

2011-02-20 Buddhist Response To Violence

Tue, 8/18 10:51AM • 45:33

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, buddhism, nonviolent resistance, stand, violence, strategy, other cheek, gandhi, egypt, buddhist, opponent, felt, person, burma, evil, external, ethics, mindfulness, power, practice

SPEAKERS

Gil Fronsdal

Last week after the Sunday morning talk, someone who was here told me as preparation for a question. He said that he grew up. His father was a Christian minister. He grew up and he went to seminary. And he was always taught to turn the other cheek. And his mother told him that he never learned to defend himself. And then he said, What is Buddhism think? Christianity says turn the other cheek. What is Buddhism say? So that that was an interesting question. And I don't know much about Christianity and I don't know. I guess the expression turn the other cheek appears. If Good times in the gospels appears, I think in the Sermon on the Mount said right? turn the other cheek, someone strikes you, you turn the other cheek if I think it also says something like if someone steals your cloak, then give them your shirt said right? Something like that. And I also think that in Christianity that expression turn the other cheek has been interpreted different ways by different people. So it's not just one way of understanding it. But at least on the surface, it looks like if someone hits you, it hits you on the on the cheek, that you offer them the other one. And it can be quite a powerful thing to do. Certainly, it's powerful not to retaliate, and not to come from anger, violence yourself, but to stand there and be willing Link to, to receive it. And sometimes it's a very powerful technique strategy to do that. Sometimes it can turn the attackers hearts dramatically around. I was once when I was 21. A friend of mine I had wronged him in a way that deserves what it was coming. But he stormed across this field to me and, and so I knew what was coming. But and you came to fight and so I dropped to one knee and he stormed up to me and said, Who's this up and said let's fight.

And I opened my hands to this my side by palms towards him and I said I can't you know, I'm on my knees right pretty defensive position is not exactly same as turning the cheek but it's like, you know, I'm not gonna fight I'm here, you know, I'm lowering myself here available, you need to do something. And so he picked it around and left in disgust. So anyway, I I was uninjured. And so, you know, sometimes it's gonna be useful strategy get out of trouble. And I don't think it helped him any or me to do that. Maybe you had to help them. Maybe it saved him from the problems that he would have if he had hurt me. So just last week, you know what about this, you notice Buddhism is saying about this. And on the surface, Buddhism would seem to say something similar Some people receive, hear Buddhist teachings as if you're supposed to be very self effacing as if you're not supposed to ever act from anger from violence, and in a sense, sometimes even hear further that you're supposed to Buddhist practice is about being very, very accepting of what is just be present, be accepting how things are. And, and so if things are terrible just sit there and you have no you know, did not self teaching, it means that you don't really count for anything. You're not important for anything you're supposed to let go of your conceit and so you don't really count so you just kind of just sit there and not defend yourself or do anything. And so something like that. Sometimes there's a kind of misunderstanding of Buddhism. Some people who value being invisible value, some idea of that clear that they don't really count. Sometimes like Buddhist teachings because not only that not self thing. Yeah, it's good. You know, I

don't really I'm not really important. But so he asked me last week, you know, what is Buddhist meant to say. And so I said that they were Buddhism teaches, is if someone strikes you, you know on the cheek and the right cheek then you look them right in the eye. You don't turn the other cheek, you don't offer your other cheek, but you also don't strike them back, necessarily. You also don't turn away, but you hold your ground and you'll look at them. And the idea of looking person in the eye. Something very deep happens when people look each other in the eyes or they can happen. And so the idea of kind of really connecting to somebody said, you know, you've you connect someone's soul through their eyes, but you really look and they look into your eyes, and then you engage them in some way. If they can and so it's not the Buddhist way to turn away. It's also not the Buddhist way to attack. But I think it's the Buddhist way to take a stand. But it's a stand does not tense. It's a stand, which is not aggressive. But it's not a stand where you're a pushover. So if someone says, You know, I need to get through you, I need to get by you somehow. And it's an appropriate thing to get by you. So you don't have to hit them. But you don't have to move out of the way either. They have to contend with the fact you're standing there. And that contention, then is where there's a dialogue or a relationship that goes on. So in my first teacher, he said that the Buddha's contribution to humanity, it was a very simple caricature, but Buddhist contribute. The Buddhist contribution to humanity was the importance of meditating. Gandhi's contribution was that it was important where you meditated. And so we had in the early 1980s people who would meditate on the train tracks to, to to the place over there was it where were Chicago over there in the East Bay where they would have this munitions and research things kind of be. And I think going into Livermore lab and so you know, it's one thing to meditate in the privacy of your own bedroom. It's another thing to meditate someplace where the, you know, you're saying, you know, this, this is not acceptable. So

