

2001-11-05: Harmlessness

Thu, 6/18 12:20PM • 45:20

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

monk, intention, harmless, precepts, harm, killing, person, buddhism, welfare, life, buddha, people, living beings, monastics, heart, hitting, rationales, world, buddhist, psyche

SPEAKERS

Gil Fronsdal

Okay. There was an ancient Buddhist text or there's an ancient Buddhist text, called the Milinda Pañha the questions of Milinda and Melinda is the Pali pronunciation of Menander. Menander was a Greek King, who ruled what is now Afghanistan, parts of Pakistan, in northern India, about the second century BC and he questioned a senior Buddhist monk on the Dharma on Buddhism. This is wonderful contact of a Greek person, a Greek thinker, Greek cultural person, and Buddhism and these questions and answer session and in and z asked all kinds of actually two big volumes translate into English the records of this conversation they had. And in course of this conversation, the monk tells King moneylender, that the distinguishing characteristic of the Dharma or of the Buddha Dharma Buddhism, the distinguishing characteristic is non harming. That that which distinguish it or that which is the main characterizing aspect of the don't when is the Dharma. Dharma doesn't have to be Buddhist Dharma, but of the Dharma, of the truth of the way things are, the law is non harming. And it's one of the idea of non harming is one of the fundamental principles of Buddhism. It's a central tenant, the central approach to how to live a life is to live a life of not harming and being harmless. And this focus and being harmless, then it you know, has has priority over, for example, meditation practice, that it's understood that if you want to practice meditation, you want to begin by trying to arrange your life in such a way that you're beginning to live in a way that's harmless, that you're not causing harm. And there can be degrees of causing harm and so maybe initially start at the biggest levels. For laypeople for the Buddhist lady, there are five precepts, that they're instructed to follow the cross training precepts. If your intention is to become liberated, if your intention is to clarify your heart, develop your heart to be free. That you need to come debate and develop the five precepts. And these five precepts are often understood to be expressions of non harming, and they are, not to kill, not to take what is not given, not to be involved in sexual misconduct, not to lie, and not to either a little bit ambiguous how the policy is worded, but either don't take any and toxic intoxicants, or don't take any intoxicants to the point of intoxication. And exactly how it's supposed to be interpreted as little bit slightly ambiguous. The

goal, traditionally, of Buddhist practice, is to become a noble one. A person of nobility is the ancient Buddhist word for someone who has attained the stages of awakening liberation has become a noble person noble one. And in defining a noble one many definitions of what makes a noble person a noble one. But here this is one very simple definition. One is not a noble one who harms living beings, by being harmless to all living beings, is one called a noble one. So, what I'm trying to stress here is the, in the Buddhist tradition, there is a central role for the desire the wish, the lifestyle, where a person is living a harmless way, trying to be harmless. The Buddha said what is the right intention? And he defined three intentions the right intentions, the second step in the Eightfold Path, intention, intention on renunciation, on freedom from ill will and on harmlessness renunciation is one of the very important principles of ancient Indian Buddhism. Whether you mean it more literally or not, there's a whole question we can explore. But of these three things, harmlessness is one of them.

And how this is going for householders for the laity, and how householders, are there three kinds of bodily conduct, not in accordance with the Dharma. Here someone kills living beings is murderous, bloody handed, given to blows and violence, merciless to living beings. Here someone takes what is not given. Here, someone engages in sexual misconduct. So these three things are considered very important for someone engaged in Buddhist practice not to be involved in killing, stealing or sexual misconduct. All forms of attempting to live a harmless life. Life doesn't cause harm. The emphasis on living a harmless life then becomes much more accentuated and much more emphasized. For the monastics the monks and nuns in the Buddhist tradition. The Buddha in a sense, saw the monastics as people who were organizing their whole life specifically in totally on the task of becoming liberated. And so, then he put much more emphasis on what you needed to do in order to attain that goal. And this is the stated a little bit more relaxed discourse, and how is a monk perfected in morality. abandoning the taking of life, he dwells refraining from taking life without stick or sword, scrupulous, compassionate, trembling for the wealthy. of all living beings. And then similarly same almost the same wording is used for not not stealing and for monks rather than sexual misconduct, the precept for monks is one of chastity of celibacy. And I love this expression trembling for the welfare of all living beings, that the intention to be harmless and not to kill Coco's together with a kind of, I don't know what is actually the best thing was translation of the Pali but it comes together with this, something passionate, something strong, some strong, quivering, movement of the heart, that is concerned for the welfare of all living beings. That is, I desire to be harmless is not just simply for one's own benefit, but it arises out of being very keenly concerned about the benefits for the people around you for the beings around you. So then in a morally legalistic language, that Buddhist monastics have to follow a house series of rules of precepts for the monks is 227 precepts. The first four are the most grave most serious. If a person breaks any of these first four, they are then automatically no longer a monk. You don't have to know that you'd have to go through it. You don't have to go through any kind of formal procedures like legalistic procedures, just these kinds, like it's the way nature works. If you do one of these things, you just, you know, you're not a monk anymore, and you can never be a monk again in this lifetime. So it's quite serious. So in a second, I think it's the third, the third of these four primary precepts for the monks goes like this. Should any monk intentionally deprive a human being of life, or search for an assassin, or praise the advantages of death or incite someone to die, thus, good person

