So, the idea of Ahimsa is, most of us and I think nowadays, if we know that term at all, we know that coming from Gandhi. Gandhi was the greatest exponent of Ahimsa, non violence or non harming in India in the last century, and he inspired many people, many, many people, Martin Luther King, just one of them. Partly because of Mahatma Gandhi, there are now different universities around the country, there are peace departments or departments, they actually focus on this topic of peace and non violence. It's become kind of an academic discipline of sorts, has become respect, respectable thing to explore. And the idea of Ahimsa goes back into ancient India. It's not something just comes from Buddhism. It's kind of in the middle of ancient Indian religions. And Buddhism had a particular slant to go take on it. But himself was very important in the teachings of the Buddha, the principle the idea of living a life which is non harming. And it's so important that it could be considered to be a foundation, not only foundational, was foundational central in all else comes from it's like the root virtue when all other virtues kind of grow on that initial virtue. But also, it's it's a wonderful way of seeing how the end result of practice if there is one in a sense of in awakening or the combination of practice, it resonates with the state of mind, which is devoted towards non harming. So there's kind of a residence or kind of a parallel or between the attempt the efforts to live a life that's not harming with it with a goal of practice itself. The enlightened person is Want to live a life at peace that has not as non harming is one of the central expressions of how that person lives, their lives. And I think of the peace, the freedom that can come in the mind from practice is a kind of freedom that comes in, there's no more conflict, no conflict at all, we don't feel like we're in conflict with others. And we don't feel like we're in conflict with ourselves. So there's kind of, you know, all conflict is subtle, and that's where the pieces and the external manifestation of that is, you know, non harming towards others. So, I want to read a couple of quotes from the Buddha about this topic. And what you'll see is that there are two these two ways of looking at this idea of Ahimsa. One is that it's a principle and principles and is essentially something that you can live up to all the time but the principle you try to live by, it's a guy. It's like a It's like a guiding light or guiding stars, you look at that. And you know, that's where you have to walk in that direction. So you have this principle of non harming. And that's kind of orientation that
you're trying to direct your life on this idea of non harming. And the question for us today is why is it
was so important for the Buddha? Why would the Buddha lay this down as being one of the primary
the primary essential principles upon which he placed the spiritual life. So that's one the principle the
other is that it's a it's a rule, in the form of, for example, not killing. And the rule is particularly strong for
monastics. And there's no excommunication in Buddhism in a sense, but the closest thing to it is that a
person is a monastic, a monk or nun. There's four different things so that person can do. It's laid out
there they have all these rules have to live rules of the order that they live by, and the first four of those
rules If any one of those rules is violated, then automatically without any, you know, ruling by the
Vatican or anybody else, just automatically that person is no longer a monastic. And the person can no
longer be monastic in this lifetime. So it's very serious for monastic to to break these rules. And one of
these three rules is not to kill. It's kind of any kind of almost absolute in the sense that there's no in
Theravada monasticism, and this is what it this is rule number three of these first four rules. Should
any monk intentionally deprive a human being of life or search for an assassin for him or her, or praise
the advantages of death or incite him to die thus, my good man, what use is this wretched and
miserable life to you? Death would be better for you than life.