Gandhi's contribution is, where you take a stand is important where you count is important. So this points back to I think, for Buddhists To the idea of, you know, what isn't? What is the inherent dignity and value of a human being? And what is yours? And what do you have a right to do what's appropriate for you. And again, it may be it's a dangerous character, but to compare, which I've done recently few times now, Indian culture as a whole, or Buddhism particular, and then kind of Western culture as a whole, which is kind of dangerous. But Western culture comes out of this very strong Judeo-Christian ethic, you know, Christian philosophy. And there's a number of elements of this Judeo-Christian kind of background, which is conditioned or entered into the popular culture in such a way that people are. Don't consider themselves Jewish or Christian. And maybe atheists still carry some of the mindset that comes out of that background. And one of them is the is the idea that there is some external authority or power that has tremendous role in your life. There's someone who has arbitrated certain rules that commandments. And those commandments come from an external source ethics comes from an external source that you measure yourself against. And there's someone out there who is going to have a very big, it's gonna make some really big decisions about what's going to happen for you for the rest of eternity. And so what this judge is going to say about you is really big. So people who don't believe in that kind of idea anymore, sometimes kind of remnants of that exists where there's a tendency among many Westerners people acculturated here to look towards ethics as being something external, and to look for approval externally, to find out if we're right or wrong. And then you add to that the western individualism such a strong, it's harder and harder for people who are really kind of only Grew up in the West in America from you know, kind of kind of popular culture here, it's hard to hard for them to understand how deeply ingrained Western individualism is, and how, how strong a cultural conditioning uses goes into it. And, and with that comes values of wanting to be unique. And as we want to be unique, then it leads to alienation. Or at least to overdependence, it leads to looking for some kind of even though we've tried to be unique and ourselves. There's some way in being ourselves in a society and a cultural background, where authority is seen outside ethics is seen outside of oneself, it lends towards, towards either kind of succumbing, looking for approval externally, are wanting to be the

authority oneself. So in in In India, they don't have a theistic foundation for the cultural thinking, they have a karmic one. And karma doesn't begin with something external karma begins with you, especially for Buddhism. Karma has to be. So in Christianity, the Bible begins with the beginning there was a god. The Buddhist Bible, in a sense begins, in the beginning there was the mind, your mind, and the mind is a forerunner of all things. And so, ethics in a karma culture or in Buddhism, is not looking externally for validation and for authority, but rather is looking from the starting from the inside and trying to understand what is beneficial and what's, what's harmful, and what's beneficial. What are the things that I can do, that can create bad consequences for me, what things I can do to create good consequences for me. And so the focus is on then it has a very different relationship to ethics. We're and so the tendency in Buddhist cultures is not to look at ethics This is absolute thing, this absolute kind of puritanical kind of idea that this is going to define who I am by right and wrong actions, but rather to look inside what can I do, how can I respond my response is important.

