what we want, these systems do so by simultaneously encapsulating us in individual cocoons spun from our digitally expressed desires and values through algorithmic processes that are increasingly impenetrable, even by the specialists who wrote their originating code.

As such, according to Hershock, our AI systems can be described in Buddhist terms as operating as ‘karmic engines,’ or desire amplifiers, that by rule of cause and effect may snowball us from seeking gratification of a rather small and innocent looking desire, into losing ourselves in hedonistic sense gratification. As such, they are scaling up human likes, dislikes, values, and intentions, as well as confluences and conflicts among them. Due to the ways intelligent technology operates, the ‘Panicked Panacea’ that AI may offer us is not a *problem* that is open to technical solution. Hershock argues that instead, it forces confrontation with a *predicament* that expresses conflicts among our own human values. This predicament cannot be solved, precisely because the values conflicts it expresses do not allow us to define what would count *as* a solution. The predicament of intelligent technology can only be *resolved*, where resolution implies both clarity and commitment—clarity regarding the origins of the predicament combined with commitment to realizing less conflicted constellations of values and intentions, both personal and social.

In this conversation with Dr. Peter Hershock, we will enter into a more detailed discussion of these issues and look for the insights that Buddhist philosophy may offer us to find an ethical direction towards resolving this predicament. We have structured this conversation in the style of a dialogue to express the train of thought that leads from establishing the nature of our predicament on AI ethics, to our experience of the world, and into the Buddhist ideas of how we can transit from 20<sup>th</sup> century individualism to 21<sup>st</sup> century relational societal organization.

Dr. Peter Hershock is Director of the Asian Studies Development Program and leads the Initiative for Humane AI at the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawai'i. He has published extensively on the subjects of Contemporary Buddhist Thought, Ethics and Social Justice, and Cultural Diversity, including his books: *Personal Zen, Public Zen* (2014), *Valuing Diversity: Buddhist Reflection on Realizing a More Equitable Global Future* (2012), *Buddhism in the Public Sphere* (2006), *Reinventing the Wheel: A Buddhist Response to the Information Age* (1999), and *Liberating Intimacy: Enlightenment and Social Virtuosity in Ch'an Buddhism* (1996). His latest book *Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future* (2021) pertinently addresses the issue of ethics regarding AI. The book offers a comprehensive outlook on the predicament of AI ethics and provides suggestions for which directions we could take towards resolution. As such, it serves as a reference point for this conversation.

### **In Conversation**

**Theodoor Richard:** In the current debate on the ethics of, development of, AI, we often see two groups of people who have their own approach to it. There are the computer scientists who are operating from the assumption that AI is a useful technology that at most may need to be subjected to appropriate regulation and coding to ensure that AI development remains transparent and that its applications stay within socially accepted norms, representing the 'Panacea' side of the debate. On the other side of the spectrum, the more 'Panic' side, we find the activists, philosophers, social scientists, and lawyers, who warn against the risks of AI and who paint pictures of its negative potential that in daily culture are translated in the images we see in *Terminator* and *The Matrix*. To avoid the actualization of this type of doom-scenarios they usually suggest to slow down the development of AI and to create ways to ensure AI stays aligned with human values. In your book you recognize the merit of this debate, but you also suggest that something more is needed to actually resolve the predicament that AI poses to us.

**Peter Hershock:** Yes, in fact, I would argue that the greatest threat that will be posed to humanity by the evolution and spread of intelligent technology is not potentially growing misalignment with human values—

imagined in *Terminator* as human extinction and in the Matrix films as digital captivity and servitude—but rather the amplification and accelerating materialization of conflicts among human values, aims and interests.

Looking slightly more forward into the future, perhaps ten to twenty years out—but still nowhere near the far scientific horizon of the advent of artificial general intelligence or artificial superintelligence, the occurrence of the so-called technological singularity—I think we are on track to be confronted with an ethical singularity. If we broadly define *ethics* as the *art of human course correction*—that is, the art of using our collective intelligence to evaluate our aims and our means for realizing them, and then altering our conduct accordingly—the ethical singularity toward which intelligent technology is hastening our arrival is the point at which the opportunity space for further human course correction collapses: a point beyond which we will have no more chance of escaping the effects of our own values conflicts than light has of escaping the singularity of a black hole.