Or with such an idea in mind, such a purpose in mind should in various ways praise the advantages of
death or incite someone to die. He's also defeated and no longer in communion. So this is a very
interesting statement. It's kind of packed with all kinds of implications. So you cannot kill anyone that's
absolute. You can't find someone else to do the work for you. That's just as bad an assassin. And you
cannot praise the advantages of that. And this is usually there's many ways of understanding this. But
one way that is interpreted is that Buddhist monastics are not allowed to encourage euthanasia. They
might allow someone to die naturally not intervene with all kinds of medical apparatus to keep them
alive. But to actually encourage people or advise people anybody that you know, you're so sick now
things are so dire. You know, I think you're better off Just, you know, doing anything medically assisted
suicide or something like that. That is complete No, no, for monastics. And is this a principle or is it a
rule? is an expression of this principle of non harming? Is it a training rule by which the monastics live
their life by Is it because monastics are not allowed to encourage euthanasia. They
might allow someone to die naturally not intervene with all kinds of medical apparatus to keep them
alive. But to actually encourage people or advise people anybody that you know, you're so sick now
things are so dire. You know, I think you're better off Just, you know, doing anything medically assisted
suicide or something like that. That is complete No, no, for monastics. And is this a principle or is it a
rule? is an expression of this principle of non harming? Is it a training rule by which the monastics live
their life by Is it because monastics are not supposed to any kind of way compromise themselves,
internally or externally? Around this principle of being harmless living a life which is harmless, lesser
rules from monastics and they're serious, they require confession and things like that, but they don't
you don't get kicked out of the order. One of them is should any monk knowingly deprive an animal of
life? It is to be confessed, so you're not allowed to kill animals. You're also not allowed to harm plants.
And it goes to this extreme. Should any monk knowingly make use of water with living beings in it, it is
to be confessed. So you can't even drink water that you like there's, you know, insects or something.
And so you find it in ancient India, at least, that monastics would carry around these filters, cloth filters,
and they'd filter the water before they drank it or, or so that whatever animals were in, it would come
out and they wouldn't, so they wouldn't have to kill the animals in the water. And the problem with this,
of course, is that now in the modern world, we realize that, you know, every little, you know, drop of
saliva has a billion little creatures in it. And so, you know, the idea of not killing animals becomes
almost impossible or impossible. But this is like this movement to live a life of harmlessness. And then,
another rule that also requires confession even lesser rule emphasizing the importance of
harmlessness should any monk purposefully provoke anxiety in another month thinking this way, even for just a moment, he will have no peace. If doing it for this for just this reason and no other it is to be confessed. So you know, that your inner light not intentionally do something that provokes anxiety in someone else. It might be reason to, you know, you might, you might say something that causes anxiety, but you can't want to do that, you know, trying to there's a movement of cruelty or ill will in your mind as you're trying to express. And here is the another this is this is not exactly a it's kind of explanation of this rule of non killing for monastics, that is this is an instructions given to every new monk. A monk who has been admitted to the order should not deprive a living being of life, even if it is only a black and white at any moment. purposely deprives a human life, even to the extent of causing an abortion is not a contemplative, not a son of the Buddha, just as a solid block of stone broken into, cannot be joined together again. In the same way a monk was purposely deprived, even being of life is not a contemplative is not a sign of the Buddha or daughter of the Buddha. You were not to do this for the rest of your life. That's the instruction least listen to the rest of your life that you're ordained.