So, what is the response and with a focus on the mind being the beginning, rather than God, I would argue that Buddhism puts a tremendous value on a human life, on each individual person, their own conscience, their own ability to choose for themselves, and, and their own value. And so, Buddhism is not about being self effacing or being kind of meek by any kind of means. The, the language of the early Buddha is language of strength. The word for making effort. The area comes from the word hero. So heroic effort heroic energy. as we as we develop mindfulness, mindfulness is supposed to be developed to a point where it becomes a power. And there's a variety of powers, capacities capabilities we have, they're meant to become powers within us. So the power of mindfulness, the power of viriya, this effort, the power of wisdom, the power of concentrated mind. And, and, you know, rather than being, you know, rather emphasizing being kind of, we relaxed to point of being weak. The emphasis in Buddhism is to be relaxed to the point of being powerful. And so the statue of the Buddha is a statue of someone who's, you know, has certain kind of inner power and dignity sitting up right strong, very present. And so what happens when someone wrongs you? When someone hits you in the rough, you know hits you on the cheek? Are you supposed to then kind of pretend that you don't count? tendency for people who hold back too much, I think that don't count to try to accept it to be patient with it too much is it sometimes it backfires, because attention builds up inside, until finally the person gets to the breaking point and they lash out violently. I have to accept this I have to go along with it. And I don't think so going along with things and being patient with things is necessarily the best strategy for patients in Buddhism. Because remember, the focus is on the mind and Buddhism more than external patients and Buddhism tends to focus much more on patients with yourself. Patients with your own tendency to get angry so that you don't succumb to your anger, but you're not expected to be necessarily patient with the things outside. You're not supposed to be impatient either. But what happens if we come from a place of strength and take a stand? I'm here and you're there. And I'm here to engage you. I'm here to be in dialogue with you. I'm not going to, I'm safe. I'm not going to attack you. I'm not going to yell at you. I'm not going to get angry with you. But I'm also not going to be a pushover, I'm here I count. And, and so the all the emphasis in Buddhism and learning to let go is not to let go. So do you just kind of be okay with anything but to let go of the inhibitions or the fears that get in the way of taking your stand One of the things that prevents taking an effective stand, his conceit is too much of a sense of being individual I count. You're much more effective taking a stand, if we can take a stand without needing to puff up or needing to prove ourselves or needing to have an identity we're trying to defend. We can just be there, open, transparent, present, and engage the person we're with. It's very powerful to do this. And, and I believe this is kind of the foundation for the tremendous examples we've had in the last hundred years in further back as well, of nonviolent resistance and nonviolent struggle that existed and now we see it just most recently in Egypt. That was a phenomenal you know, 30 million people, right? over 60 million people. So huge country with a huge army. And if the people of Egypt had risen up violently against the government, they would have been squashed. But

they weren't they rose up non violently for the most part. And it's quite something. It's brought down a dictator.

And they didn't they took their stand and they, you know, they didn't. The fact that people showed up was what was the most important thing. They showed up at a particular square center of Cairo. And they kept showing up, and then they stood and they stood, you have to listen to us. powerful thing. So I read it, maybe some of you read the New York art New Yorker article from last week about one of the sources of influence for the people in Egypt. And it was a man, American by the name of gene sharp, who has been my youth was one of my heroes because he wrote a Book, a three volume book on the philosophy and I forget what the author was called with the philosophy and strategy or philosophy and technique of nonviolent action. And he earned his PhD on it, and was his professor was professor of political science or something. And, and he studied non violent movements down through the ages. And he said, there's no manual. Most people who successfully or unsuccessfully managed nonviolent resistance to something a struggle, or just doing it intuitively, they pick up little ideas here and there, but there needs to be a manual. So he wrote a manual three volume manual on how this is done the history of it all. And he took and then in the late early 80s, he wrote an 82 page, concise manual, about how to overcome how to deal with it. theatres. And it was that at a two page treatise that was translated into Egyptian Arabic in the people in 2005, who were kind of trying to deal with the government there, realized they had very little hope. And they was casting about for something, some ideas. And they saw that in Serbia, they had been successful movements of non violent action. And so they asked the Serbians they said, Oh, Gene sharp, they said, so then they translated gene sharp, and they got one of his kind of students to come and do some trainings in Egypt for them. And so that was there in the background. So it wasn't just completely spontaneous. uprising, there was thought that went into it among some people. One of the remarkable examples of often brought up as is Martin is talking about Gandhi. And one of the amazing things about Gandhi. many amazing things but in a couple of within a couple of years. years of nonviolent resistance against the against the English this guy and you know it basically walked around India and just you know his diaper you know just the cloth he had so little was treated as an equal by the rulers of the English Empire, you know, he went to England and was met this head of state only, you know, he had no hidden wasn't elected to any position of power. But he took a stand there one of the most powerful stance he took was he went to collect salt interesting took a few few things of salt in his hand and they arrested him and he took a stand, powerful thing to take a stand. And so, Martin Luther King as well, and the whole civil rights movement for people who consciously felt the worth of a human being and said that because we're the value People, you cannot do these things to us. And we're gonna stand here, because we need to change you because we can't accept this anymore. So this is what Martin Luther King said. It must be emphasized that nonviolent resistance is not a method for cowards. It does resist if one uses this method because one is afraid, or merely because one lacks the instruments of violence, when there's not truly non violent. This is why Gandhi often said that if cowardice is the only alternative to violence, it is better to fight. He made the statement conscious of the fact that there's always another alternative. No individual or group need submit to any wrong. You need. They use violence to write the wrong. There's a way of violent resist nonviolent resistance. This is ultimately this ultimately is the way of the strong person is not a method of stagnant past.

