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As we begin now to lay the foundation of the GCC, it’s vital to be clear about the the primary, fundamental, first principles of what we’re creating: our North Star. We will pursue this vision in practical ways, and need to ensure that our methods stay true it.

The vision statements that have been the basis for founding the GCC are contained in the essay, Restoring Healthy Human Politics, and the Summary of GCC Vision and Actions, both appended at the end of this document. Let’s explore some of their practical implications.

Reestablishing “caring-and-sharing”
As Paul Gilbert has shown, our ancestors evolved caring-and-sharing – compassion and justice – as the basis of their hunter-gatherer bands. This was a remarkable departure from the holding-and-controlling strategies of all other primate species. But as agriculture began to spread 10,000 years ago, wealth and power became increasingly concentrated in the hands of the few, to the cost of the many.

There have been some significant improvements in the human condition, particularly in the past couple centuries. Nonetheless, huge structural inequalities remain, 60% of humanity lives under authoritarian rule (with only 6% in a full democracy), and we continue to hurtle toward climate catastrophe.
Clearly, there is much to do! There have been many aspirational statements such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals, but little progress toward them. What will it take, for real, to have a world that works well for everyone?

The primary purpose of the GCC is to gather together millions, potentially billions, of people and organizations worldwide – and focus their efforts toward reestablishing compassion and justice as the basis of all societies. How we intend to do this is sketched in the Summary document, and that plan will of course be enlarged and improved over time.

**Seriously ambitious**

This global coalition is a framework that will enable humanity to come together at a scale that could actually change the course of history. Even then there is no guarantee of success. But if we don’t find a way to combine our efforts at this vast scale, we’re guaranteed that business as usual will persist, as it has more or less for thousands of years.

In conversations with many people, the scope and audacity of our mission is what has most evoked their passion and inspiration, their support and their hope.

While keeping our mission clearly in mind and in the foreground of our descriptions of the GCC, as a practical matter we will spend our first several years focusing on the first purpose outlined in the Summary: supporting our members in doing what they do even better. But this early focus is in the context of our long-term aims.
The GCC’s activities – such as having a website, sponsoring conferences, or facilitating synergies among its members – are worthy undertakings in their own right. Still, we must never forget that they are primarily a means to the end of our mission.

For example, if we fostered an association of compassion researchers and teachers, that would be a good thing, but if the fundamental power structure of our world nonetheless persisted through the end of this century, that would be a great disappointment.

**We stand together**

This is a coalition of individuals and organizations. They belong to the coalition. Innately, they are all members of it.

This is the primary matter. The overall financing of the GCC is vital but secondary. How to do skillful fundraising is important but tertiary. We have to make sure that the tail does not wag the dog.

**Finding new forms**

This is an historically unprecedented undertaking. We should not force the vibrant and audacious essence of our coalition into old forms simply because they’re familiar to us.

For example, just because those who belong to a coalition are innately members of it does not mean that we should impose a conventional “pay-to-play” model of membership on what we are building.
**Inclusive from the start**

It is by being an inclusive coalition of millions, eventually billions of people and organizations worldwide, that we will accomplish our purposes. The only way we will accomplish our big aims is *by being big ourselves*.

Therefore, our primary stance must be an open hand of invitation to all. This must be how we meet potential new members.

We can certainly begin with invitations to those we know – and to those *they* know – to join us. With meanwhile an eagerly open hand to the general public. The practical and natural sequencing of our early membership efforts should not create structural distinctions between who belongs to this coalition.

We only get one chance to make a good first impression. The initial framing of what we are will persist in a self-fulfilling way. For instance, we must not allow the GCC to be perceived as one more association of well-educated professionals, mainly from affluent Western countries, that after a while invites the general public to support it.

We need to form our coalition with vast numbers of people who are and feel like outsiders. They are less likely to join if the GCC looks like another bunch of insiders.