And here, the extension is to the extent of causing an abortion. So, certainly a monastic cannot perform an abortion, nor can they advise someone to do an abortion. Now that raises all kinds of questions and controversy and anxiety and a lot of people with this issue of abortion. It's very interesting that we have abortion as a major theme for our location here at IMC you become if you drive by our center on Thursday or Friday morning between nine and 11. Maybe you're in for quite a sight because there's anti abortion protesters lining up around the corner here because Planned Parenthood is across the street. So does this mean that Buddhism's against abortion? It's a little bit hard to extrapolate from that, but what is very what what what, what it literally says is a person's monastic monastic person cannot be engaged in that kind of activity. How does that apply then to laypeople? And this is my suggestion. Is that how to extrapolate from will say this, the Buddha did not have a lot to say about les ethics. It's kind of like this, that the impression they get from the sutras is the Buddha didn't feel that it was his place to go around, preaching to people and telling people how they should live their life and what they should do. You didn't go around kind of making these blanket statements, no, thou shalt live this way whatever. He was mostly interested in talking to people who came to him and ask them questions about how they weren't how they should live their lives. And the people who are deemed as monks or nuns, they're very clearly kind of putting themselves under his direction in a very complete way. Because for the purposes of attaining liberation in this lifetime and so a lot of the way of life a lot of the rules the way monastics live was to create the proper Foundation, the proper, proper conditions, so they can live a life that is most conducive towards attaining liberation in this lifetime. So for someone so another way of understanding this is that for people who are quite serious in their spiritual practice, it's imperative to try to live a harmless life. So here, lay people so the Buddha did say a lot about lay people, they can live their life the way they want. And, and but if the layperson comes to the Buddha and says, you know, this is how, you know, I want to take refuge in the Buddha, I want to be protected by the teachings of the Buddha, I want to kind of align myself with those teachings, but they're not really interested in liberation, then the Buddha would say Okay, in that case, if you want to be take the refuges, then you have to live by the five precepts. But if a lay person is a serious about, about
attending liberation as a monastic, then I think there's a higher threshold of ethics, that the person that is least needs to live by. and what I've seen in some light, people who practice is that that threshold of their ethical life slowly increases over the years. It's not necessarily something you have to kind of automatically assume you have to do live up to, but rather as a person practice deepens, there seems to be almost a natural inclination or wish inspiration to live a more ethical life and so it kind of goes you know hand in hand as a practice deepens a person's a spark a little more ethical life so it's not a burden necessarily don't feel like you're in conflict yourself or struggling in some too much of a dramatic way. Um

I was a little boy told me recently was back east visiting people and a boy told me Oh, in my uncle's house, they kill insects, but in our household, we carry them outside. And he was very, he was very happy with that. Lovely that's some kid would say that growing up there. Deer that you know, our household we don't kill, we take care of things outside. So why is it? Do you think that the Buddha would put such a premium on non harming, and the extension of non harming, not killing, not killing is an absolute rule. And in fact for the layperson, people, those who take the five precepts, it says, For the purposes of training, there's not an absolute commandment. But if you're interested in spiritual training that the Buddha offers for that purpose, do not kill. And there's no exception to that. According to the Buddha, a lot of people will have exceptions for themselves. And a lot of Buddhists will have exceptions to themselves in various ways. I mean, one one, maybe very unsatisfying exception to that we gave one example. I think it's in maybe in Nepal. Buddhists are not supposed to kill, but they would you know, farmers, local people would kill the sheep in order to have meat for the table and stuff. And so they had a system where sometimes where they would have this wall compound, the wall was quite small area that wall was quite high. And they would people, few people gather around outside with stones to throw stones over the wall and on top of the sheep. So they've never so you never know who is killing him. Because you know, you weren't, you weren't actually trying to kill you is throwing a stone over and one of the stones would kill, but you know, maybe it wasn't yours. Yours it was, you know, your neighbors. So it's very unsatisfying, right? And more satisfying when also from Nepal, is the if you go you go to Nepal, you actually see, at least I still think still today when I was there. You can see she thinks sacramentally sacrificed, you know, just on the street there because it's part of Hindu ritual tradition. And you have these big stones and they slit the throat and the Bloods all over and it's kind of gory. And, and apparently they have these Fest, this festival in Nepal. That big kind of a big kind of affair but part of this festival is everyone's slaughters a sheep. And but there's also the new worries or population of Buddhists in Kathmandu. And so they participate in this annual festival. But what they do is they really gruesome about this and they do it on their, on their doorstep in front of their house. They get a they get a you know, big hatchet and knife and then they get a watermelon and they slaughter the watermelon. And so the lid red and all the juice kind of drips out in the stems. And that's the way they participate in this kind of, you know, national thing. So that was very nice.

So what do you think? What are your reflections now? And why do you what are your thoughts about why non harming is such a central principle in Buddhism, teachings of the Buddha and why non killing
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should be bumped up not just to be a principle but also to be kind of a very, very heavy rule for the monastics. Yes.