But uses this wretched miserable life to you. Death would be better for you than life. With such an idea in mind should in various ways praise the advantages of death or incite him to die. That monk is defeated and is no longer in communion. And then the sub commentary of this defines human life is beginning from the first time consciousness for the time first of consciousness first becomes manifest in the mother's womb. So this is usually taken by monastics that they are not allowed to be have any kind of involvement with abortions or encouraging abortions or somehow any kind of way. So this is this is, you know, very absolute no involvement with killing even indirectly. It goes beyond human beings. It's not as grave it's real 61 And you don't get automatically expelled from the order. You have to if you break this one you have to confess. And then there might be some thing you have to do with motoman you have to do well, maybe not. But rule 61 for monastics is should any monk knowingly deprive an animal of life,

it is to be confessed. So this means, in a sense that monastics are not allowed to kill animals. Rule 62 should any monk knowingly make use of water with living beings in it? It is to be confessed. So here are the if you if you know there's an insect or anything living in the water, you're drinking, you can't drink it. The emphasis and being harmless goes to that extent you have to be very, you're trying your best not to knowingly be involved in the death or causing the death of any living being at all, even something very, very small that exists in the water. And so some Buddhist monks in the old days used to have these filters this cloth, they would pour the water through the cloth. And just to siphon, sift, sift off the insects, and then they would drink the water. Probably in ancient India, the water was not always so clean. And this is from the instructions to every new monk. There's certain things that catechism I guess, right, that a monk who has been accepted as a monk should not deprive a living being of life, even if it is only a black or white at any monka purposely deprives a human being of life, even to the extent of causing an abortion is not a monk is not a son of the Buddha. Just as a solid block of stone broken into cannot be joined together grant again. In the same way a monk who has purposely deprived the human being of life is not a contemplative, not a sign of the Buddha, you are not to do this for the rest of your life. So, very, very, very emphatic please. No killing, no killing, no killing, that central to practicing Dharma central to engaging in this path of liberation is to be harmless to the extent of not being involved in killing. For the monastics it's stated much more seriously much more definitively, buildings for the laity. So then the question is, also for the monastics and he goes further than even little beings in the water, monastics are also not allowed to kill plants. And so they're not actually not supposed to be involved in gardening or farming. Because if you might do as you're tilling the soil, you might destroy some of the insects in the soil. But or you might have to pull the plant out of the ground, you're killing the plant. And if you're going to offer a tomato, to a monastic, before you can properly offer the tomato to monastic, you have to take a fork or a knife and poke it so that it's already dead by the time you offer it. Because the tomato kind of living, right, so because a monk is not allowed to eat it if it's living plant, because that's kills it. So they're pretty serious about this pretty serious, but this business of being harmless. So then the question is, are there limits to how far we should go in being harmless? Are there times when we should maybe be involved in causing harm or there, for example, in our own self defense, or in the defense of our home from termites Is there a limit to When, to this precept of being harmless? If you look at this issue, it's it's often contrasted with the

Buddhist notion of harmlessness is contrasted with the notion of the Jains, the Buddhists and the Jain religion of ancient India. We're contemporary religions of each other. And both of them have been pointed to as being exemplars of this emphasis on a himsa on being harmless of being non violent. And one of the reasons I wanted to give this talk tonight is that it's quite it's, it's what if you're looking for resources or understanding from the religious world for some understanding or some dedication or some model somewhere in the world for people who organize their life about being harmless. Buddhism is one of those places, and it goes back for 2500 years. The Jains also with that way, but the giants are a little bit different understanding the Buddhists, for the giants, any killing at all, was not allowed for the Buddhists on only killing, which were you intended, the killing is not allowed.