**Richard:** You mention the advent of the collapse of the opportunity space for human course correction. This as the anticipated result of our growing inability to solve our value conflicts. I understand it in this way that you are saying that the technological revolution in a sense works as a magnifying glass for our more deep-rooted problem, which is the intensifying opposition between our value systems. Where in the past we would speak of a ‘generation gap’, now we would have to acknowledge that younger generations think of *Boomers* as no longer from this world. And where before we could think of inequality as a divide between rich and poor, now we have to observe that the wealthy have already moved to *Elysium*, leaving the rest of the world behind.

I want to make reference here to the Taipei 2020 Biennial (21 November 2020 – 14 March 2021) hosted by the Taipei Fine Art Museum and curated by French philosopher Bruno Latour, together with Martin Guinard, and Taiwanese curator Ping Lin (**Latour, 2020**). Its theme was: ‘You and I Don’t Live on the Same Planet.’ The curators had proposed this theme because, to their feeling, the world’s development has reached a stage where people can no longer agree even about what it means to ‘be “on” Earth’ anymore. It seems people of disagreeing opinions do not want to consider the people who form the other side, to belong in their, vision, of the world anymore. These people have a value system that no longer recognizes people of different opinions as citizens in their world, therewith depriving them from any right to speak, vote, or even, live, in ‘their’ world. Latour, Guinard, and Lin see this trend as a deeply destabilizing movement.

This is similar to what you mention, that by excluding others from our world-view just because they have different ideas or values, people are cancelling any space for common ground? It seems now looking back, that the past debate while recognizing the existence of gaps and divides, always seemed to hold it for possible that such gaps and divides could be closed in some way or another; all that was needed was to find the right solution. Now that we refer to people being in different worlds, this has suddenly turned to be a utopian vision?

**Hershock:** If you mean a ‘utopian’ vision ironically, suggesting that we are mistakenly assuming this new technological arrangement—this new human-intelligent technology-world relationship—to be a wondrous end to all ills...well, then I agree. The new digital infrastructure through which the Attention Economy 2.0 is emerging, and through which the colonization of consciousness by commercial and state powers is being conducted, has made possible a system of domination that operates not via coercion, but by offering each of us as individuals the opportunity to exercise greatly expanded freedoms of choice—the freedoms to connect, shop, access information, entertain ourselves, and even find dates and perhaps significant others—through algorithmic systems trained to read and anticipate our likes, dislikes, fears, hopes, and dreams and to then recommend ways of acting on them that are valuable for those who have designed and deployed these systems, whether for commercial or political purposes. So, yes, an ironic utopia in which the boundary between choice and compulsion has been perforated to the point of practical insignificance.

But, perhaps you are using ‘utopia’ literally, pointing toward a vision of a world in which we have ‘no place’ in common—a world in which populist divisions of the kinds that have deepened in recent years have been so thoroughly extended as to include our divisions across all dimensions of human presence, from the political to the social, cultural, and economic. That, I am afraid, is not a very happy prospect.

You mentioned the Taipei Biennial and its theme, and it is very appropriate. Inequalities of wealth, power, risk, and opportuning are being deepened and widened by intelligent technology as it scales up values of competition, convenience and choice rather than coordination, consilience, and commitment. Although lip-service is paid to the values of diversity and equity in many of the AI guidelines and ethics standards that have been proliferating over the last decade, these values continue to be understood in essentially individualist rather than relational terms. This perpetuates, in fact, one of the great myths of modernity—the myth of universality—even as it equally perpetuates the great postmodern myth of free variation. These two myths—of grand unification and of infinite

variation—express an interesting quantitative bias that accords rather well with computational systems. Buddhism suggests the need for a shift from seeing the individual as the unit of ethical, as well as economic and political, analysis to seeing the relational as basis—a shift away from comparative and compensatory considerations toward considerations of qualities of interdependence.

So, to use a contrast coined by Jean Luc Nancy, what we are in need of is not some mythical *common* ground, but rather commitment to fostering the conditions for enjoying truly *shared* ground. In terms of AI ethics, what this means is that we do not need and should not be attempting to realize a common global ethics of intelligent technology—a new, universal species of ethics. What we should be doing is fostering the emergence of an ethical ecosystem in which many ethical systems have significant contributory shares—one in which ethical differences are engaged as resources for mutual contribution to sustainably shared flourishing.