Yeah, there is there seems to I don't know, I don't understand this, too well, but there seems to be one little minor exception, where suicide is not condoned. But allowed, and this is with that monk was at already finished this practice. He was fully enlightened. And he being and being so sick. And in that situation it was you know, I guess it's euthanasia was was okay. But no one's supposed to encourage him to do that. Yes, animals are very serious by some other cause and probably never going to be the first animal it would be for a monastic. And, and then the question is, you know, how do you extrapolate that to a lay person, the rule is not to kill. And this is where there's a very, there's a very interesting contrast between kind of the early Buddhist teachings and what still continues in Theravada Buddhism and what developed in the Mahayana. The early Buddhist tradition tended to be quite strict about this, this rule that, you know, no killing no matter what, in the Mahayana there, the rosy idea that because of compassionate concern for the other person, there might be situations where it's for the welfare of the other, or some kind of provide some welfare for the world to be involved in in breaking a precept like this. And it isn't it isn't that it's it isn't that the precept is suspended. However, the person understands that there's a greater good being created, perhaps buy something like that. And so it takes more extreme forms. For example, if they talk about some of the Mahayana texts, that if there's some really terrible desk bot, who is, you know, killing people left and right and causing a lot of damage, then is it can that if a monk has access to that spot, do they have it's okay to kill them. And Mahayana which some people in so some, some some that's just not universal in the Mahayana even but you find some Mahayana thinkers who would say, well in that situation, out of compassion for all the people that can be saved, because that desperate is killed, they can't kill any more people that it's you should kill that person. But the consequence of that for the monastic is that monk or nun Will you know, according to traditional kind of mythology of rebirth, that person will be will be rebirth will be reborn in hell for a while. So, there are consequences of that you don't mitigate the consequences of those kinds of actions. So that's something you know, that's just very interesting issue that you raised then in this divide in the Buddhist tradition between those people who see these rules as being absolutely absolute, and those people who are mitigate the rules and principles because sometimes concern of compassion. The word Ahimsa has himself means to injured harm, and amin is not, but often in Pali, when there's a negative with all in front of it, it has a different connotation than our English, which is the absence of the absence of harming non harming. It often implies the positive corollary the positive virtue, so that it said that himsa is often equated with compassion, the expression of a him}s
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compassion, it's not doing nothing. So, then the question is, you know, what, what, what, what, how do we live our life? What motivations Do we have, if if compassion is a primary principle, and this is a big, big debate in Buddhism? Yes.

just wondered listening to it about not harming and not killing.

