The need for living ecologically and socially sustainably is therefore implicit in Mahayana.

Therefore an aspiring Bodhisattva would help all beings, starting with all beings that there are here and now (for only that is there always), to be mentally and physically optimally well--with no beings favored over others, with no beings left behind, and therefore an aspiring Bodhisattva would promote the way of living fully ecologically and socially sustainably.

The reason that humanity has not become ecologically and socially yet--and that there still is no lasting world peace in evidence--is that we all meditate and pray for different things in this regard.

What is needed is to create a unified idea of what ecologically and socially humanity, and what a lasting world peace, should actually be like, so that we all aim for the same thing!
More on how to unify all the diverse ideas of what what ecologically and socially humanity, and what a lasting world peace should actually be like, please read all the above, or visit ModelEarth.Org where I am trying to introduce the concept of designing the future of the Earth collaboratively.

&

Designing the Future of the Earth Together

by Mr. Jan Hearthstone
www..ModelEarth.Org
P.O.B. 2182
Sebastopol
CA 95473

modelearth@gmail.com

For my children, for all of our families, friends, ohana ...

Open Access
Copyright – Hearthstone – ModelEarth.Org (1999-2009):
Creative Commons - Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 USA

TOC:

The Need for Designing the Future Collaboratively	**3**
Credit and Dedication	**6**
Ecologically and Socially Sustainable Education	**7**
Designing a Lasting World Peace	**17**
Grassroots Government: The World's Ombudsman	**19**
Sustainability Starts at Home	**21**
Mahayana: Philosophy for Sustainability	**23**

criminal behavior--surely assuring that social misfits have the opportunity to take their own "healing" into their own hands by being able to find comfort at home first before venturing into the larger society again, would be the first in healing of the society?.

By forever trying to become sustainable with all the little fixes, by introducing more and more laws and rules, we might never become sustainable.

We might have a chance, if we start with the basics; the basics start at home.

MAHAYANA: PHILOSOPHY for SUSTAINABILITY.

(The following reflects author's own understanding of the terms "Mahayana" and "Bodhisattva").

Mahayana is a view that acknowledges the interconnectedness of all phenomena across all time and space, and that any one's well-being depends on the well-being of every other being across all time and all space.

A Bodhisattva is one who strives to realize the ideal of Mahayana, and therefore regards the well-being of all other beings as important as one's own.

To live ecologically and socially sustainably means to acknowledge the need of all other beings to live well also.

called HOME!

The foregoing is a fiction for most people, but unless it becomes a reality for all humanity, humanity has not arrived yet. When all humans have a home that would be a font of real comfort, instead of being a source of anxieties , only then humans will have the right to call themselves "sapient", only then we can start calling themselves intelligent.

There is no doubt in my mind that such a home will be transparently sustainable in every aspect and it will be a matter of indisputable right, of societal necessity for everyone to have such a home, unlike today when humanity in its madness considers a home that is less accessible (in price) a good thing to exist.

Indeed, the quest for sustainability should start with everyone having the possibility to start a sustainable home, no matter how humble a home, right now, before the excesses of our mismanagement result in situations in which we might have a lot of money, but nothing to buy with it--nothing to eat and no things to get from anywhere.

A real home will be a good thing to have in times when laboring for money will not result in obtaining even the basic necessities for life. Having a sustainable home will be more reliable than any kind of welfare. If having a good sustainable home would be the norm, rather than something only the well-to-do have access to, many social ills that are directly, or indirectly connected to most people lacking a really good home will have ceased to exist; to wit: homelessness, poverty (no one would have to hungry, homeless, etc.), and also a lot of

THE NEED FOR DESIGNING THE FUTURE COLLABORATIVELY.

Why to wait for the future to just happen to us, bringing with it many things that we might like and, also, many things that we might not like? Why not design our future to our liking first, and then what happens to us in the future is something that we want to have?

All of us are planning our respective futures to a greater, or lesser degree, but rarely we include *all* others in our plans and therefore we rarely succeed in obtaining the kind of future that we might like, because, at most times, our plans for our future are at odds with the plans for future others wish for themselves. The differences that there are among our ideas of what our collective future should look like result, not infrequently, in strife; not infrequently in violence, rather than in comfort for all involved.