**Richard:** I think you touch on a very essential issue in the ethical debate for AI here. By critiquing the notion of the individual as the prime unit of ethical consideration, you seem to be questioning the future relevance of the Enlightenment ideal of individuation that has dominated Western thinking for several centuries. There is no doubt that current forces in AI driven consumer and social media online platforms, attempt to maximize the perception of the ideal of endless individual choice, even though at the back side, they are in fact creating an opposite closed sphere of looped feeds. This creates a paradox that suspends us in the tension between two narratives: one that suggests we can find satisfaction of our limitless desires by chasing our individual choices made on the basis of our own personal and selfish considerations stimulated by the AI driven systems, and the opposite one that denies exactly this on the basis of a lack of shared flourishing, as you so correctly call it, that is created precisely by our deep engagement with the first narrative. These two narratives play out simultaneously in our heads and in our, separated, worlds, and find their way into our lives through our interaction with our smartphones.

It may be argued that the concept of culture and our notion of how we form our ways of life and our ideas of how the world works, plays a crucial role here. We have been engaged in cultural interactions that are grounded in separation and discrimination ever since Johann Herder proposed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century that a 'folk's' culture defines the boundaries of a community, and also nation. Ever since, we have constructed cultural identities that are determined by boundaries; boundaries between us and them, me and you. There has been substantial critique on this concept of culture, especially from the perspective of how historically, culture forms through mobility, networking, and hybridization. In the theory of

transculturality offered by German philosopher Wolfgang Welsch, culture is not defined by boundaries, but by exactly the opposite, the loss of the distinction between own-ness and foreign-ness of cultural elements. According to Welsch, it is a future task of humanity to find an identity that is not based on opposition, but on finding the shared sphere of cultural space in between. He calls this a transcultural identity.

If we agree that the creation of a sphere of sharing is essential to the new ethics of AI, how can we then go about to overcome our drive to individuation and establish this, cultural, space of in-betweenness? What is needed then to rise over the abovementioned paradox and dissolve this tension? When you mention Buddhism as a basis for relational interactivity, how do we understand this more concretely? Is it not that in Buddhism, there is also a practiced ideal of individual awakening? And how would that then relate to the relational aspect of it as you propose this here?

**Hershock:** What you refer to as the paradox of options for individual choice being algorithmically tailored and thus controlled is, in fact, one of the predicaments of intelligent technology—one of the conflicts of interests and values that is at its heart. The liberal conception of the individual has been a very powerful philosophical fiction. Along with the fiction of equality, it opened a space within which to labor for freedom from both prescribed and ascribed roles and identities, especially those framed around conceptions of gender and ethnicity. Yet, as powerful as fictions can be, they have lifetimes and the notion of the individual is, I think, due for retirement. The situation is comparable to that of Copernicus confronting overwhelming evidence that the Earth is not the center of the solar system or the cosmos. Having accepted that, humanity has been able to make remarkable advances in both astrophysics and aerospace technology. Of course, most of us continue to see the sun as ‘rising’ in the morning and ‘setting’ in the evening. We do not feel the Earth spinning on its axis and circling the sun. But we have learned to accept that fact and act accordingly. Similarly, we have tremendous evidence now that individual entities—even at the subatomic level—are abstractions or conceptual conveniences. What ultimately exists are relational dynamics, not ‘things’ in ‘relation’ with each other.

Now, admitting that we are relationally constituted is not inconsistent with valorizing those efforts by means of which each of us can ‘stand out’ or exist with great and at times admirable individuality. Indeed, we realize ourselves individually by enhancing the qualities of those relational dynamics in which we discover we are participating most immediately. So, the fact of and desire to be unique can be retained. But, when we start to address inequity, for example, it is no longer good enough to treat each



human or human group as an individual and to then do some comparative ranking with an eye toward compensating individuals when their 'lesser' fortunes are not of their own doing. That is better than being unconcerned with the distribution of goods, services, attention, and so on. But relational equity is the open-ended pursuit of ever-greater qualities of inclusion.