**With equal status**

In humanity, every person has equal standing. In our coalition, every member has equal standing. Sure, some contribute more money than others, and we thank them for that. But this does not give them higher standing than other members.
The stratification of humanity based on concentrations of wealth and power *is* the problem. We will not solve that problem if we’re perceived as creating similar stratifications within the GCC.

**And equal access**

We invite people and organizations to join this coalition for the greater good. Humanity is hurting, all are welcome, and we should never approach membership in this coalition as something that is *purchased*. The doors are open, and we invite everyone to come on through. Buying a membership in the coalition is antithetical to its far-reaching vision.

This equality of access is primary. As a tertiary matter, we will be forthright and skillful in asking for their support: their suggestions, their involvement, their good will, their outreach to others, their volunteering of time, and yes as they have it to give, their money.

We will be clear and direct in asking for financial donations. For the coalition to succeed in its mission, it will need a lot of money. But the majority of its funding will likely come from major donors, foundations, large grants, and offering certain programs for sale (with a scholarship for anyone who needs it), and not from general membership donations.

We should never allow a sense of financial pressure to move us away from first principles. Additionally, as a practical matter, if our initial communication to prospective members is the very conventional “pay $100 to buy access to these
great resources,” that will immediately turn off many many people, and defeat our primary purposes. For example, it is much better for the coalition to have, say, 10,000 members whose average donation is $10 than 1000 members whose donation is $100.

In the tertiary matter of fundraising, we can have minor distinctions related to how much a person or organization contributes, with a particularly appreciative thank you for larger forms of financial support. But these should not be “tiers” of membership and support in which by definition someone is above and someone is below.

**Giving from the heart - not primarily to get back**

People and organizations will become members of this coalition primarily because they are moved by compassion. They want to relieve suffering and its causes. Secondarily, we hope that they get personal or organizational benefits out of participating – including the wonderful benefit of knowing that their compassion is making a difference at a vast scale.

But we must not approach potential members transactionally. We are not asking them to give in order to get. For example, our welcome video to new members is simply that: a deeply grateful welcoming “thank you.” It is not a goodie that they get if they sign up.

We should never lead with what they are going to get if they give . . . perhaps because at some level we doubt they’ll support the great cause of compassion unless they get a bunch of benefits in return. That would be deeply mistaken about
the nature of this coalition, and it would undermine what should be the primary motivations of its members.

We will make a financial ask during the registration process, and make additional asks in other skillful fundraising activities. But everything we do involving money needs to stay out of a scarcity worldview, and it needs to be artful and to respect the first principles of the coalition we are creating.

**In conclusion**
If we’re talking about mere nuances of languaging or sequencing, no worries. But if we are departing from what is fundamental and primary in our vision, we’ll be building the GCC on a tilted and wobbly foundation.

If we are ever in a mindset that commodifies compassion, stratifies the coalition itself, waters down our audacious mission, defaults to familiar financial models just because we’re used to them, frames membership as something to buy in order to get benefits, or allows ourselves to be perceived as a mainly professional, Western organization . . . then we are in trouble, and will be creating more trouble for ourselves down the road.

So I hope we can stay aligned on the fundamentals . . . and then hit home runs with the nuances!
Caught up in the daily now, it’s easy to forget that we are each a living museum, containing the solutions to harsh survival problems faced by our ancestors. Primates emerged around 60 million years ago, tool-manufacturing hominids about 2.5 million years ago, and anatomically modern people nearly 300,000 years ago. For more than 99 percent of this time, our great-etc.-great-grandparents lived in small hunter-gatherer bands; a typical human band had 50 or so members, many of them children. As the brain has tripled in volume over the last several million years, a major driver of its evolution has been the selective advantages of growing social abilities such as empathy, language, compassion – and politics.

**Hunter-Gatherer Politics**  
Politics, broadly, is about decision-making, sharing resources, regulating power, and cooperative action. Bands that were a little better at working together in tough conditions were a little more likely to pass on their genes. The capabilities and
inclinations that promoted effective politics in the social setting of small bands were gradually woven into our brains.

