CONCLUSION

Our attitudes and beliefs which have been formed in the past influence our present reactions to oncoming stimuli, and these attitudes are often rooted in dynamic personality traits. According to the Buddha, these attitudes are not the result of deliberation at a conscious level, but emerge on deep-rooted and dormant proclivities referred to as *anusaya*.

The term “dormant” or “latent” gives a clear description of the nature of *anusaya*, as they are persistent, latent dispositions. They are pertinacious and tend to provide the foundation for sensuous greed, anger, pride, etc. The *anusayas* are like the potentiality of a tree to bear fruits; the potentiality cannot be found anywhere within the tree, but we know it is there by seeing the fruits it bears when the time is ripe. “*Anusayas* are nowhere to be seen. They do not have distinct appearances, and they are not specified by such characteristics as arising-existing-dissolving. But they remain ready to come to the surface as real defilements at an opportune moment when they are in contact with the corresponding sense-objects. This continuous upsurge of such proclivities is made possible by their very nature”\(^1\). Thus, the *anusaya* differ from passing mental states. They have eaten into one’s nature, settled there and found a habitat there. It remains there ever since a being has just been born.

What constitutes the true and innermost nature of man, or any other being, is this subconscious life-stream (*bhavanga-sota*) of which we do not know whence it came and whither it will go. All life is a flowing, a continual process of becoming, change and transformation. Previously

\(^1\) B.A., p.267
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accumulated *cetasikas* (*anusaya*) provide the necessary driving force which causes new forms of energy to arise as the mind continues to function.

*Anusayas* are accumulated at every moment, but there cannot be an additional *citta* that stores these *anusayas*, and there cannot be anything lasting. That would be eternalism. One *citta* falls away, but it is succeeded by the following one. If there would be no connection between past and present there would be annihilation belief. Accumulations change, they are not static, because a new accumulation, good or bad is added. Accumulations lie dormant and can condition the arising of *kusala* or *akusala* at the present.

Good and bad qualities accumulated in the past become our nature, they condition the different *cittas* in the present life by way of natural decisive support-condition (*upanissaya-paccaya*), When one commits one kind of *akusala* it can easily lead to the committing of other types of *akusala*.

The more *anusaya* is accumulated, the more it flows out. Therefore, when the feeling of greed, anger, or delusion passes by, it immediately jumps out because of many accumulations in the trait. And these psychological and behavioral traits in a person define his own temperament (*carita*).

When saying that *anusaya* are the latent tendencies of mental defilements that lie dormant in the life – continuum (*bhavaṅga*) and arise at any time, it does not mean that they are permanent and unchanging. They are also conditioned *dhamma*, and can be abandoned. The only way to do this is practising *Vipassanā* or insight meditation. The *Satipaṭṭhāna*
Sutta, the Discourse on the Foundations of Mindfulness, is generally considered as the canonical Buddhist text with the fullest instructions on the system of Vipassanā meditation.

Advanced meditators are instructed to deliberately investigate these unconscious forces and thus release themselves from their power. Meditators who have trained their mind to be concentrated, steady, clear, and transparent will examine the heart, search for the latent roots of suffering there, and release them.

The mental defilements that are said to be eradicated at the moment of enlightenment are actually nothing but that ability or liability to come up. When we see things clearly there is no chance for these mental defilements to come into the mind. In this way, Vipassanā or mindfulness practice removes latent tendencies of mental defilements.

In this thesis, a special reference was made to Freudian psychology to find out the similarities as well as the differences of the two systems while dealing with the negative forces of human minds.

The Buddha and Freud had much in common, despite the centuries that separate them. Both were revolutionaries who challenged the traditions and authorities of their day. Both encouraged their followers to recognize the richness of their inner life and the authority of their own personal experience. They were scientists, endlessly curious, who carefully investigated the workings of the mind. Freud analyzed his own dreams and wrote about his experiences with his patients. Buddha shared with his disciples the fruits of his contemplation. Above all, both were men of compassion who sought to relieve the suffering of others. While both sought the relief of suffering, Freud’s therapeutic approach ended
where Buddha’s path to liberation began. Freud engaged in a “talking cure” in which he instructed his patients to speak freely about whatever came into their minds. He invited them to pay close attention to their free associations and offered verbal interpretations to help them resolve inner conflicts. While appreciating its benefits, Freud honestly admitted the limitations of his approach. He acknowledged that his therapy could only relieve neurotic suffering, but left untouched “everyday unhappiness.” Buddha, on the other hand, sought to relieve the everyday suffering caused by the afflictions of the mind, that is, the greed, hatred, and ignorance that interfere with inner peace. He proposed four noble truths as a practical guide to life: the reality of suffering, its cause, its cessation, and the path to inner freedom.

While both Freud and Buddha had a common goal in the relief of suffering, the type of suffering differed for each of them. Freud’s therapeutic approach promised relief from the suffering caused by neurotic conflicts, while Buddha offered relief from existential suffering, everyday unhappiness. Freud’s approach was much more active than Buddha’s, requiring the engagement of the analytical mind. He asked his patients to be introspective in their daily lives and to speak freely, without censorship, about whatever came to their minds in the therapy sessions. Together, he and the patient observed the thoughts, feelings, desires, and images in their sequence and associations. They noted repetitions and patterns and traced their source to early childhood experiences. Furthermore, they discerned how those patterns of thought, feelings, and behavior were repeated in the present day and the consequences of the repetition on the individual’s wellbeing. In short, they actively explored and analyzed what emerged from the stream of consciousness. Meditation
for Buddha was a much more passive endeavor. He taught his disciples to be quiet and attend to what emerged and passed through the stream of consciousness. He told them explicitly not to think about or cling to whatever they observed, but to let it pass. Distracting thoughts were noted and released from awareness. With much practice, the state of silent, calm awareness could be achieved readily and sustained through daily life, resulting in a freedom from the suffering caused by attachments.²

Freud was more concerned with what was closer to the surface, to the waves and ripples, while Buddha sought the silent depths and source of the flow. Freud introduced his patients to the rich inner world of the unconscious, which shaped their lives in ways that eluded their conscious awareness. He believed that by making the unconscious conscious, the patient could resolve conflicts and achieve a measure of happiness. Through an introspective free association of ideas, the content of the unconscious was revealed. In therapy sessions, he and the patient explored and identified the specific ideas, the concrete images, the elusive desires, and the fleeting feelings and sensations that emerged in their interaction. In particular, they also investigated any thoughts that interfered with the free flow of ideas, that is, with the patient’s freedom to express himself fully. The Buddha instructed his disciples to develop a quiet mind, in contrast to their usual distracted “wild monkey mind.” After achieving a measure of stillness through concentration exercises, he encouraged them to pay close attention to the rising and passing away of any thoughts, feelings, images, or sensations.

He advocated remaining an impartial observer. Furthermore, he told his followers to be aware of their reactions to the emerging thoughts, whether liking, disliking, or neutral, and to let them pass without judging or dwelling on them. By focusing on the process of passing thoughts rather than their content, the meditator would enter more deeply into silent contemplation and come to an appreciation of the impermanence and ultimate emptiness of all things. The resulting mental state was one of freedom from illusion and pain.

In conclusion, Freud, a representative of modern psychology, and Buddha, representing the ancient spiritual traditions, both promote a relief from suffering through self-awareness. They use an increasingly refined attention to the stream of consciousness in the present moment to effect this liberation from pain. These intellectual giants point the way toward the integration of psychology and spirituality. Their insights about self-awareness suggest how a deepening introspection can prepare the way for a meditative experience of mystery and the ultimate realities of life.