So the difference so the Giants will go out of their way with great kind of almost a kind of ascetic practice level. Try to avoid making absolutely sure nothing is killed by them. And they'd be they go, they go walking around with this broom in front of them, to make sure there's no insects in the ground in front of them sweeping out of the way so they don't step on them. For the Buddhists, they didn't go to that extreme, even though they did filter the water. But if the basic idea in Buddhism is that you have if, if, if you had no intention to kill, then you haven't violated your precept to be harmless. Even though you should try Not to avoid accidental killing. The focus in Buddhism is on the intention versus Jainism as much more absolute any any action at all that caused harm. But are there limits to how much how far we should be harmless? I was a little bit surprised to realize only a few weeks ago that the five precepts would lay it. Not to kill, not to steal, not to lie, not to be involved in sexual misconduct, and no intoxication. says nothing about hitting someone. You can kill them. But what about you know, just punching the guy out? I kind of always assumed that hitting was you know, as bad as anything else. You won't hit anyone. If you're a Buddhist prayer, you know serious about Buddhist Buddhism. You to refrain from that and hormones went to the point of being avoiding hitting someone. But if you look at the precepts that lay it you're supposed to follow. There's no rule preventing a lay Buddhist from hitting someone. So now you want to kind of it'll be further away from everyone. Make sure that you're on friendly terms. So what does that mean? If anything?

So this is rule 74 and 75 for Buddhist monastics.

And it says, should any monk angered and displeased give a blow to another monk. It is to be confessed. So the operating important terms here is angered and displeased. So if you hit someone in your anger angry and displeased, you've violated your precepts as a Buddhist monk. What about if you're quite not angry? If there's no anger, no displeasure in your heart in your mind, there's no then you're not violating the precept because it says specifically if you're angry or displeased. So now when you get close to a Buddhist monk, you want to make sure that

so then an explanation of this, in the canon, of so called sacred explanation is that it states that it is a wrongdoing that needs to be confessed. To hit or to also hit any honorary Being including animals, if the monk is angered or displeased, so the rule just says you can't monk can't hit another monk. They

said 20 227 rules say nothing about a monk hitting a lay person. But then the excellent explanation says you have to also avoid hitting even animals, let alone late people. In addition, it explicitly states that it is not an offense to hit someone in self defense, if one is not angry or displeased. Now is that possible? And, and the assumption is that there are times when that will happen. There are times when maybe you you know someone's about to give you a blow and you bring up your hand and knock it out of the way. You do something to protect yourself. And you know, you're not angry at the person you're not intending harm to the person. You're simply trying to protect yourself. From being harmed, and that is allowed. Now for monastics they're explicitly not allowed to have weapons or to handle weapons. So the argument that there's justify forms of self defense does is not extended, then, you know, you you get, you get to have the bomb, that you get to have some kind of weapon to do some kind of, you know, major kind of, you can use your hand your body, but you can't do use anything more. So, it's, it's a, also it certainly allows for kind of the reflex, you know, Sony striking out as a reflex if you're being attacked, and it's not an offence to do that. So are there times when we are not angered or displeased, where we might want to hit during hitting becomes appropriate. There's some ambiguity then. So so taking that example of the monks, then you go back to the five precepts for the laity. Maybe the reason why you not hitting is not included in it is that it's ambiguous about. It's not an absolute precept. There are times perhaps from his early Buddhist tradition, where it's not disallows, I considered wrong to be hitting someone. However, it seems to say that you should not do it in anger, or displeasure, there should be no intention of ill will, as part of that action. Can that be done? Do we know how to do that?

The focus here, also, again, is the intention with which we're doing something. And this is something we find emphasized in Buddhism over and over again, that the intention the motivation behind our actions, is really defining what defines the morality of the action? So, part of mindfulness practice is to encourage us to look back, why are you doing What's the motivation here? If you want to do X, why do you want to do X? You want to do it because you're filled with greed. You want to do it because you're filled with hate and you want to strike out. You want to do it because you want to harm somebody. You want to do it because you want to help someone, you're concerned about their welfare. What is the intention behind it. And what we often can see is that sometimes what looks like a beneficial act can actually have unwholesome intentions behind it. You want to help your neighbor who's sick and that seemingly in the surface is a very nice thing to do. But really while you're helping a neighbor is you think if you help the neighbor now then the neighbor is going to give you some of their wonderful apple pie next time they make it. And really, you know, you want something returned you want or you want to show off to all the other neighbors. What a great some, some, some neighbor you are and And really has to do but self aggrandizement more than helping if you really pay attention to the intention behind it.