The phrase passive resistance does not give often gives a false impression that this is a sort of doing nothing method in which the resistor quietly and passively accepts evil. But nothing is further from the truth or while the non violent resistor is passive in the sense that he is not physically aggressive towards his opponent, his mind and emotions are always active, constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong. The message is passive physically, but strongly active spiritually. Second, basic fact that characterizes non violence is that, that it does not seek to defeat or humiliate the

opponent, but to win over his or her friendship and understanding. The non violent resistor must often express his or her protest through non cooperation or boycotts. But he realizes that these are not ends to themselves. They're merely means to awaken a sense of moral shame. In the opponent. The end is redemption and reconciliation to speech and Martin Luther King gave in 1958. The fourth point that characterizes nonviolent resistance is a willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows from the opponent without striking back. rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood. Gandhi said to his countrymen. The non violent resistor is willing to accept violence if necessary, but never to inflict it. He does not seek to dodge jail. If going to jail this very, he enters it as a bridegroom enters a brides chamber. When may well ask what is the nonviolent resistance justification for this ordeal to which you He invites men for this mass political application of the ancient doctrine of turning to the other cheek. The answer is found in their realization that unearned suffering is redemptive, suffering, the nonviolent resistance realizes has tremendous educational and transforming possibilities. Things of fundamental importance to people are not secured by reason alone, but have to be purchased with their suffering, said Gandhi. He continues suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent and opening his ears which are otherwise shut to the voice of reason. So it goes against so much intuition to be willing to accept this kind of suffering. But how many people died in Egypt in the last this uprising happened there? Some 300 people or so. And that's a huge number of people. To die. But how many people have died in Iraq? Maybe not fair to compare. But how many people usually die when there's a violent uprising that brings down the government? Are you one of the people who are willing to, you know, people, people who are willing to fight to bring down a government are willing to die? But are you willing to do it in a non violent fight? Where where you know, you, you know, when you're fighting violently, at least you have that better, you have a better chance because you can defend yourself. I, you know, what's the best strategy? So gene sharp was one of these people who, who said, we have to look at this in a rational kind of scientific way and, and really kind of not irrationally and look at what is that what are the strategies and we have to train ourselves and learn the different strategies of how to respond in non violent ways, so that we know how to do it effective. And we know we know what's behind this. We know the theory behind it, we know what the impact we're trying to have behind it, so that we're not just doing it blindly or, you know, there passively. So Gandhi was one of those people who studied that thing. He spent years training people preparing people for the civil rights movement, this speech was given 58. So the so my suggestion is, in Buddhist rights really ringing the seer.

Apologize for that stuff better? nothing better than ringing not ringing for me anymore. Is it ringing for you? I'm not rooting for you. Okay. There's a feedback going on. So what to do when someone wrongs you is really the question and someone's you can someone strikes you on your cheek? What do you do when someone wrongs you? And so my suggestion is the Buddhist response is you look them in the eye. And, and that metaphorically means that you kind of take your stand where you are. And you say, you can't do that. Maybe not in those words, but you engage the person and you and you insist that the person engage you. If it's a one time event and they walk away, maybe you know, you can't. There's not much you can do to disappear. But if someone you have regular contact with, it makes a difference. You know, then you have if you if regular contact and you see someone regularly, then you have a certain power that you ask you have to deal with me. Let's sit down, let's talk but did Do it and look people in the eye. There was a childbearing technique I learned whenever my kids were young. Some of you might know this. The kids you know, do they the kids do things which they shouldn't. And so then you have to make an impression on them. And so one of the things that makes a big impression is when you when you have to talk to them, or when they need to talk to you to get a understand what you're saying something is you say, look at me. You can look at me I'm, you know, I'm talking to you to look at me now, when you tell me this, you look at me. And if they have to look at you, it's very hard for kids to kind of skirt around or kind of avoid, they have to kind of take it seriously and has a big impact.