I propose that the differences that there exist among our ideas about what our common future should be like be resolved by what-so-ever expedient means *first* in order to prevent violence and strife occurring in real world.

The usual way of trying to improve the living conditions on Earth is to deal with problems by addressing them as they emerge, at the same time causing more problems for the future, as a rule. Were it otherwise, and we would cause less and less problems for the future with our remedies, we would be experiencing fewer and fewer difficulties as the time goes on.

A better way of improving the conditions for life on Earth would be to

create a vision of how things on Earth should be; a vision that would portray an optimal accommodation for all life on Earth; a vision that would be a product of an on-going collaboration of all who share the Earth—and who all are to share a common future--and then following and realizing the commonly held vision, instead of making our main preoccupation fixing of problems caused by our past actions.

The result of focusing on achieving a collectively designed vision for the future would be that although we still would be fixing problems stemming from the past, at the same time we would be approaching the by us created vision—an eventual reality that would be as close to what we all want as we together design it.

The ground rules for designing, modeling of our collective future should include these points:

- Everyone's wishes would be accommodated, as long as others would not be discomforted by our choices.
- All the features of the commonly shared reality would have to be *justified* by all that is known on the subject at hand, and approved of by all others.

One, a very dominant, although a default feature of an *ideal* world design would be that it would be transparent (only clear and justified ideas would be inputted)—the younger a child would understand the developing design, the better, the more transparent the design would be.

Planning the future of the Earth is being done very imperfectly currently--only a small proportion of people are involved in the

universal Ombudsman-like([1]) entity existing as a network on from local to global level that would deal with any complaints and suggestions pertaining to the welfare of society, and offer wholesome re-solutions--optimally suitable realities whose implementation would rely on their moral and factual strength only. But this would be enough at the beginning, and it would be something that a small number of people could start.

For more details on how the concept of “grassroots” style government could be implemented, please see all the above that concerns designing of our common future collaboratively, and, also, please visit www.ModelEarth.Org.

Notes: 1) Ombudsman:
www.yourdictionary.com/ombudsman

dictionary.reference.com/browse/ombudsman

SUSTAINABILITY STARTS at HOME

The focal point of individual family lives is the place where people go to replenish their strength, where people go to heal; it is a place where people can grow their own sustenance--not having to rely on the many middlemen, be those bureaucratic, or any other kind of middlemen, to do something that they themselves can do themselves; it is a place from where people can reign over their entire earthly domain--it is

it might take a long time before wrongs being committed on minorities are addressed to a satisfaction; Wrongs committed on individuals might never be considered at all, in most instances, mostly due to the impossibility of people having an equal access to justice.
This pattern is common to even the most humanitarian advanced societies--a pattern that is impossible to imagine to ever improve.

The most salient characteristics of today's forms of government is that there are no provisions for improving the system to be more efficient and more just in any satisfactory way. Inefficiency and social injustice are permanent fixtures that are to stay with us forever, unless a radically, and a long overdue change for much better happens in the way that we govern ourselves.

What is really needed is that instead of leaving behind in our wake all the detritus of imperfections and injustice, imperfections and injustice should be ideally dealt with *before* those ever happen. There has to be a way of dealing with *any* kind of problems *as soon as their very possible existence is suspected!*

The only way to accomplish that is to get every citizen actively interested in their government by making it possible for every citizen to have an equal say in governing themselves! Then it would be every citizen's *own* responsibility and a duty to look after their very *own* interests--they would then have no one else to blame than themselves for any (other than natural) misfortunes!

Of course--before all of this happens, this project could be started as a

process, only a few people have a say in deciding of what our collective future ought to be. Even the most enlightened way--the democratic process--leaves many people's wishes for the future unheeded.

The powers that are forming humanity's fate, and, along with it, the fate of the entire Earth, act globally, and the tendency of those is to act more and more so. Any geo-social entity on Earth (be it a small village anywhere, or an entire nation) is directly and indirectly influenced by these processes, and its future is decided along with the future of the entire Earth.