I remember when I was visiting Arjun Amaro in his monastery. I don't know if this is really his story. He went up there with a whole bunch of people and we all brought all these food dish offerings, because often you do it to go to a monastery, you bring food, because monastics don't have their own food in a sense, and you have to kind of feed them. And so everyone else in my group brought with them,

offerings for the lunch for that day. And it was very nice as a weekend. I knew the monks get a lot of food in the weekends, and when people visit them, but during during the week, they don't get a lot of visitors. So what I did was I brought all this dry goods that Wasn't cooked or ready to be eaten right then and there, but it was could be eaten during the week that they couldn't take care of them later. So it was kind of nice thought I thought I went ahead and did that and seemed fine. And but what I didn't know, was that the custom algeron was monitoring is when they monks are going to eat their meal. As it's being the food is being delivered to them, they announce who has offered the particular dishes. And so on so brought, brought this so and so brought this, after a while, became obvious that Gail hadn't brought anything and I could find feel myself, you know, inside of myself feeling this great impulse, you know, you know, I gotta raise my hand, say, Excuse me, you know, you know, I brought something to and so it wasn't simply the intention. Somehow I didn't just simply have the intention to make an offering but in context of that ritual of announcing who was making the offering, my ego got involved and how I appeared and my reputation, got all kinds all tied up in it. So the intention becomes important. And one of the reasons why harmlessness as a fundamental precepts in Buddhism, is that the intention to cause harm is detrimental to you detrimental to the person has that intention, that the effects of our intentions are consequential, that if you intend to do something that that kind of puts a kind of flavor or kind of perfumes or puts a little twist or kind of puts a little spin, maybe it's best to put a spin on your psyche. On your karma is what they usually say, on your psyche. And it might seem very innocent or very minor what you're doing the intention, but with enough drops the bathtub is filled. And if we repeat the same little kind of intention, you know, to say okay to exaggerate and to lie, and maybe you know to do it once doesn't really make much of a spin. But to do it a little bit, you know, every five minutes or 10 minutes, it adds up over time over a day, over a lifetime. That our intentions create a spin that can either be detrimental to ourselves to our psyche, its well being or can be supportive of it, and before our welfare, and to help us create conditions where our psyche is becomes healthy is one of the functions of Buddhist practice and to avoid creating a psyche, which is unhealthy. And so looking at your intentions is fundamental to this. So one of the reasons rationales for being harmless is not because it doesn't cause harm to other people, but the intention to cause harm creates an unhealthy psychic environment within yourself. And if you're interested in becoming doing the work of liberation, you have to try to create as much health as you can within yourself, whatever way you can. Another reason for motivation for rationale for the harmlessness has to do with empathy. And the Buddha stress that it's very important to put yourself in other people's shoes. That if you put yourself in other people's shoes, then naturally you wouldn't want to cause them harm. And the way that this is stated in the discourses of the Buddha, just like this, this is a very famous quotation that gets quoted as being the reference for this kind of empathy being the source of desire to be harmless. All tremble at violence, all fear death, have been having likened others to yourself. Don't kill or cause others to kill, all tremble that violence, life is dear to all, having likened others to yourself, don't kill or cause others to kill.

So the act of the exercise the use of your imagination, because empathy requires imagination, the use of our ability to put ourselves in other people's shoes is a very important one. Very important quality for Buddhist practitioners. And then to consider the other person so even someone you can think of as