This returns us to your final questions. What do we do? How do we resolve the predicament of intelligent technology? How do we realize more equitable and humane futures? Here, I would invoke as precaution the adage the 'the way to hell is paved with good intentions.' It is not enough to have good intentions, we must have sets of values that are not fraught by conflict or structured in such a way that we experience ironic outcomes and opportunities—arriving in hell after thinking the way to avoid that was to simply go 'up.' Buddhism offers practices for being present as needed to evaluate our own values, their constellation, and their intentional enactment. At their roots, these practices are all about realizing freedom-of-attention in order to enjoy freedom-of-intention and engage in virtuosic exemplifications of the meaning of relating freely. Having freedoms of choice is better than not having any choice at all. That is clear. But relating freely is more than just making and acting on choices. It involves sensitive attention to others and pairing our right to differ-from them with our obligation to differ-for them in ways that they deem valuable. This is true for us as persons, as communities, as nations, and as but one species among hundreds of millions of other species on this planet. To resolve the predicament of climate change or that of intelligent technology, we will need to be virtuosically present and committed to continuous ethical improvisation, extending our horizons of relevance, responsibility and readiness. The aim of Buddhist practice—as it is epitomized in the personal ideal of the bodhisattva or 'enlightening being'—is to be able to engage our situations, whatever they may be, in ways that are conducive to sustainably realizing liberating relational dynamics.

**Richard:** Again, here arises at least the impression of the perceived prevalence of, yet, another paradox: the one between individual liberation and the emancipation of humankind as a species. Maybe it can be argued that our preoccupation with individual development is grounded in the structural and prolonged misunderstanding of the truth about our reality. If I understand it correctly, in Buddhist philosophy there is a very distinct idea about how reality is construed. According to the teachings by the Buddha, it cannot be said everything exists, nor that it does not exist. In this realm of thought, we as human beings both have a self and are not this self. We operate in our worldly reality and communicate with other beings in this world, through the construct of a self. But in deeper truth, this self is merely a construct; functional, but not essential to our being. This is the meaning of us existing in two levels of truth at the same time:



the relative truth of our lifeworld, and the absolute truth of one shared consciousness wherein we, mostly unconsciously, unfortunately, remain. And the difference in our perception where we are in this worldview, depends on our level of developed awareness. Full awakening or enlightenment is then nothing more than being fully aware of all truth on both levels of reality simultaneously.

Assuming then that we have the inherent capacity to variously 'be' in two levels of reality, meaning our own, more individualized one, and the shared, relational one, it may be argued that we also have both the ability, and the responsibility, to actualize this potential. Ability, as this defines the true nature of humankind, and responsibility, as in not doing so, we have already experienced disastrous results, like for example climate change and its hard felt consequences. The effort required to liberate ourselves from individualized ethics, can be said to be an investment in the cultivation of what you call in your book *Ethical Agency*. When we accept that we are agents of our own reality, as well as that of others, our planet, and non-human species, we can take up our role of creators of reality and maybe develop this attentive virtuosity that you propose.

Do I understand correctly that this is the core of what you also call 'humane becoming?' In your book you reflect on the Six Paramitas of Buddhist practice. Maybe you could expand on how we can nourish our inherent humanity in this way and cultivate an ethics that is focused on this virtuosic presence?

**Hershock:** I think it is important to stress that there are many Buddhist philosophies, not just one, and that some significant differences obtain especially in relation to metaphysical and ontological questions. This is traditionally explained by taking note of the Buddha's commitment to offering effective teachings to each student or audience, and thus adapting as needed. Significantly, in Buddhism theory supports practice rather than practice validating or invalidating theory. I mention this because in China there developed a 'three truths' alternative to Indian/Central Asian 'two truths' teachings. The therapeutic aim of these theoretic constructs is, however, the same. As I would phrase it: realizing liberating relational dynamics, the first steps toward which are gaining freedom-of-attention or freedom from compelled/compulsive presence. That said, it is written in the Diamond Sutra that when the Buddha was asked what he attained through realizing unsurpassed, complete enlightenment, his response was 'not one thing' or 'nothing at all.' Thus, in the Ch'an Buddhist tradition of China, later Zen in Japan, it was stressed that enlightenment is not something to attain or get, whether quickly or slowly; it is something to demonstrate, to embody, to express relationally.