So what do you do when someone wrongs us? We look them in the eye. And when we see when we look someone in the eye, so disappointed so who are you is one question, but who's the other? And what are you able to see in the other person? When you look at somebody else? Do you see someone to be afraid of? Do you see someone to be angry at you see someone who doesn't really count in your eyes? Someone who's not really that important? Do you see someone who is someone who can do things for you. And so you want things from them. And that because you can want things from them, they have certain control over you, you're not willing to ruffle things too much, not willing to upset them because if he upset them, they're going to leave or they're not going to provide you with whatever it is you want them to have. You know, what do you see when you see another person? Or if you look deep into the person, you see their capacity, for love, for happiness for peace, and to what degree are we tapping into and seeing people's the depths of people's souls in their home? Hearts, their minds, and what they're capable of what's possible in there? and to what degree do we see the surface of people? You know, our surface judgments and ideas? What does it take to see someone really deeply and well, so many times, you know, I mean, not in the world. And I see that the interactions I have with other people don't allow for a real seeing and meeting of people. It just kind of, they're not interested, they're busy. But every once in a while I'll meet someone, a store clerk or something who seems quite open, relaxed, and they're willing to meet my eyes. And you can see that kind of meeting meeting of kindred spirits or meeting of something special happens of two people, something deeper happens. So what do you do when you get wronged? You put you put your ostrich heads in the sand? Do you bring out all your weapons? Do you run away? Do you argue to yourself I don't really count, you know, I'm supposed to just do this Buddhist thing and just accept and me kind of just work on myself. I would suggest that Buddhism emphasizes that you're supposed to be strong. That Buddha isn't asking you to tap into your strength and take a stand and engage. Engage in a way that's non violent, but still engage.

That's my idea. So I hope that was okay. But I was so struck by that little conversation last Sunday, that I was kind of staying with it for the last week. We have about 10 minutes. So if someone would like to say something, this might be a good time. So all the way in the back on the outer Hall. Is there a mic? Yes, fellas if you can, and this person's way out there.

I'm so excited about this topic this morning because I've been for the past several months studying how to transform evil. I've been doing a lot of reading about how to become a spiritual warrior. And a lot of practice related to this. And of course, evil as defined is an intention and energy with the intention to cause harm or without regard for someone else's harm. And so what I've been what I've been discovering is exactly what you're saying that empathy rather than angry response or fearful response is the answer. And to practice this, one of the first things I did was to go negotiate a new car at a dealership and I was alarmed by how much evil was present in that negotiation. It was amazing to me that the tactics the strategy that they have to cause the person to be in disequilibrium. And so I've been noticing in my daily life, just the observation of when evil is present. And that is an amazing experience. When you see it, it gives you the option to respond successfully and spiritually to it.

Great, thank you. It makes me makes me curious about the definition of evil. Because the reason why I think it's important issue is that one definition of evil has been that evil is when people for no other reason than for their own pleasure, cause harm to others. But that's pretty rare. Most people who like those, you know, if someone's kind of manipulating you in a store, in a way that's maybe a your language is evil. Not doing it just because they enjoy it, I hope, but rather they want something out of you. And so there's a lot of harm that people do to each other on the world where there's a there's a strategy to get what they want. That's more than just needed to pleasure them. So but so but if what they want with once, once you kind of tune into that they want something and you can see what they

want, then you can kind of look behind that and more deeper and perhaps begin having a relationship about something much more deeper than what's at the surface of it. When is pure evil it's very hard to think to have a conversation or to understand because it just spread to it is just for the sake of some kind of misunderstood pleasure. It's a powerful word to use evil, word evil and

someone else

Thank you for the talk. And so the thought that I was having was to Burma. And having gotten to know one of the monks who survived the saffron revolution. I just, I just wondered what what your thoughts were

about that and I don't have much thoughts. I mean, it's

Yeah, I don't have I don't know, you know, deeply studied student of this whole topic and, or a Burma what happened, what happened in Burma? It's a very, you know, it's, you know, I, we had a lot of hope, when the saffron revolutions began there, that it was going to somehow work. And, and, and so, when is it? When is it work and when doesn't it work? You know, it strikes me that You need to give some thought to when it works and when it doesn't work, what are the what are the conditions where someone that, you know, they're in Egypt, apparently the military at some point felt took, you know felt connected to the citizens they felt this not people we want to attack and Burma. The military has been attacking its people for decades. So it's a very, very different ethos going on there. Are they trained well enough in Burma, Burma, you know, Egypt was kind of a well developed country compared to Burma. Burma is pretty backwards still, you know, it's still I don't know how backward but I was there in the mid 80s. And I felt like I was stepping back into the 1940s and in Rangoon. But outside of that. I know there are people who've been trying to translate and smuggle in gene sharps works into Burma. so that people can be better prepared.

But I don't have anything really intelligent to tell you. Where were you hoping man would say? You know what, why are you asking the question about Burma?

Well, to me, it just seems so.

so terribly sad and awful. And I don't know, just kind of a contrast to Egypt and I just was thinking about I know someone personally went through all that and

just came to my mind.