As Paul Gilbert and other scholars have shown, our ancestors evolved a way of living together that was organized around “caring and sharing” – a remarkable departure from the “holding and controlling” strategies of most other primate species. (The primal impulse toward self-centered domination still found expression in frequently violent competition for scarce resources with other bands.) Imagine living with the same 50 or so people for your entire life, with few personal possessions and your fates bound together. A politics for the common good emerged naturally from three conditions inherent in hunter-gatherer life:

1. **Common truth** – Living in small groups, the facts were usually obvious: Did the hunt bring back food? Did the leader’s plan work? Is someone eating more than their fair share? Is this person trustworthy – or not?

2. **Common welfare** – Sharing ties of both kinship and mutual dependence, what happened to some happened to all. The self-interest of leaders was tied concretely and immediately to the good of the group.

3. **Common justice** – Leaders had to face the people they led each day, and couldn’t mistreat them with impunity.

In sum, humans are best able to govern themselves when the truth is readily apparent to all, the welfare of the few is tied to the welfare of the many, and leaders bear the consequences of their actions.
Today, nearly eight billion people are spread across the planet, most of us living in ways that are vast departures from our ancient social template. Grounded in hunter-gatherer life, the natural decision-making structure of our species involves about 30 adults. Imagine the current distribution of humanity represented by 30 people – most of them relatively poor, some of them desperate – staring at each other across an internet “campfire,” trying to figure out what’s best for our human tribe as a whole.

As we seek the greater good in the 21st century, we must ask how we will solve our modern problems – such as great inequalities of wealth and power – with our Stone Age brains.

**The Un-Common Good**

Life in small human bands was not idyllic, but anthropological studies generally show that inequalities of power and resources were not extreme, certainly when compared to those today. Eight percent of the world’s people now hold 85% of its wealth. In fact, eight individuals have as much combined wealth as half of the human race. In the United States, the top 1% have more money than the bottom 90%. Political influence is linked closely to wealth and is similarly concentrated. In America for instance, there are approximately 120,000,000 households; nonetheless, midway through 2015, almost half of the donations to the various Presidential campaigns had come from just 158 wealthy families.

What has enabled the enormous inequalities in modern societies? You’d think that with the great production of surpluses through agriculture, industrialization, and
modern technology, there would be plenty to go around and all would share in the wealth of the human tribe. But in fact the opposite has occurred, fostering terrible individual poverty and misery as well as many brutal conflicts between groups and nations. What happened? Across the world, who decided that living conditions should be rich for one person in a hundred, comfortable for another ten or twenty, and difficult to awful for everybody else?

These are complex questions with multiple answers, but key among them is this one: the conditions that fostered healthy human politics – common truth, welfare, and justice – were lost with the shift from hunting-and-gathering to farming-and-herding. The production of surpluses let leaders concentrate wealth in their own hands, which let them concentrate power as well by hiring warriors to enforce their dominance and priests to justify it. The truth of deals struck behind closed doors could remain hidden in societies with thousands, let alone millions, of people. The hunger and poverty of the many did not affect the meals and welfare of the few. Protected by their walls and their guards, the 1% could escape the consequences of their rule for the other 99%. And holding-and-controlling was unleashed to become the basis of human governance for the next 10,000 years.

Average living conditions worldwide have certainly improved in the past century. Still, deep inequalities of wealth and power have persisted – fundamentally, because truth, welfare, and justice continue to be un-common:

• In technically complex societies, high-impact actions are easily buried in fine print. Truly fake news spreads virally through social media. Journalists and scientists are attacked as enemies of the people. Awash in information in the digital age, the truth is often hard to find.
• To take the world’s richest country as an example, the meteoric rise in wealth of the top 1% over the past forty years has not lifted the stagnant incomes of the American middle class. Similar trends have occurred worldwide. What has happened to us has not happened to them, and what has happened for them has definitely not happened for us.