Therefore—the future of anything and anybody on Earth has to be seen as a part of the entire future Earth. When planning the future of anything , or anyone, the future of anything and anyone else on Earth has to be factored in in making of any such plans.

It would therefore make sense to design the future of everything and everybody on Earth at the same time with everyone who is to share it.

It would make sense to include ideally everybody in the process of planing of the future of the Earth, because if the future doesn't optimally satisfy everybody within reasons defined by our collectively held knowledge, the dissatisfaction of those barred from the designing process would cause problems farther on in the future.

Please read "Designing a Lasting Peace Together" - p17, where the need for collaboratively designing the future of the world could be seen best.

Designing a common reality of the whole Earth collectively would also function as a world government that would supersede any, even the most advanced, democratic government forms in existence now.

Such a government would also act as a World Ombudsman, by means of which any victim's complaint of any perceived injustice could be speedily analyzed and the appropriate solution to the problem modeled –please see:
Grassroots Government: The World's Ombudsman - p19

It is entirely possible to start the process of collaboratively designing our common future immediately—we have all the knowledge and all the technology needed (consider only that whole new worlds are being constructed in very fine detail for entertainment purposes online—the many online collective games!). It would not be necessary that all the people in the whole world start participating at once; although all should have the possibility of participating at any time!

Credit and Dedication:

The idea of designing the future collaboratively, "ModelEarth"--a working name for the idea--is based on
Mahayana Philosophy (page 23)
and on the basic idea, that we need to know what we want to achieve well enough before we can actually strive to achieve it, contained in
The Path of Least Resistance by Robert Fritz
Salem, MA, DMA, Inc., 1984, ISBN: 0-930641-00-0.

what anyone might think that their future should look like would be reconciled with each other, so that conflicts in real life would be prevented from occurring.

Prayer:
May all differences, all controversies, and all conflicts that there are in the world among all beings resolve harmlessly by the virtue of all wholesome meditations, all wholesome prayers, all wholesome wishes and intentions; may those resolve peacefully in models, or/and by using what-so-ever wholesome, expedient, and effective means!
May humans become ecologically and socially fully and truly transparently sustainable (and may they stay so forever!) for their own good, and for the benefit of all those beings who suffer unnecessarily only because of humans!
May we have good sustainable homes for ourselves, all our children, all our families, our friends, and our ohana!

Please dedicate your practice to the optimal benefit of all beings of all three times and ten directions of space, starting with all beings that there are here and now on Earth.

GRASSROOTS GOVERNMENT: THE WORLD'S OMBUDSMAN.

Today most people are not represented in their government properly, if at all, regardless where this might be in the world.

Even in the most advanced democracies of the "first world" countries

"Peace on Earth" should be, because only one version of reality can manifest at a time--we have to ensure that this reality is one that is accepted by all of us who are to experience it; hence we have to collectively design a reality in a model first, we have to see that we all like it, and *then* set out to materialize it coherently together cooperating closely and enthusiastically.

Unifying and reconciling of all the different ideas that we might have about the future of the Earth in a model, and then working towards this unified ideal would prevent conflicts from happening in real life, since, after all, wars happen because people go to war so that Peace happens *their* way.

So that we do indeed arrive at a reality that would be preferred by all, we have to first see (in a model) what it actually is that we collectively want! Unless we can agree on what it is that we collectively want, we would merely continue to strive for a reality that we would like to experience individually--and this would, of course, result in reconciling of our ideals in reality, with the accompanying suffering that we are all too familiar with: social and environmental degradation that happens only because we don't agree on what should be the best for all of us. In other words--instead of reconciling of our differences harmlessly in models (or by using any other expedient means), we let our differences to reconcile in real time/space causing real harm and grief.

Meditation:
Find, or imagine that there is, a mental space in which all the ideas of

A newer edition of the above book is available as
Path of Least Resistance by Robert Fritz
Random House, Inc., 1989, ISBN: 978-0-449-90337-7
(0-449-90337-0).

