

# 2018-01-29 Buddhism Ethics Or Not

Thu, 9/3 5:44PM • 48:45

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

ethics, buddhism, people, virtue, buddha, teacher, ethical, rely, called, buddhist, greed, thought, feel, suffering, religion, surpasses, delusion, buddhist texts, unwholesome, person

## SPEAKERS

Gil Fronsdal

It's possible that I don't have a coherent talk tonight. I just have a topic. I have some thoughts about it. The topic is ethics, and how ethics fits into Buddhism, Buddhist practice. And one of the curious things is that Buddhism is often considered to be, or to have a high standard of ethics. And it's often said that ethics, ethical life, ethical integrity is needed for, you know, going if you really want to go far on this Buddhist path. So some people associate Buddhism with it. But there's no obvious word in Buddhism in the Asian like in Pali, ancient Indian language that really fits well the English word ethics. And then, but that's okay. Because there's no good word That's pitch for the word spiritual. That's okay. Because there's no good word that fits for the English word, religion. So maybe Buddhism has nothing to do with ethics or spirituality or religion, what's left? And it's kind of like the three areas that we spread, we think to do what we're doing here, right? And somehow, and I think what's happening is that in West in the English speaking West, and these are three categories that are used to somehow organize human human experience. But they're not absolute categories. And it just happens to be that Indian Buddhists didn't have those categories. They had full complete human lives, but they didn't see it through the lens of what we would think of as ethics. We would think of as religion or we would think was spirituality. And you can find things that kind of fit. So you know, and, you know, more or less fits in, we get religious nonprofits that is here in America. So that's nice and convenient. We're not going to tell the IRS, we're not a religion. And that we, you know, we don't do ethics and things like that. That doesn't quite work. But in fact, there's, you find if you read Buddhist texts, coming from India and ancient scriptures of the Buddha, there's a lot of things that most people hear in English speaking the word would consider ethical teachings. But they just don't call it that. And what what's happening is that, in the West, there's a strong tendency to separate ethics out as its own subject and its own kind of field. And that goes Back to the Middle Ages, when it first kind of Christian monastic kind of universities were formed. And they had, they had one whole department or field called ethics. And it was very important for Christians to understand ethics. And partly because ethics was seen as something that was ordained or in, in commanded by God. And so for Christians back then, it was very important to try to understand what God had in mind. And to interpret his ethics, his teachings, his his, his commandment, things like that. And so ethics was something that was out there. It was, it came from some other place. And so it can be studied objectively. And so there's a whole department field of moral philosophy that's really looking at all the complexity of ethics, and morality, but in Buddhism, There was no out there. And Buddhism doesn't start with a god that's offering teachings. But it's starting from the inside out, is starting from human beings. And, and so Buddhism is actually not that interested in ethics. Buddhism is interested in anything in ethical people. And rather than rather than learning about ethics, we're supposed to learn to become ethical people who have ethical sensibilities or ethical orientations or ethical intelligence, and such things. And so and what we see is that the things that here in the West we would call a be ethical, are run through the course of what in the West we would call a spiritual development. The development of practice to develop in a path of liberation could be described as a thoroughly ethical path.