your enemy or think of you have tremendous irritate you, or you're really annoyed by them or something. Try to put yourself in their shoes. Imagine what it's like for them their life and their difficulties and the causes and conditions that came together for who they are. So we don't just write them off, which is often a tendency people do when someone's your enemy or someone who's caused you harm. There's also sometimes a tendency to write them off or to demonize them or project you know, that they're absolutely wrong in some way. But you put Put yourself in their shoes. In a later Buddhist tradition, this kind of teaching was presented as all beings, all living beings that you encounter, at some point in the endless cycle of rebirth have been born and died again dying again. They were the people, you kind of at some point or other, they were your mother, or your father, or your children, or your wife or husband or, you know, some point everybody has been related. And so this intimate connection between everyone means, of course, you wouldn't harm someone who has been was your mother or your father. And if that's actually the case, in some former lifetime, you know, and you treat them with great respect and love and care. So there are two motivations, two rationales in Buddhism for harmlessness. One is that I'm just going to read Repeating this one is that you have intentions of causing harm. That intention harms you. And you don't want to cause harm for yourself. You want to avoid harming yourself. And the second is that if you have some empathy, if your mindfulness and awareness is open enough to sense some sensitive way, the humanity of the person you're encountering, then that that empathy or that sensitivity or the person, you naturally would not want to hurt them. And part of what happens with mindfulness practice is that sensitivity gets developed over time. Often people are not so sensitive, they're kind of going off and callous to each other or we're not paying attention to other people very well or we're living in our thoughts a lot and we don't really encounter the person as they actually are. And as we practice the mindfulness, there's a greater sensitivity to what we encounter. And as it sensitivity tunes into someone else and their well being and their potential for suffering. Bringing harm, there gets born a kind of a natural wish not to wish them harm. So that's the kind of the rationale as I understand the two major rationales for harmlessness in the Buddhist tradition. The focus on intention is so powerful for the Buddha, that

or taking care of your own welfare taking care of your own inner psychic spin is so important that the Buddha said you should not sacrifice your own welfare for the welfare of someone else. So that goes against what a lot of people kind of sacrifice a lot of people will make that they see that some people say there's a greater good out there and my good is nothing in comparison to the greater good. So I'm, you know, I'll sacrifice my own benefit for the world for the sake of this greater good. And that kind of to the extreme example of that people have used that, you know, if you have a chance to kill someone who, by killing them, you prevent the murder of 1000 people, you know, that's going to cause bad karma for yourself that spin on yourself. But you're willing to do that for the sake of the benefit. So that kind of argument, I'm not gonna, I'm not gonna argue against it. But it's very powerful. I think the Buddha in his emphasis on harmlessness and the path towards liberation, stressed, don't give up your own welfare, for the welfare of someone else. That your own welfare is actually very important that the self love, kind of a love of yourself appreciation of yourself is a very important quality. Buddhist practice said you can't really love someone else. Unless you love yourself first. You can't really want the welfare of someone else, if you don't really understand and want your own welfare also. This part

of the reasons for this emphasis is the Buddha was very serious about the possibility of us becoming liberated from the deepest roots, deep, deepest roots of suffering within ourselves. And it's very hard to do that work. And he said, You can't really help someone else point away towards that possibility unless you've attained some degree of this liberation yourself. Instead, it's like someone who if two people are stuck in a maybe quicksand in the mud in quicksand, they can't pull themselves out. One. You know, if you're in quicksand, and the neighbor is in quicksand, you can't you it's very hard to pull each other out. But if one of them's up on the dry land, then they can pull the other person out. And so if you if you avoid your own welfare of these your spiritual welfare, you're not going to have a transformation and the understanding, that's going to have the eyes to see what needs to be done for someone else who's seeking in the mode of samsara, in their suffering. So there's emphasis on being on then the intention, and what goes on inside of us in our hearts is so extreme for so that we have the following. This is kind of like to prepare you for it. It's this is only for adult audience. And it's it's kind of like Reminds me of the Old Testaments story of Job he was tested as we all are these days earlier

says okay Am I going on Am I kind of just sometimes I wonder just talking on and on.

Okay ready monks so he's talking to monk so we're off the hook. Monks, even if hoodlums with a cut off your limbs. If you became hateful towards them, you would not be carrying out my teachings rather you should practice our hearts will be will remain unaffected. We will say nothing evil, we will maintain compassion for that person's well being. We will maintain loving kindness and a heart free of hate. We shall practice defusing the person with our heart filled with loving kindness. After doing this to this person, we will practice a fusing the entire world with our heart filled with immeasurable loving kindness. This is how you should practice how you feel about that someone's chopping off your arms. So you know, we don't want to kind of think too much about this. But the you know what, you know, apparently the monks are allowed to kind of say no, you know, strike out But within the it's very, very powerful language, with the Buddhist pointing to is not the issue of whether you should not defend yourself or whatever. But he's saying, even in such dire circumstance, extreme circumstances, you are not to have a heart, it's filled with hate. If you produce hate, if you develop hate become hateful, then you're not carrying out the Buddhist teachings. Of course, many of us will have ill will and hate, and we're not supposed to kind of be down on ourselves because those things come up. But rather, the focus then of practice is to work with that. And not to take it for granted not to take it as a given. And not to be overwhelmed by that and kind of act on it. But with great compassion and friendliness towards yourself for having it, to work with that and try to free yourselves from any compulsion that comes with that. Those feelings of hate, so you're not acting on it. Try to free yourself of those In a healthy and realistic way, not repression, denial, pushing it away as it's not there, but in some very healthy way, addressing that and trying to purify your heart from that. So the focus again, is on the intention within us, what's the inner psychic life is like. So, is there some ambiguity in the teachings of being harmless? I think that there's no ambiguity. If it has to do with killing, killing is absolutely prohibited prohibited. There might be some ambiguity about what we do in our self defense. But even though there's ambiguity there, in the Buddhist teaching, there's absolutely no ambiguity about what