• Outside of democracies, governing elites are rarely held to account. Even in democracies, leaders and legislators can usually avoid dealing with the wounded soldiers, people without healthcare, or impoverished children that are the results of their actions or inactions.

I’m not saying that all those with wealth and power have gained it unfairly or ignored the common good. Wealthy benefactors have brought many wonderful things into being, and some wise and large-hearted leaders have made great contributions to humanity.

This said, wealth and power have been used routinely throughout history to hide the facts, decouple private gains from public welfare, and shield leaders from justice – all to gain even more wealth and power.

**Good Governance in the Internet Age**

I came of age politically in the 1960s, and have seen in my lifetime the beginnings of a promising restoration of the three conditions of healthy human governance. Technology and education have increased access to facts, knowledge, and truth. In some countries, tax policy and business regulation have slowed the concentrations
of capital. The gradual spread of democratization has increased the holding of leaders to account. We have been leaning in the right direction, and the greater sharing of truth, welfare, and justice has been beneficial to many, many people around the world.

On the other hand, recently we’ve seen a swing back in the other direction, including fundamentalist or authoritarian attacks on a free press and factuality itself, attempts to separate the wealth of the few from the prosperity of the many, and a movement toward pseudo-democracies in which leaders can lie freely and enrich themselves and their cronies. Meanwhile, billions of people live in crushing poverty as the planet gets hotter every day.

We are at a crucial tipping point in the course of human history. Things could go either way. What can we do?

For starters, we live in a time in which knowledge is increasingly distributed and democratized – and this could foster the same for wealth and power. Gathering around a fire, in the small bands of our ancestors the many could speak up and stand up to the few. These days individuals can join together to do the same, though our “campfires” look like social media, town hall meetings, and the public square. Gathering around them in our own ways today, we can speak up and stand up for facts, for the general welfare, and for justice. And we can call out and name and frankly shame those who violate the basis of any healthy relationship – so fundamental that we teach it to our children – which is to tell the truth and play fair. Imagine a critical mass of people – 100 million? 1 billion? – making a moral commitment to honesty and fairness, especially in our politics, and through a web-
based platform, finding camaraderie and opportunities for collective action with so many others who’ve taken the same pledge.

Countless nonprofit organizations are also pursuing the common good, from neighborhood groups to multinational NGOs. Some of them integrate science, mental health practices, and social policy, such as the Compassionate Mind Foundation and the Greater Good Science Center. Their work is vital, and imagine a world without it. Nonetheless, prosocial organizations could work together a lot more effectively. While profit-seeking companies compete in the marketplace, at the political level they are shrewdly cooperative, combining their money to pay lobbyists, donate to political campaigns, and influence policy in corrupt ways. Meanwhile, prosocial organizations rarely pool their resources at the scale necessary to stand up the forces of wealth and power. Imagine the results of thousands, even millions of these organizations committing 1% of their revenues and thus hundreds of billions of dollars each year for a generation, aimed at a single shared and highly leveraged purpose, such as promoting the physical and mental health of the youngest among us – and by necessary extension, their mothers and families.

The 2100 Project

If we don’t imagine it, we’ll never achieve it. Ambitiously and semi-realistically, how would we like it to be for humanity by the end of this century? People will have different answers to this question, and here’s a start:

1. Half or more of the world living in a well-functioning democracy (rather than the current ~ 10%)
2. All children – including girls – having access to a decent education
3. No child goes hungry
4. No use of nuclear weapons
5. Average global temperature rise capped at “just” 5 degrees Fahrenheit

These five would be both the results of major positive developments over the next 80 years as well as powerful factors of continued positive developments in the 22nd century. Putting them in writing prompts a sense of both “of course that is how we should live together” and “wow, we’ve got a lot of work to do to get there.”