Now for some people that's disappointing. So I'll tell you a little story. I happen. So in, in 1980s, United States there were some creative Buddhist teachers, creative ethically. And it was difficult for a lot of people a lot of suffering happen and ethical behavior. And so by the early 1990s, a number of Buddhist groups in the country that we have to have an ethical guidelines to, you know, so these things, these kinds of things don't happen anymore. And a lot of these Western Buddhist groups had never really thought much about ethics. They just kind of learned meditation and started offering that and so they said, We need to actually get our act together and come up with the Code of more moral code for teachers and things like that. And so I was involved at that point with the San Francisco Zen Center. And, and, and I was asked to be on the Zen center board for a year. But right around that time, like, early 90s, Zen center formed a committee to come up with a code of ethics for its teachers. And so this committee went to work, and they didn't know what to do. So they looked around, and somehow they had a connection with some union Association association of union therapists or something. Well, they know how to do ethics, they thought, so they went there and learn what they do. And they came up with a code. There was our taken Kind of pried out of the Union Institute's codes. So the language was not Buddhist. But they came back and they had this new code of ethics for, for the teachers, etc. And so then it was presented to the community and the community explode, exploded. You needed to have an ethics, they should have had an ethics document before they proposed their ethics document to the community. Because the community was there was a very strong streak of what's called antinomianism. In Zen at that time, which is we don't do rules. We just kind of feel what's natural. And the practice will just you'll just practice and practice and you'll know intuitively how to live and you'll kind of just know what to do and, and so, this this was felt like restriction like a loss coming from above and rather than is any Being about freedom. Now Zen was about restriction. And so then this ethics document came to the Zen center board. And I was in the board, right? And these are good people. These are people who if you're not very good people I see. But there was somebody touched a nerve. And people literally yelling and calling each other names. Talking about talking about an ethics document. It was wild. And so this thing about ethics can really touch a nerve for some people and some people will just like recoil, like, that's not what I want, but isn't about freedom and not about this. And, but now, I'm telling you that Buddhism doesn't have ethics. So now you're okay. So what does it have?

The goal of Buddhism. In Indian Buddhism, the teachings of the Buddha, is defined over and over again, as the cessation, the ending of three things, three things that are called roots, meaning they're deeply embedded deeply rooted in us. In this from this that a lot of other behavior stems grows out of. And if you don't get down and pull out the roots, that plant will just keep sprouting more things. So the routes are called greed, hate and delusion. And sometimes as a Buddhist teacher, I say those three words, I think too often. I feel like as I say it, you know, it's greed, hate and to end of greed, hate and delusion. We're looking at greed, hate delusion. And sometimes I think it is because we say talk about it so much it kind of people start tuning out not paying attention. Do it. But the Buddha talked about it over and over and over again. But to these three roots when you get fully awakened, these three things are uprooted. So what are suffering that we have and the harm that we caused in the world, in the Buddhist analysis, come out of people's greed, come out of people's hate, and come out of people's delusion. One of the meanings one of the understandings and a lot of people have about ethics, if it means anything at all, it means no longer causing harm, no longer causing harm intentionally to others, or causing harm to oneself. And the primary source for causing harm causing affliction is the word is in the Buddhist analysis is greed, hate and delusion. So, the goal could be seen in Buddhism to to be an ethical goal, as opposed to having, you know, some kind of great, wonderful, blissful experience, as opposed to having some kind of a great unity with the cosmos. Or, as opposed to having some great understanding about the secrets of the universe. Thick over and over again, the Buddha was focusing on, on what some people would consider an ethical idea. Coming together with this is the idea that if

you don't have an external source of authority to tell you, you know, the injunctions he's supposed to live by or tell you what is true. And you really have to find it for yourself in some way. What are they reliable sources information you can rely on. What can you really know? Many people want to be told something many people want to have certainty about their religious beliefs. And people get sometimes very attached to their religious beliefs. I know Buddhist gets very attached around, you know what the core teachings of Buddhism are. Because the more people invest into Buddhism as a religion, the more they kind of get a little bit fundamentalists. This has to be right, that's true. And people will pour over Buddhist texts and don't really get to what the truth is what's really going on. But if the starting point is not a text, but oneself, what can you know? So here's a teaching from the Buddha. That's repeated a few times in the suttas. Some of you have heard this before. So this thing about not going outside of yourself, for sources of spiritual religious ethical authority. The Buddha said, Do not go. And of course, it's a paradox because here I'm reading the Buddha right? You'll see so it's kind of like, you know, you'll you'll maybe forgive me.