Yeah, there's lots of lots of sad things. And then I think that sometimes you have to be very patient with some of these things and keep thinking about it. You know, it takes a lot of strategizing and thinking about A lot of courage, and sometimes it doesn't work. Sometimes violence doesn't work. violent uprising sometimes haven't worked as well. And so you know, which which camp do you put yourself in how to? So one of the really important aspects of, I think what Buddhism but also I think what Martin Luther King says here is that he says, The fifth point, here's the seven points about nonviolent resistance. The fifth point concerning nonviolent resistance is it is that it avoids not only external physical violence, but also internal violence of the Spirit. nonviolent resistance not only refuses to shoot one's opponent, one also refuses to hate the opponent. At the center of non violence stands the principle of love. So in the karma, kind of foundation for that Buddhism has the taking care of your own karma taking care of your own heart, the purity or the beauty of your own heart is paramount. And so you want to avoid external violence, but you also want to avoid the ways in which we provide linkwithin.

And so we're the custodian of our capacity not to hate, and not to be greedy, not to be afraid. And so that's one of the contributions I feel Buddhism has to make to this. You know, how we hopefully can live in a world and effective, powerful way is the Buddhism. Buddhist meditation. Buddhist practice is a powerful practice powerful teachings for how to look and look into our own hearts and minds and understand how to keep it from being violent in there. Keep it from being succumbing to anger or hate, frustration, fear all those kinds of forces. And so it's not just a matter of what we do externally. It's also what we do internally. And why I think one of the beautiful aspects of this of you know, the saffron revolution was the degree to which the monks who stood up, were not willing to give into hate. They might have lost external, the external struggle. I hope they didn't learn to lose the internal one. One more.

I, I think you said something to the effect of each uprising has very specific circumstances and so it requires almost like intuitive responses often in the moment and this man wanted to study and make more of a scientific practice.

And I think that

we have the same situation. My mics not working as it's working. We have the same situations at work often in places, people with conflict, sometimes maybe a superior who you feel is abusive towards you. And the immediate response for me can be really new knee jerk. And if I am more mindful of how I want to be inside here, I think it's easier for me to confront in a healthy way or in a kind way, or a loving way. And then it's easier to be intuitive. But I think it takes a great deal of mindfulness prior to finding solutions.

Yes, I agree. That's why you should practice mindfulness. I've heard it's a good idea. I hadn't thought of it. And you know, if you wait to be mindful, if you wait to practice mindfulness, for when there's a crisis it's might be too late. But if you really develop a develop these skills, mindfulness and many other things, a lot of you know a lot of you know, a lot of the big challenges that people have in life are best dealt with if we're well prepared. And so, so, practicing regularly prepares us for the crisis's in life when they come along, if we have to engage in difficult problems at work, that hadn't involve very intense conversations, maybe it's good to prepare by taking a class and nonviolent communication or you know, or because just rely on whatever innate ability you have to converse, you know, might not be enough you might need to be trained and how to speak in a way that's much more effective and careful and so nonviolent communication can be very effective way. If you want to be involved in nonviolent struggle against the government Maybe you should do nonviolent training. You know, I kind of grew up in Norway. And Norway has a high percentage of back when I was there of people who are conscientious objectors to serving in the military. And they have Norway has mandatory military service for all males. When they're about, I don't know. 18 1920 or so they go spend a year in the military. And it's relatively easy to get conscientious back then when I was there, conscientious objector kind of status. But if you were, they didn't have to serve in the military. But what you had to do then was served two years doing some kind of civil, civil work, like you'd work in a hospital for two years and help in the hospital. And you had to do something for society. You couldn't just get off scot free. You had to contribute back and so but then was two years instead of one year. And but some of the some of the conscientious objectors didn't like this. Corruption because they said we also want to defend our country. And they felt the presence of Russia not far away and, and they felt, you know, there might dig, you know, Norway had been was, was invaded by the Germans in World War Two. And so the idea that Norway was vulnerable was was quite active for some people. And they didn't want to just go be orderly in a hospital, they want to be able to defend the country as well. And what so what they were lobbying for, was they wanted nonviolent resistance bootcamp. They wanted to be trained because they felt it

was a very effective, and they want to be trained in that so they were ready as well to be able to resist the next invasion. So to be prepared, so please prepare yourself. And my trust is that the basic practice of Buddhism is a tremendous preparation for learning to deal with content Reflect. And my hope is that Buddhist practitioners are skilled and wise and willing to be present for conflict, that we are not conflict averse of culture. But we're not we're not we don't create conflict, but we're willing to be present for it. Good luck.