I’ve mentioned two strategies already: millions of individuals joining together to commit to common truth, welfare, and justice, and thousands of nonprofits pooling their resources toward a single transformational goal. Four additional strategies come to mind, and certainly there are others:
• A sustained advertising and social media campaign emphasizing the common good and conveying basic factual information, particularly to the most disengaged or misinformed portions of the populace
• Outreach to youth worldwide, who have the greatest stake in the future yet are playing the smallest role in creating it
• Growing a Global Compassion Coalition (www.GlobalCompassionCoalition.org) to support and coalesce the efforts of the many individuals and organizations worldwide that are focused on the common good
• Just treating these questions seriously – What world do we want by the end of the century? What will it take, really, to achieve it? – will itself help to restore healthy human politics.

The hunter-gatherer conditions that promoted a politics that served the many, not just the few, are no longer simply given to us today. We must create them. It is up to
each one of us to forge a common truth, welfare, and justice. It will not be easy. For most of the past 10,000 years, ordinary people had no chance against the elites and their soldiers. In the dictatorships and pseudo-democracies that prevail in much of the world today, they still have little chance – though the courage of their efforts may help to bend the long arc of history toward justice. And where there is some basis of civil society, at least there is a decent chance. It is up to us to use it.
Healthy Human Politics
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Suffering abounds, and moved by compassion, many are working to relieve it.

Numerous people have come together to establish a nonprofit association – titled the Global Compassion Coalition – of individuals and organizations for the science, education, application, and advocacy of compassion. This is an evolving document that will be revised. Please contact Rick Hanson for more information.

Mission
Promoting compassion and justice as the foundation of all human societies

Purposes
The Compassion Coalition will pursue this mission by:
• Supporting and enhancing the work of its members through collaborative community, facilitating synergies, showcasing projects, microgrants, and more

• Sustaining an effective media and influence campaign worldwide to promote compassion-related values, programs, and policies in our culture and politics

• Coalescing and directing the combined resources of its members toward a transformational, multi-year goal such as ending child hunger and abuse: an
initiative that is both worth doing in its own right and will lead to substantial improvements in civil society

**Members**

Individuals and organizations from around the world who:

- place compassion at the center of their work, or
- include it as an important aspect of what they do, or
- simply appreciate compassion as a guiding principle and practice

**Major Activities**

The Coalition can accomplish its purposes by:

- Providing a **website** with resources for researchers, clinicians, educators, advocates, and the public, including:
  - Directory of individuals and organizations that are members
  - Recent studies and archive of research
  - Current programs and trainings in compassion
  - Online resources for experiencing, developing, and applying compassion
  - Listings of compassion-in-action projects
  - Showcasing “compassion heroes,” including young people around the world
  - Downloadable handouts, audios, and videos that can be shared with others
  - Expressions of compassion in art, music, and new narratives and stories
  - Applications of compassion in particular areas such as trauma, healthcare, business, children, and social justice
• Being a **tax-deductible vehicle for supporting compassion projects** around the world

• Through grants, fellowships, and summer institutes, **foster a generation of young researchers and activists focused on compassion**

• Organizing an annual **conference/festival**

• Offering annual **compassion prizes**

• Developing and publicizing a **compassion index**

• Publishing the **online magazine, Compassion**

• Sustaining a long-term **media campaign for compassion**

• Perhaps sponsoring an **academic journal on compassion science and applications**

• Channeling pooled resources for a **major, multi-year, compassion-centered project** that is worth doing in its own right (e.g., educating all girls and boys) while heightening civil society

• Being a **coherent, influential voice for the common good**

**Guiding Principles**

• Boundless compassion for all who suffer, including nonhuman animals
• Urgency to relieve suffering and a willingness to think big

• Emphasizing actions and concrete results that substantially reduce suffering and promote well-being

• Inclusive, ”big tent“ for all who value compassion; equal priority given to the four major areas of study, education, application, and advocacy

• Supportive and helpful to those engaged in compassion work

• Valuing science while also exploring pragmatic, therapeutic, moral, political, and spiritual aspects of compassion

• Diverse, multicultural, international, and respectful of differences

• An open framework that will evolve over time, based on the interests and priorities of its members

Action Timeline

Phase 1 (accomplished) – February to June, 2022. Discussions in the initial working group. Draft initial documents. Reach out to key individuals and organizations involved with compassion for input and support. Secure funding for first year of operations. With pro bono law firm, finalize articles of incorporation and by-laws, and establish the Global Compassion Coalition (GCC) in California as a nonprofit
tax-exempt organization. Identify initial members of the coalition’s board, and formally constitute it.