intention is. That disallows that kind of activity, if there is hate or ill will, as part of the intention for self defense. Then that act of self defense is prohibited.

So the, the responsibility then, always, for Buddhists at least, is to turn the attention of mindfulness back on ourselves in our on our own intentions. So no matter what's happening in the world around us, we have to try to understand it and come to terms with the best we can, but never at the expense of turning away from at least one eye that goes in and notice what's going on inside of me. What are the reactions and feelings? What are the motivations? That's prompting me to say what I'm saying or what's the motivations that prompted me to come up with my particular opinion what has to happen? Or what's the motivation getting me to act in a certain way? Am I trying to harm someone getting back at someone is a revenge. All those are forms of ill will, that then are disallowed. So The attempt then is to try in a healthier way to become someone who's peaceful, filled with love, generosity, calm, to be calm in the midst of crisis. And then from that basis of peace and calm and love and generosity, then to be concerned about what the right and the effective and appropriate responses are, to the world that we find ourselves in, to what's happening. And, and not to sacrifice our own welfare, by our blind compulsion that can lead to hate or to react out of fear, whatever it might be. So in a sense, the first principle for Buddhists is to come back to yourself and find out how can you become a peacemaker by having been having a peaceful heart yourself, and then going forth in the world and the world is an ambiguous Place. So it's not always so clear how we should put you to act in the world. But it's very clear for Buddhists, how they should try to quickly start to cultivate in their own hearts. Last thing I want to say is that the focus on being harmless is a kind of a negative. It's the absence of causing harm. And there's one discourse where someone comes to the Buddha and says, Well, this, it seems to me that if I just refrain from speaking and acting and doing anything that then you know, I've accomplished the purification of heart that's required and I'm liberated. And the Buddha said, if that was the case, then a newborn baby would be fully enlightened. And what I didn't want to allow for that because the latent tendencies towards greed, hate and delusion are buried in the heart of That baby, they haven't done the inner work. And that what's required is not just simply the absence of certain behavior in Buddhist practice, but also what's required is the presence of certain forms of inner cultivation. We develop things like generosity and patience, forbearance, discernment, wisdom, concentration, we develop inner qualities. for ourselves, we try to cultivate ourselves, develop ourselves make ourselves better in a sense. And was also required is to be concerned about the welfare for others, to tremble at the welfare of others. So let's see. I'll end with this.

Monks, a wise person, one of the greatest Wisdom does not intend harm to self. So that's a big one, right? I mean, it's one thing to say be harmless to the world around you. But you have to also do it to yourself. I think for a lot of people, a lot of the ill will and hate and ways in which we suffer is a harm is directed towards yourself, we carve ourselves to a great extent, like all the inner conflicts and inner wars that we have. A wise person does not intend harm to self, intend harm to others, or intend harm to both self for others. Thinking in this way, such a one benefits intense benefit for self benefit for others, benefits for both benefits for the whole world. The US is one wise and have great wisdom. So the encouragement of the Buddha It's not just simply that we should be harmless, and live a life that's

harmless. But we should all live a life which is concerned for the welfare and well being of everyone, ourselves and the world around us. And in fact, I believe that as practice develops, we have no choice for that. But to do that, because as I said earlier, the sensitivity that comes with mindfulness is since its sensitivity, that where it's not possible to exclude from our inner psychic life, our consciousness, the well being of other people. And as we take that into the psyche, then the motivation for the well being of others, becomes as important for us as the well being for ourselves. We don't sacrifice our own being our own well being in order to take care of others. But the two of them go in tandem. We want them both so that was my attempt to present you, one of the world's pre eminent examples of a tradition that stresses the importance of being harmless. May you soar through the ambiguity on your own. Thank you