**HUMAN FLOURISHING**

**Human flourishing** is a Greek and Western concept that is often misrepresented by an overdeveloped and highly technological society.

There exists a misunderstanding in traditional Western economics, says **Schumache**r, when it is preoccupied with a type of self-righteousness, which puts premium on goods over people or utility over creativity.

**Schumacher**, that the source of wealth is human labor. Quite interestingly, modern economies have somehow understood labor from two opposing perspectives. On the one hand, from the perspective of the employer, it is understood as a cost in the process, which can be removed by automation. On the other hand, from the perspective of the workforce, it is understood as a "disutility." By "disutility," Schumacher refers to labor as a letting go of leisure and comfort; in relation to this, wages are understood as a kind of compensation for the sacrifices made.

The **division of labor** is also the introduction of specialization. Not that workers were not specialized before (as if we were not working nor creating since time immemorial), what we mean here by the division of labor refers more to the splitting of processes into smaller parts. Such that crafts that previously engage a laborer are now subdivided into four or five subprocesses with specifically assigned laborers. What this does is to produce efficiency of labor.

**Products** are produced faster and accountability in the pipeline is easier. As this involves efficiency, it is often understood as progress; or better yet, this is what is often misunderstood as human flourishing.

**Schumache**r challenges this understanding of human flourishing using a Buddhist point of vie In the Buddhist perspective, labor is understood as: "to give a man a chance to utilize and devel his faculties; to enable him to overcome his ego-centeredness by joining with other people in common task, and to bring forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence" (Supr p. 422). If we understand work negatively,

**Schumacher** argues that it is criminal because it focu on goods rather than people; this lacks compassion and reduces the soul to a woridly existencet is inhumane. In the same way that to favor leisure than work is to forget the complementarity work and leisure in living and to destroy "the joy of work and the bliss of leisure." in the perspective above, we can draw two types of automation/mechanization.

**human flourishing** simply constitutes automation/mechanization, then we become victims of the slave; this is not the vision of human flourishing, we intend to push forward.

Similar to **Gandhi, Schumacher** further distinguishes Buddhist economics with the economia of modern materialism.

The **distinction** is based on the perspective that civilization is not about the duplication of wants and desires as it is "the purification of human character."

For the **Buddhist** character is formed, as well as it is a consequence, of human labor.

Since it is **human labor** that is concerned here, it is determined by the condition of human dignity and freedom, and "blesses those who do it and equally their products" (Supra, p. 422).

The **materialist perspective** is concerned merely with the production of goods and the accumulation of wealth. The Buddhist perspective is all about a type of liberation that is not against physical well-being.

**Schumacher's** claim in Buddhist economics, therefore, highlights two things: nonviolence and simplicity. From his **economist perspective**, the beauty of this way of life lies in its utter rationality that is, that **human flourishing** does not entail big or huge things, but tiny or small means that lead to satisfactory results. It is no surprise that this is difficult, or even impossible, for an economist from a consumerist culture.

**human flourishing,** then, cannot be understod vis-à-vis consumption.

When considering h**uman flourishing Buddhist-style,** it seems like the best mariner of consumption entails producing optimal human satisfaction while utilizing a relatively low rate of consumption nonviolence and simplicity.

These **Buddhist principles** allow people to live their life without pressure and strain or without the need to be something or someone. This mindset represents the central injunction of Buddhism: **"Cease to do evil; try to do good.**"

As **physical resources** are scarce, the people's drive to modestly satisfying their needs are more sustainable than people who voraciously depend upon a high rate of consumption and use. Speaking of nonviolence and simplicity, local communities that are self-sufficient are less involved in large-scale violence. Issues of sustainability are concerns of human flourishing