Phase 2 (in process) – July 1 to October 30. Develop teamwork and community within the Board. Choose a Chair who can work three-quarters time on the Coalition. Hire an Executive Director, who will then hire key staff, notably a communications director who can create texts for the website, membership invitations, and press releases. Form Board committees. Develop an Advisory Council. Identify distinguished Founding Members (including the Supporters listed below). Put up a good initial website as outlined above. Establish basic organizational infrastructure. Create membership policies and launch a soft membership drive. Create a realistic financial plan for the GCC’s first year. Identify a few additional angel donors. Ongoing outreach to diverse and international members of the coalition.

Phase 3 – November, 2022 to mid-year, 2023. Have a fundraising webinar (with prominent teachers of compassion) and call to action that launches the Coalition publicly. Edit the webinar into an online product whose purchase supports the Coalition financially. Launch the online general interest Compassion magazine. Have a monthly newsletter summarizing the latest compassion studies. Continue the membership campaign. Build out the “science” and “education” elements of the website, and showcase compassion-in-action projects on it. Stabilize the organization financially. Begin planning for an annual conference/festival and compassion prizes. Support clusters of people and organizations within the Coalition that come together to advance “compassion-and-____ “, such as compassion-and-leadership, compassion-and-racial-justice, compassion-and-healthcare, etc.
Phase 4 – Fall, 2023 onward. On the foundation of a sturdy organization, move into more of the “advocacy” aspect of the GCC’s reason-for-being by launching a sustained media campaign about compassion and planning for a major transformative compassion-related project such as ending childhood hunger and abuse. And keep on keeping on!

Initial Board

[An institutional affiliation may be listed, but that does not mean that the institution itself has committed to joining the Coalition; individuals may be associated with more institutions than are listed here.]

Jaskaran Basran – Compassionate Mind Foundation
Yi-Heng Cheng – CBI Investment Management Ltd.; Club of Rome
Jim Doty – Stanford University, Center for Compassion and Altruism Research and Education
Paul Gilbert – Compassionate Mind Foundation
Rick Hanson – UC Berkeley, Greater Good Science Center
Julia Kim – Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness Center
James Kirby – University of Queensland
Marcela Matos – University of Coimbra
Sithembile Mbete – University of Pretoria
Jennifer Nadel – Compassion in Politics
Lobsang Tenzin Negi – Emory University, Center for Contemplative Science and Compassion-Based Ethics
Nicola Petrocchi – Compassionate Mind Italia; John Cabot University
Mamphela Ramphele – Club of Rome
Lynne Reeder – Federation University; Australian Compassion Council
Lilli Ross
Tania Singer – Max Planck University, Social Neuroscience Lab
Marilyn Turkovich – Charter for Compassion

Supporters

[These people have expressed support for the idea of a Compassion Coalition. An institutional affiliation may be listed, but that does not mean that the institution itself has committed to joining the Coalition. We are actively seeking more diverse and international supporters.]