So, to your questions. One basic Buddhist practice is to see all things as changing. In doing so, one realizes that there really are no beings in the world, only becomings. Having realized this, the question is then...change in what direction? becoming whom or what? I have adopted the qualifier 'humane' to express the need to go beyond 'human-centered' approaches to intelligent technology or approaches that are consistent with 'human values.' My first Buddhist teacher, Seung Sahn Dae Soen Sa Nim, once said the 'human beings are the number one bad animal.' Unlike any other species, humans have committed genocide as an expression of deeply held beliefs and values. Humans have sufficiently plumbed the depths of subatomic relational dynamics to build nuclear weapons arsenals that, if deployed, would render the Earth uninhabitable. Humans have engaged in activities that have resulted in global climate disruption and then persisted in those activities for the half century since discovering this. AI that embodies human values—as conflicted and often destructive as they have been—is a profoundly frightening prospect. Yet, humans are also unique as a species in the depth and extent to which we have proven capable of what Confucian scholar Roger Ames has called 'enchanted the ordinary.' We have opened up entirely new realms of values—new modalities of relational appreciation. That is what families are, or cultural traditions, or educational institutions. These are 'virtual realities' created and explored by humans—realities that are not reducible to material systems in motion. So, humans are a 'mixed bag' as we say in the U.S.

Fostering 'humane becoming' is a way of expressing the importance of stressing relational quality. Passing from the merely human to the truly humane is an open-ended, improvisational pursuit. The six *paramitas* or modes of perfection are benchmarks for movement in the direction of realizing increasingly humane presence: generosity, moral clarity, patient willingness, valiant effort, poised attentiveness, and wisdom. As modes of perfection, these are not moral *destinations* or goals at which we might finally arrive. They are open-ended *directions* or *domains* in which to realize virtuosic presences. In describing how to go about doing so, traditional Buddhist accounts stress the continuation of *kuśala* patterns of conduct and the curtailing of those that are *akuśala*. These terms are often translated as 'wholesome, skillful, apt' and 'unwholesome, unskillful, inapt.' But *kuśala* functions as a superlative. It refers, not to what is good as opposed to bad, but rather to what is excellent or virtuosic. Thus, conduct that results in good outcomes and opportunities or evil outcomes or opportunities are both *akuśala*. Good is better than evil, but not good enough. To realize the end of conflict, trouble and suffering, we have to embark on and continue moving in the direction of superlative outcomes and opportunities. The implications for ethics is that we eschew efforts to arrive at predetermined moral ideals or manifesting predefined virtues,

and labor instead to realize ever more progressive moral ideals and ever more expansive embodiments of virtuosity. Practicing the six *paramitas* is one way of describing the kind of presence needed to engage in this labor.

**Richard:** When you speak of being humane as an open-ended pursuit and of ethics as a labor of expanding our virtuosity, I immediately think of our educational systems as a pathway to incorporate such pursuit and labor. Already in 1973 in his landmark study *Small is Beautiful*, E.F. Schumacher proclaimed that education is abound with teaching *how to do* things, while we should teach our next generations *what to do*, letting the how of things fall into perspective from there (**Schumacher, 1973**). In other words, Schumacher stressed the importance of value education. And as such, the role of ethics in the process of learning itself.

An important Buddhist idea on mindfulness and its training, is that training mindfulness is not simply a process of cultivating awareness. Mindfulness training is in essence deeply virtue based. Through developing higher levels of awareness, we will become more virtuous. I have experienced this also in the university classroom, where I ask students to practice meditation in the beginning of each class. I have found that discussions on the ethical side of issues become more profound. Students also become more aware of their own self-development situation and directions, while applying newly found insights from there into their way of observing the world around them and their positioning in this world.

How would you suggest that in for example education, we can provide ways to help people progress into the relational virtuosity?

**Hershock:** With all due respect to Schumacher, I think it is presumptuous of us to tell future generations what to do. Past generations would have instructed us to forge ahead with fossil fuels to energize bright new futures for all. Past generations would also have instructed us to educate women for excellence in the private domestic sphere, not for political, entrepreneurial or artistic leadership. But, if your point is that we should focus on providing this and coming generations with the cognitive, emotional and somatic resources needed for engaging effectively in the personal and collective ethical labor of determining what *should* and *should not* be done under conditions of complex change, then I agree. And, crucial to that approach to the provision of education is eliciting passions for learning.

There is a very fundamental difference between *acquiring information* as needed—something that the current generations of students have found can be done essentially on demand via digital devices—and going through the hard labor of *incorporating knowledge*. To generate and embody new knowledge is an intelligent practice, a recursive process of responsive and

responsible improvisation in adaptive concert with our ever changing relational environs. Learning in this sense is not a means to an end, certainly not the end of being awarded a degree of some kind. It is exploring the frontiers of meaningful presence—extending the range and depth of the sensitivities and sensibilities we bring to bear in materializing new structures and domains of significance. This is ultimately nothing less than the consciousness expanding and enhancing process of collaboratively advancing the coherent differentiation of *matter* and *what matters*.

