



One does not necessarily have to agree with the author's delimitation of Tibetan Culture Area. However, the fact that the author dares to conceptualize and approach Buddhism from a non-Western perspective is laudable. There is an urgent need in both the humanities and the social sciences to study Buddhism from different perspectives. The political sciences in particular need a deeper understanding of Buddhism, also as a political and social phenomenon.

A relevant question is whether Buddhism promotes peace or is all too often used as a political instrument to rule a country or mobilize people for a conflict. It can also only serve at least as a denominator of identity and therefore be politically relevant. And assuming that Buddhist teachings have an impact on political behavior, one should investigate to what extent and in which contexts and circumstances they could prevent or resolve tensions and conflicts, and thus promote peace.

The subject and theme of Anjaria's paper is very relevant to the emerging field of ethnogeopolitics and we would like to invite more contributions on this subject and theme.

- Babak Rezvani, Editor-in-Chief

Author's Response

I would also assert that the article primarily deals with a certain way of life across a large geographical area and offers a historical analysis of this congenial phenomenon that is spread across two continents, namely Asia and Europe. Certainly Buddhism does emerge as a key linkage, yet the nuances of socio-political behavior and their philosophical concerns are for scholars to further look into.

The paper seeks to highlight the influence of Tibetan Buddhism beyond the contours of Tibet and also the historical role of the institution of Buddhism based in Lhasa. The present-day widespread influence and domination of the Gelug (Dalai Lama's) school in Mongolia, Buryatia, Kalmykia and Tuva is the result of a historical association of these regions with Lhasa and Tibet in particular. While other regions within the Tibetan culture area identify with different schools of Tibetan Buddhism, the general linkage that draws them together is Tibetan Buddhism.

Thus the general assumption of a single monolithic nature of Buddhism in the popular perception and certain scholarly domains stands challenged by highlighting the diversity of thought and a certain congenial coexistence which remains strongly grounded in the regional particularities of the Tibetan culture area. I appreciate the profound editorial comments and the keen reading.

- Arnav Anjaria

NB: do you have any comments on Arnav Anjaria's article and/or the Critical Response, the Editorial Note and the Author's Response to these? Please send your comments to info@ethnogeopolitics.org, or through the contact form at www.ethnogeopolitics.org. Some of the comments on this and any other contribution, we may publish as Critical Responses (maximum 3,000 words) in the next issue(s) of the journal. Extensive critical responses with own source references may be published as full-fledged, separate articles. Please supply your name, contact details, academic and/or other professional titles and affiliations, as well as your specialisms and any major publications.