I am grateful to my Alma Mater—University of Hawai'i--for giving me the education that I need for what I want to do--please see my CV: http://www.modelearth.org/cv.html

Dedicated

to the optimal physical and mental well-being of all beings anywhere and anytime.

May all differences that there are among beings in this world resolve harmlessly by the virtue of all wholesome actions--in meditations, prayers, gedanken experiments, and models--before those differences resolve in real life, not infrequently causing real harm to many involved.

!OmManiPadmeHum!

ECOLOGICALLY AND SOCIALLY SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION:
Creating a Sustainable World.

Abstract.
The purpose of ecologically and socially sustainable education is to

teach the skills and to impart knowledge necessary for the establishment and perpetuation of ecologically and socially sustainable society. The first step in ecologically and socially sustainable education is to determine what an "ecologically and socially sustainable society" is. This is achieved by reconciling and unifying of all individual ideas that there ever might exist of what should constitute an “ecologically and socially sustainable society” into a unified model--a model acceptable to all because it is based on and justified by all knowledge and data pertinent to the subject. This unification in a model is necessary in order to avoid costly (costly in terms of time, energy, and resources) resolving of differences among those ideas in real life. Once it is agreed upon what an "ecologically and socially sustainable society" should be, "ecologically and socially sustainable education" would find the means for establishing and maintaining of "ecologically and socially sustainable society".

Keywords.
"ecologically and socially sustainable education", "ecological and social sustainability", sustainable, sustainability, education, *Path of Least Resistance*, Robert Fritz, “Mahayana philosophy”.

Introduction.

The aversion to suffering is fundamentally the basis, the reason for the emergence of "ecological and social sustainability". It is obvious that most of human suffering is caused by humans themselves, and to see that by merely addressing the by the humans caused suffering the greater part of all human and other beings' suffering could be eliminated.

ideal state of the Earth would greatly improve even our current political process by "seeing" to what degree each political decision would, or would not, help to achieve the ideal state.

DESIGNING A LASTING WORLD PEACE COLLECTIVELY.

Over the ages many people always desired a lasting peace; they prayed for it, imagined it, worked for it since time immemorial. "Peace" is a goal of many religions and many ideologies. The reason that, so far, no lasting peace in the world materialized yet is due to our (sometimes great) differences in what we mean when we say "peace on Earth". As long as we do not have a unified, common idea of the concept, that long a "peace on Earth" can never happen. Instead we always end up fighting for our version of "peace", and we wonder why any lasting "Peace on Earth" never really comes about.

Knowing that every time of peace in human history ended in a war, what should "Peace on Earth" look like, so it would not result in a war again? Unless we can answer this question, we can never achieve real "Peace on Earth".

We should learn how to imagine, in as much detail as possible, what would constitute a real "Peace on Earth", and then, since we each have different concepts of the idea, we should learn how to reconcile all our differences in models (or by using any other expedient way, e. g. in "gedanken experiments", meditations, "think tanks", round-table style discussions, etc.) in order to arrive at a *unified* portrayal of what

Sustainable education always makes sense, because at each point the whichever particular knowledge that is being acquired is clearly "seen" (by comparing the modeled desired reality with the current reality) as being necessary to know in order to achieve that which is desired in the projected vision of a sustainable society.

The start of the modeling process itself would be the start of sustainable education.

Conclusion.

Most problems that humanity experiences are human made, and this fact implies a hope--it might well be within human powers to effect the healing of our world.

The "old" way of doing things will never do; obviously the "old" way got us to where we are now. We cannot look back trying to find solutions to our present problems, because any "solutions" from the past helped to get us exactly to where we are now. Any solutions based on humanity's experience from the past that have been tried have been proven ineffective, so far; ineffective in trying to deal with issues that really matter--fulfilling basic human needs satisfactorily--QED.

We have to look, as if, into the future for solutions, more precisely--we have to design our future to our collective satisfaction, and then we can work to make this designed future our reality. It is very important to know what it actually is that we desire to have.