Julian Abel – Compassionate Communities UK; Elevate Compassion
Paul Atkins – Prosocial World
Willa Blythe Baker – Natural Dharma Fellowship
James Baraz – Spirit Rock Meditation Center
Michelle Becker – Wise Compassion
Mary Ann Boe – Elevate Compassion; NicBluCares; Compassionate Communities
Joan Borysenko – Mind-Body Health Sciences
François Bourgognon – Institut de Cancérologie de Lorraine
Judson Brewer – Brown University, Mindfulness Center
Bhante Buddharakkhita – Uganda Buddhist Centre
Vidyamala Burch – Breathworks
Tara Brach – Insight Meditation Community of Washington, D.C.
Marguerite Callaway – Callaway Leadership Institute
Yi Heng Cheng – CBI Investment Management Ltd.; Club of Rome
Imee Conteras – Mindfulness Asia
Helene Creager – Every Day Wellness
Margaret Cullen – Compassion Corps
Diana Divecha – Yale Center for Emotional Intelligence
Andy Dreitcer – Claremont School of Theology
Jane Dutton – University of Michigan, Center for Positive Organizations
Daniel Ellenberg – Rewire Leadership Institute
Elissa Epel – University of California, San Francisco
Barbara Fredrickson – University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chris Germer – Center for Mindful Self-Compassion
Jim Gordon – Center for Mind-Body Medicine
Timothy Harrison – Emory University, Center for Contemplative Science and Compassion-Based Ethics
Matt Hawkins – Compassion in Politics
Steve Hickman – Center for Mindful Self-Compassion
Diana Hill – Your Life in Process
Felicia Huppert – University of Sydney, Body Heart and Mind in Business Research Group; University of Cambridge, Well-Being Institute
David Jones – Point of Care Foundation
Aaron Kahlow – Society for Social Health & Well-being
Valarie Kaur – Revolutionary Love Project
Dacher Keltner – UC Berkeley; Greater Good Science Center
Jack Kornfield – Spirit Rock Meditation Center
Frits Koster – Mindfulness-Based Compassionate Living
Thomas Legrand – Politics of Being
Marc Lesser – ZBA Associates
Crystal Lim-Lange – Forest Wolf
Greg Lim-Lange – Forest Wolf
Kaira Jewel Lingo – Order of Interbeing; Spirit Rock Meditation Center
Thubten Jinpa Longri – Compassion Institute
Joe Loizzo – Cornell University; Nalanda Institute
Beth Lown – Harvard University; Schwarz Center for Compassionate Healthcare
Sonja Lyubomirsky – University of California, Riverside
Sithembile Mbete – University of Pretoria
Nipun Mehta – Service Space
Bill Mobley – UC San Diego; Sanford Institute for Empathy and Compassion
Myriam Mongrain – York University
Caverly Morgan – Presence Collective; Peace in Schools
Kristin Neff – Center for Mindful Self-Compassion
Kami Norland – Elevate Compassion
Walter Osika – Karolinska Institutet
Frank Ostaseski – Metta Institute
Koshin Paley Ellison – New York Zen Center for Contemplative Care
James Pawelski - Pennsylvania State University, Positive Psychology Center
Lakiba Pittman – Menlo College; Healing Together
Susan Pollak – Center for Meditation and Psychotherapy
Julie Potiker – Mindful Methods for Life
Jordan Quaglia – Naropa University
Rob Roeser – Pennsylvania State University
Charlotte Rotterdam – Naropa University
Sharon Salzberg – Insight Meditation Society
Sara Schairer – Compass-it
Rhoda Schuling – Hanze University; Mindfulness-Based Compassionate Living
Zev Schuman-Oliver – Harvard University; Center for Mindfulness and Compassion
Henry Shukman – Mountain Cloud Zen Center
Dan Siegel – UCLA; Mindsite Institute
Judith Simmer-Brown – Naropa University
Emiliana Simon-Thomas – UC Berkeley Greater Good Science Center
Shauna Shapiro – Santa Clara University
Jeff Snipes – Millenium Schools
Stephen Snyder – Awakening Dharma
Chade-Meng Tan – One Billion Acts of Peace
Marleen ter Avest – Radboud University; Note to Mind; Mindfulness-Based Compassionate Living
David Vago – Vanderbilt University; International Society for Contemplative Research
Erik van den Brink – Mindfulness-Based Compassionate Living
Aly Waibel – Compassion Education Alliance
Christine Wamsler – Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies; Director of the Contemplative Sustainable Futures Program
Michael West – Lancaster University
Mark Williamson – Action for Happiness
Monica Worline – University of Michigan, Center for Positive Organizations