So the issue of diet and vegetarian, again, there's also a divide in, in Buddhism around this topic in, in the, in the Pali tradition where the Buddha was teachings of the Buddha. He had a cousin named devadata, who was kind of considered to be a bad person kind of evil devil. And he did things he tried to kill the Buddha for example, various times, and he was a monk and he was trying to kind of basically wanted to kind of power play you want to take over the order kind of bump his cousin aside, or his uncle aside or something and take over and, and he had various strategies for doing that. But one of the strategies he was he thought, Oh, well, I'm gonna I'm going to ordain stricter rules and the Buddha has ordained for the monks. And if people see that I'm much purer than the Buddha and then I'll All the disciples of the Buddha and all the way like followers will come over to me because I'm computer and one of the rules he tried to instigate was the idea that no eating of meat and much more pure teaching of non harm non harming. What the Buddha said about it for the monastics he didn't say much, as far as I know, all for lay people. But what he said for monastics, is he said, monastics are not allowed to eat meat. If the animal if they know the animal is killed for their sake. But you can imagine these monastics are going around India, with their bowls, and they can only eat what's offered to them. And then people don't even know they're coming down, you know, because they're wandering around. And people are cooking the food, they're cooking in their own homes. And so people are cooking meat, and they don't want you know, cooking the meat for the monastic but the monastic happens to walk down the street is Oh, wait a minute. Let me let me share with you some of my family's food. I have my table here. And so they plop the food in the bowl, and some of that food is the meat. So they're supposed to eat whatever is offered to them, unless that meat is knowingly been killed for them. When you get to places like later in India, after the early tradition, there were some Buddhist orders that then ruled that the monastics should be should be vegetarian. And some of that then traveled into China. And you find in China and Japan and even in China, Korea and Japan, that there's a very strong strict rule about not eating meat. In Japan, Japanese monastery were trained in there was never any meat cooked in the monastery. But the monks were not vegetarian. So what happened there was sometimes the monastery was given cooked food, because the monks would go out into the community and people would offer food and bring the cooked food back, and if there was meat, we would eat that meat. And then once we had a backpack that was not that great hiking trip up into the mountains away from the monastery, and, and then we had a barbecue because we wanted to because we weren't, you know, at the monastery anymore, so the rules didn't apply. And it Chinese monks sent to you much stricter about this, you know, no meat. When I was in the monastery in Burma, I served a lot of pork, and in bowls and you know, covered with oil, everything was an oil and lots of oil. And it was always pork. And most of the Westerners didn't eat the meat. They're most you know, most of the Western practitioners that I encounter in Asia were vegetarian. And some of them stopped being vegetarian because it was so hard to get proper nourishment unless you ate something
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besides just rice. And there's all this pork being served And there's a huge monastery, sometimes there are 5000 people there, but there were, you know, hundreds of monks and nuns. And so I went to the abbot one day and tried to explain to him the economics of supply and demand. And you know, the monastery, some lay person, the monitor would go out into the market to the butchers and buy all this pork and bring it back, and then cook it there and serve. So the minette monks were involved in buying it, but I said, Look, you know, you guys buy so many pounds of pork, that probably, you know, the people in the market, they're planning for you're coming to buy. And so if you didn't, if they if you weren't going to buy if you were vegetarian, probably fewer pigs would be killed. Because there wouldn't be such a big demand because you're, you know, you're a big source of the demand here. And maybe I didn't explain it very well, but he couldn't he didn't have a clue what I was talking about.

Well, there's some other issues as well. But what about

and then there's the example of the Samurai in Japan, who follows the

shooter.

And, presumably So, no more

liberated, at least in some fashion. There's some evidence of that.

So those are issues.

On the other hand, if you kill a person, you're depriving them of the opportunity, perhaps the private, the opportunity to be.

Yeah, and so certainly one of the reasons to to to oppose capital punishment is because you deny the person that opportunity for some radical transformation. In the issue of Bushido and samurais, and that whole thing, in addition to that there were in Japan, monks kind of a category of monks that were warriors were fighters. And often they would be. sometimes they'd fight other other monasteries and do various things. And, and you find it, you know, you find different different Asian Buddhist countries, you find occasionally phenomenon of warrior monks. And you find in Thailand in the 1970s 60s, famous monk who said that, you know, to kill a communist was not breaking the precept. And so you find, you know, all kinds, it's your, it's your long call, so, you find some, you know, so you mean, so what you find is, you know, difference between, for example, principle and teachings and how it's understood and applied by different people, and generally, Buddhists overall I think had benefited A lot compared to what some other examples we can think of in religions. But, but you should you shouldn't idealize Buddhism too greatly, because there are, you know, currents in Buddhism that haven't been as dedicated to pieces. I think the Buddha was emphasizing.
Some people would say the kind of the warrior monk model, or the Bushido Samurai model, is a perversion of the teachings of Buddhism, and are they really enlightened? Do they have some experience of enlightenment? Maybe. Maybe they have something maybe there’s some kind of initial first stage of enlightenment before they’re really transformed, purified completely. But more likely, I think what happened to the kind of Zen inspired Bushido and kind of movement was that they developed powerful concentration, and that path of concentration, sometimes mistaken for enlightenment, but there isn’t a really deep transport transformation that happens. And with that concentrate one of the dangers of having a very strong concentrated state and then is yoked with idealism or arrogance or conceit is that a lot of damage can be done because the person is so confident in themselves.