To envision what is involved in education in pursuit of relational virtuosity, we could do worse than to take the Buddha's teaching career as exemplary. His approach was not methodical. It was an approach rooted in improvised response to and collaboration with each learner in light of his or her distinct needs, endowments and aspirations. There is not and cannot be a universal curriculum for delivering 'virtuosic graduates.' But I think we can advocate universally providing education in ways that are consistent with the purpose or aim of valuing diversity and equity, where diversity is a relational quality that emerges when differences are engaged as the basis of mutual contribution to sustainably shared flourishing, and where the pursuit of equity is the limitlessly progressive endeavor to enhance qualities of inclusion. Valuing diversity and equity involves us in realizing—that is, materializing—transformations in who we are present as, embracing the liberating, nondualistic insight that each of us *is* only what we *mean* for others, and indeed that all things ultimately are what they contribute to the meaning of all things. The path to humane virtuosity has no end. But it begins with a passion for learning and extended through relationally perfecting confidence in and capacities for offering: the first of the *paramitas*.

**Richard:** And if we thus may return to the beginning, the final question would be: what comes next?

**Hershock:** That is, indeed, the right question to ask and I have some thoughts about data governance and education that I have written about in *Buddhism and Intelligent Technology*. But the truth of the matter is that what comes next will have to be improvised, and our best chances of improvising wisely together will depend on the depths with which we commit to embodying the attentive mastery and responsive virtuosity needed to *recognize* the truth and value of all perspectives on the meaning of a truly humane future, to skillfully *resist* the universalization of any single perspective, and to *redirect* our interdependence in ways that allow each of our unique strengths full expression in enacting that hope-filled redirection. Playing finite, winner-takes-all games of competitive realism is an individualist luxury that humanity in my view, can no longer afford.

Theodoor Richard is Research Fellow with National Chung Hsing University in Taichung, Taiwan, and specializes in globalization and sustainability culture. His interest in the subject was sparked by his experiences doing action research of using meditation as an instrument of value education in regular and online Higher Education classroom settings



Peter Hershock is Director of the Asian Studies Development Program and leads the Initiative for Humane AI, at the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawai'i. Peter has published extensively on the subjects of Contemporary Buddhist Thought, Ethics and Social Justice, and Cultural Diversity. His latest book *Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future* (2021) pertinently addresses the issue of ethics regarding AI.

---

## References

Hershock, P. D. 1996. *Liberating Intimacy: Enlightenment and Social Virtuosity in Ch'an Buddhism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

---. 1999. *Reinventing the Wheel: A Buddhist Response to the Information Age*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

---. 2006. *Buddhism in the Public Sphere*. New York City: Routledge.

---. 2012. *Valuing Diversity: Buddhist Reflection on Realizing a More Equitable Global Future*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

---. 2014. *Personal Zen, Public Zen*. New York City: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

---. 2021. *Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future*. New York City: Bloomsbury Academic.

Latour, B. 2020. You and I Don't Live on the Same Planet. *E-flux*, 114. Available at: <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/114/367057/editorial-you-and-i-don-t-live-on-the-same-planet/> [Accessed: 13 October 2021].

Schumacher, E. F. 1973. *Small Is Beautiful*. London: Blond & Briggs.

## **Bibliography**

Tsong-kha-pa. 1402. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*, 3 vols. Trans. Committee, The Lamrim Chenmo Translation. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.

Welsch, W.. 1992. Transculturalitaet: Lebensformen Nach Der Aufloesung Der Kulturen. *Information Philosophie*, 2, pp. 5-20.

---. 1999. Transculturality: The Puzzling Forms of Culture Today. In: Featherstone, M., ed., *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. London: Sage, pp. 194-213.

---. 2001. Transculturality: The Changing Form of Cultures Today. *Filozofski vestnik*, XXII, 2, pp. 59 - 86.

---

### **To cite this article:**

Richard, T., & Hershock, P.D., 2022. On The Ethical Challenge of the Predicament of AI and the Perspectives Offered by Buddhism: A conversation with Peter D. Hershock. *Exchanges: The Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(2), 97-110. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.31273/eirj.v9i2.897>.