Alone the existence of a constantly updated, evolving model of an

It could be argued that for humans to live sustainably is the optimal way to exist, a way that would generate the least amount of suffering for humans and many other beings who share this world with them. The principal idea expressed in this paper--the purposeful and conscious designing of our collective sustainable future collaboratively--is based on the philosophy of Mahayana and the practical approach to creating of desired results as it is formulated in *The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz (Fritz 1984).

Mahayana's noble goal is to cause all beings to become ultimately optimally happy, to become “enlightened”, with no beings left behind in suffering. Thus Mahayana philosophy might be best suitable as an ideology for creating and maintaining of ecologically and socially sustainable society, because Mahayana's concern is the ultimate happiness of all beings, transcending all differences--be those differences in species, ideologies, creeds, classes, and any such differences--that divide all beings. All beings' welfare is important in Mahayana's view, as it is in true sustainability.

To live ecologically and socially sustainably does not imply a complete abolition of all beings' suffering which is the goal of Mahayana--that would be impossible to achieve with our mere "earthly" means--, but to live sustainably would prevent most of *unnecessary* suffering from happening, at least.

The *Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz (Fritz 1984) teaches how to create results that one desires without concerning oneself with whether a particular goal might, or might not be achievable at the moment, without concerning oneself about (this is important) what *not*

to have in a desired ideal. What *is* important in any creation is that we know what it is that we want to have, what we want to create. What matters is whether one cares, wants to see one's particular goals realized. A condition for the realization of a goal is that the goal to be achieved is imagined in as fine a detail as possible, or, at least, to know what one wants to achieve so well that when one would encounter this goal realized, one would recognize it without a fail. Obviously, it would not matter to know what it is that one does not want to have in the desired result, because this would never make any desired goal any clearer. There just might be an infinity of things that one might never want.

The process is described in the *The Path of Least Resistance* as “creating”, because it concerns bringing into reality results that might not have existed ever before, bringing into being results as if out of nothing (the foregoing sentence is loosely paraphrased from the book--*The Path of Least Resistance* by Robert Fritz--Fritz 1984).

At present there are many people who know what they do not want in their lives, but a very few who have formed a definite image of what their ideal life should be. Moreover, there exist a myriad definitions of “sustainability”, many of which are not even compatible with each other, and a lot of time resources, and energy are being wasted on trying to reconcile the differences among those definitions in real time and space, while all this waste could be avoided by reconciling these differences in a model, i. e. by deciding the viability of any idea by modeling in virtuality "concrete" applications of any ideas in consideration.

increasing till they will be "solved", for a while, by some major societal catastrophe.

In contrast, no one ever would be excluded from modeling the ideal state of the world--all who would care to live in a better world would always be able to improve on the ideal. No one's effort in modeling of the ideal and in contributing to achieving of the ideal would be wasted--actions small and actions grand will all flow coherently into the realization of the ideal--both in the model and in reality. Differences that there are among people and cause so much unhappiness in real life could be dealt with, could be resolved in models, before this would happen in real life with consequences we are all too familiar with.

Sustainable education springs from the need of bridging the current reality with the desired state of affairs.

With a visible, collaboratively being created and generally upon agreed model of what our ideal common reality should actually be, it would always be possible to see what the discrepancy between what is desired and what actually exists currently (in relation to the ideal) is. This discrepancy between the desired goal and what there is in reality (in respects to the desired goal) alone would be the driving force of sustainable education (I am alluding to Fritz's description in *The Path of Least Resistance*--Fritz 1984--of how "structural tension" between the desired objective and its "current reality" drives the creation of desired results).

unlikely, when we solve all of our problems, we still might not be even close to having what we really want to have, especially, if we don't know what that might be. The modeling has to focus on the results that we do want to have in our common reality.

The resultant emerging portrayal of an ideal state of things would not depend on the personalities of people inputting the model--only ideas would compete with each other. The process would not be hampered by the prestige, or the lack thereof, of people inputting the modeling process. Nor could anyone personally profit from taking a part in the process. The "profit" would lie in making it possible for all to design and to strive to obtain the optimal home ever possibly obtainable with no one excluded from the process of doing so.