Death reasons The bed is such a practice of violence.

Before Buddhism went into very violent culture, very warring culture, and it was working in the example of King Ashoka was a warrior came in

as a lay plot practitioner, I have a I have a lot of conflict with this with this issue and has to do only with boundaries My household in my garden when I can take it outside of that I have no problem at all trying with great intention to kill. But in that confines, I do have conflicts with it. And I don't know what to do. I do everything I can to try to make my home not not hospitable to add some to spiders. That's sort of my issue, maybe go for some garden, but I don't have a good way inside of me

with this issue, so I'm in conflict with

good. You have a question. Nice. It was nice. It was nice report. I appreciate it.

It's very common when I when talks are given on the first precept of killing people to ask about, you know, People don't people are supportive of the idea in some ways. And then when they weren’t one of the places people struggle with it kind of the immediacy of their life, because most of you here I don't think are involved in killing other people and neighbors and things. And so is that that's not really so relevant, and you're not butchers and so, but it comes to play, you know, with render house, like you said, you know, the insects and gophers and things. And my own kind of my own attitude towards answering those kinds of questions, is to say that I'm very, very appreciative of people who have the concern to be engaged in these questions to our generation are just kind of blowing off just kill the gopher kill the insects, but really engaged is there is there an alternative or some other way of doing it and exploring and really working with that and concerned with that, and, and, and I really encourage people to kind of keep that kind of line of inquiry going and don't just take the lazy way out. But We know what you're gonna decide to do. I don't know, I know sometimes I've weighed myself for myself, I've weighed the, the consequences in both directions. And sometimes it seems to be a greater loss you know, if termites can destroy my house, and I'm supposed to be there, you know, take care of you
know, you know, creating a healthy environment for my kids to grow up in you know, maybe I'm destroying something else. So I'll be I'll try everything I can to try to find alternative ways so where I live now we have a lot of ants that come periodic Lee. And in my first move, there was much more concerned about ants and all now just answer there. And we mostly I would sweep them up and take them outside. And, but I didn't feel so good about that. Because, you know, if you swipe them outside away from where they're coming from, it's kind of like, isn't it kinda like death for an end? Because then probably have their little colony off on their own. It's like, you know, it's kind of like that's it, right. So it was kind of just kind of not such seems like not ideal. So we do all the things, you know, keep trying to keep everything clean, you know, everything tried to everything and try various things to keep them at bay, and it works pretty well. But what we come to mostly is in, we do all those things, so it's not too bad. And then we should live with them. It's okay to have ants in your ants in the kitchen floor, if you're answering the counter and they're kind of going exploring a little bit here and there. It doesn't seem to be a problem. You know, why should you know why shouldn't they have rights to the house as much as I do? You know, they can't shouldn't invite all their friends. But you know, so that we don't have this coexistence going on. What? We don't have termites as far as I know, so don't don't have the face that Some years ago,

terabytes and terabytes

also coexisting with them is a good thing. Yeah.

Really want to get rid of them?

So I wanted to relate to your story from this the middle length discourses of the Buddha. It's in discourse eight. And I'll try to be brief about it. There is a monk goes to the Buddha and says something like this, that so somebody who is relatively new to their practice, who doesn't have very Deep practice yet? Could it be that they have? Very short tend? Could it be that they've liberated themselves from wrong view? And the Buddha says, Well, if it doesn't say yes or no, he says, if they could have, if, if they have learned that if they can see, with insight, if they see directly the empirical evidence upon which we build our worldviews from. If you look at that empirical evidence and really see it with insight, then that person would be free from all kinds of wrong views. And the idea behind the story is that this monk was concerned about new meditators who had a certain level of attainment, but hadn't really gone very deep in their practice, but because a certain kind of initial initial initial kind of level of attainment hadn't gotten conceited and thought that they had really attained a lot. They were really hot stuff. So he goes to the board and says, you know, these really these guys really as hot as they're supposed to be? And the Buddha doesn't say yes or no, if they've if they have insight, then they're as hard as they say they're, if they've
inside, then they're done with that be done. And so the concern is that about, you know, people have overestimated their attainment. So that's just kind of introduction to it. And then the Buddha seems to continue the discussion, taking it a new direction. Anyway, he goes on and says, oh, there are other people who overestimate the value of their attainment. And then he goes through and he lists all the eight to jhanas, all the eight absorptions and which are very important in the teachings of the Buddha, retaining these levels of deep concentration. So he's not gonna he's not pulling their importance, but he's pointing that person can get easily get wrong conclusion based on these things over and over. Over value, overestimate their attainment, or the value of these experiences. And he defines each of these eight deep concentrations practices as providing a person with pleasant abiding now. And that's not to be knocked. So, being at ease, being happy being at peace in here now. But learning how to be deeply at peace here now as a function of concentration, does it involve does not involve a transformation of our inner core of who we are the inner tendencies in your inner workings of who we are. And there's no there's no refinement or polishing of the character or changing this. And then, so, then this is what it says, but this itself does not provide with this transformation. And then he goes through and he shows this is how transformation occurs. And it goes to 44. I'm not gonna read all of them. This is how transformation should be practiced by you, others

will be cruel,

we shall not be cruel here. Thus transformation should be practiced, and the word for cruel is himself. And so maybe a better translation would be non harming, cruel being any kind of attempt to harm anybody else any motivation. Then, but then it goes on to say others will kill living beings, we should abstain from killing living beings here. This is transformation. And then he goes through a whole bunch of things and he thinks like, others will be envious others will be fraudulent, others will be deceitful, others will be resentful, others will be difficult to admonish. Others will be negligent, others will have will be lazy and We here don't do that we are trained ourselves to be inclined ourselves. We work on ourselves, we do the difficult practice of trying to change this aspect of who we are. And the first one is listed is himself. And the commentary says that's because everything else, all the other virtues follow on the foundations of being harmless. And so to tie these two together, that it's one thing to attain some level of calm or peace or ease, or even insight in meditation practice itself is a whole other aspect of practice, is to use that as a foundation to look at our lives and see where can we incline our lives, to transformation to change our character, refine ourselves, the word that I'm translating is transformation. In Thai, it's translated as polish. to polish a person to polish Polish was character something. So to actually take something on it work on oneself Not just relying meditation is this magic, you know, stone that's going to, you know, magically transform you into, you know, a more enlightened for your person, but you actually engage in certain virtues certain principles and you grapple with them, you work with them, you try to incline your mind in that direction. And the last thing I'll say is that the state of mind that is inclined not to harm the state of mind that is motivated by non harming is a very, very peaceful state of mind. And I would argue or my experiences that long as a peaceful, which it's very, very deeply satisfying. It's very closely related to the most deep satisfaction the person can have, when they're centered home at peace with themselves. So one of the reasons
for the practice of non harming for the virtue of the principle of non harming is to support and enhance the possibility of us individually discovering this very deep level of peace and satisfaction. As we live our lives. So I hope that you have some sense that how the mindfulness practice can help in this, in this regard to use the meditation practice, both for insight, but also as a foundation from which to then study more carefully some of these questions, and for example, the answer to your question, you know, when you're going across the line, you know, get some kind of poison, for example, and I'd bet that you'd answer that question differently, depending on whether you came out of meditation. Or whether you'd spent this really frantic day you know, at the DMV and nothing works and long lines and it's hot and you've come home and oh, my God, you know, you're we make decisions we make the moral decisions we make is very much conditioned by the state of our mind to begin with. And so if you if you cultivate a really good state of mind, you probably find yourself making different decisions. Then if you make decisions, you know, when you're angry and things like that. So thank you all very much.