In essence the shaping of human society on any level, from a local community government to global concerns, driven by the desire to approach the ideal, would supersede, eventually, any form of government in existence currently, because once a justified, unified objective would be identified, the actions to achieve it would always be defensible, and because no one ever would be excluded from the political action.

There is a qualitative difference between the way the society would be governed by using the modeling process and the way politics is being conducted currently. Today our future is being shaped by a very small portion of humanity, with a huge proportion of people who cannot influence their future significantly. Much discontent thus generated will create problems in the future, problems that will be resolved to the satisfaction of only a few again--the number of problems will be

Even people who do not "believe" in sustainability could use the modeling process to see how their ideas of what an ideal world should be like in a model. I contend that by using the modeling process continually, even using input of people who do not "believe" in sustainability, eventually the result would have to, inevitably, be a portrayal of a sustainable world, because no other way other than sustainable could ever be as justifiable, nor any other results could ever be as elegant and parsimonious as sustainable ones.

The modeling of the ideal, would never be in any way influenced by any ideologies, creeds, or personalities of the inputters. Only the realization that we all have to share the Earth together with as little conflict as possible would matter. Only the relevance of ideas to creating of the ideal would matter.

The modeling of an ideal future could be used even on small scale in situations to resolve conflicts, and also in deciding the future of smaller social units.

What is "ecologically and socially sustainable education"?

Ecologically and socially sustainable education helps to establish and maintain an ecologically and socially sustainable society. It shows what a sustainable world should be (by collectively modeling the ideal world) and the way towards establishing and maintaining of a sustainable world.

What is an "ecological and social sustainability"?

There are many definitions of what constitutes "sustainability", let alone "ecological and social sustainability". Some are less abstruse

than others, but there is not a single one definition of "sustainability" that would satisfy everybody.
Therefore, in order to be able to define "ecological and social sustainability", the best definition of the term would be actually showing in a model what an ideal sustainable state of any geo-social entity ought to be by collectively inputting individual definitions into models and reconciling the differences among them by representing and comparing "concrete" portrayals of the optimal sustainable states of those entities (be those societal, or ecological), then deciding what modeled portrayals would be the best ones.
(All the above is farther elaborated upon bellow).

In my opinion, although the emphasis currently is on the "ecological" part of "sustainability, it would be impossible for "sustainability" not to be "sustainable" also socially. For a society (or more fittingly in the sustainable sense--a community) to be able to readily react to the demands of ecological balance, the community itself has to be "sustainable"--i. e. - to be self regulating at the very basic level; to be "transparent" in order for its members to react swiftly should any societally exigencies arise that would threaten the ecological environment (read--the home) of such a community.

<u>The need for a model that would show what an "ecologically and socially sustainable" world should look like.</u>
The unification of all ideas about what our collective future should be like in a model is necessary in order to avoid costly resolving ("costly" in terms of time, energy, and resources) of differences among those ideas in real life.

It is necessary to have a good definition of "sustainable" should mean for practical purposes. Only by modeling of this definition we can get definitions of "sustainable" that actually would be "visible"--made visible--by virtually "concrete" applications of what "sustainable" should be in a model.

To reconcile all the various definitions of "ecological and social sustainability" (and to unify all ideas about what our collective future should be like generally) I propose that all of these are used to construct a model that would portray what an "ecologically and socially sustainable" society, or any social entity of any size--from a local community to the whole Earth encompassing humanity. In such a model it would be possible to "see" what the each definition of "ecological and social sustainability" ("sustainability" from now on, but let us not forget that "sustainability" should be a holistic concept) would look like when translated from the abstract to an *in modelo* visible representation of "sustainability".

In this way each of the definitions' viability could be "seen" and evaluated against all other definitions and against all knowledge that is important in deciding what is "sustainable" and what is not so (e. g.--availability and distribution of resources, particular societal composition and traits of particular societal groups, and such).

It is important to stress that this modeling should not be about "problem solving"! According to Robert Fritz in *The Path of Least Resistance* (Fritz 1984) the process of creating the results that we want to have in our lives cannot depend on "problem solving", because we never, really, run out of problems ever, and even, very