Do not go do not rely on oral tradition, because there was no books back then. So, nowadays we can say do not go buy books. By lineage of teaching, by hearsay, by a collection of scriptures, by logical reasoning, by inferential reasoning, by reason, cognition, by the acceptance of a view after pondering it by the seeming competence of a speaker. Thank you. Because you think that teach that person is our Guru, that person is our teacher. That's a phenomenal statement to make. Because many, I think religions rely on these things. They rely on scriptures around what teachers say they rely on. reasoning. Some people are very rational. I don't some people are, have this idea that yes, I'm not going to rely on all those things. I'm going to work it out myself. And so they use their, their rationale to do it. But then the Buddha says, what you can rely on what he recommends you rely on. And he gets away with it. I think. Since he's, you know, he's saying don't rely on teachers, but he's a teacher, right? He gets away with it because of what he's pointing to.

But when you know for yourself, these things are unwholesome. These things are blameworthy, these things are censured by the wise these things that if accepted and undertaken, lead to harm and suffering that case you should abandon them. So, he is pointing back to yourself when you know these things, but there is some some reference to what the wise would say. And some concerned about if the wise people would, you know, would criticize you because not completely relying on yourself. But then he gives an example. What do you think? Is there greed? strange question, is there greed in this world? Yes. Is there hatred? Yes.

And is there delusion? Yes. Then he says Somebody who has greed or hatred and delusion is liable to harm other people liable to steal from other people liable to begin on sexual misconduct, liable to be involved in lying and liable to be involved. I think that's it. That's the four I think he mentioned here.

If a person does this, does these kinds of harmful behaviors does that lead to one's own harm for a long time? does it lead to the harm of others for a long time, it can are these things greed, hate and delusion and acting on them? Are they wholesome or unwholesome? They're unwholesome? Are they blameworthy are blameless blameworthy? Are they censured by the wise or praised by the wise, they're centered by the wise. And if they are done if they're accepted and undertaking, do these things lead to harm or suffering, to harm and suffering. So what he's saying here is that there are certain activities that arise out of greed, that you can know for yourself, that they feel unwholesome, they don't feel good to do. You can know for yourself that they cause a certain kind of harm to yourself and to others. And you can know that they're blameworthy so somehow you can put them off. But how do you know this? And how do you do this? It's not an ethical teaching like You're supposed to do this. But you rely on what you can know for yourself. So here is the first real when I was when I was introduced to

vipassana teaching. This teaching we're doing here, I was introduced to it in, in Thailand. And it had a big impact on me. But one of the big impacts it had was had to do with what we can call ethics. And so it was a long retreat. I sat and meditated just all day long for 10 weeks. That was a long time. And in the course about that 10 weeks, maybe about six weeks into or something. I thought about this woman that I had met before the retreat started. And before the retreat started, I had kind of garden variety lust for her. That's allowed You know, I was attracted to her and you know it, there was nothing unethical if we'd gotten together would have been nice. But you know, we didn't, but I had certain desires laughing and I didn't think about it much. But then at six weeks into the retreat, I thought about this woman. And, and when I thought about the lust that I had, it didn't compute. Because what had happened was I was so peaceful or so settled. So many of my, my greed, my hates my delusion, so many of my kind of attachments. Fears had settled down and I had it had a visceral feeling of purity. Within there was being thought cleansed on the inside. Probably better than purity really cleansed. And when I thought about the lust, it just went against the grain. It was painful. It felt like chalk across the chalkboard. And I was so surprised. Wow. What is this? You know, I know what it is I'm feeling in there. I never felt something like this before in my life. Wow. It felt unwholesome to have the lust to have greed. unwholesome and it kind of felt off for I felt like I wasn't there wasn't integrity in it or there wasn't some some goodness in it or there was its inner goodness there. There's somehow and, and this idea that there could be a reference point inside of being feeling clean or feeling a goodness or feeling something that was the That's what hooked me to Vipassana. That was the first thing that got me Wow, this is impressive. And so then that became a reference point. for finding the way and for the Buddha, your whole way to liberation, can be found with that inner reference point, your own inner compass, to understand, am I is what I'm doing here? Is it being generated by something by attachments by clinging by lust, by by greed? Is it being generated by hate or hostility aversion?

Or is there delusion in the mix of it somehow ignorance and confusion, projections and bias and all these other things that go on and then to feel in oneself? Not that not not ethical idea, that precept the conjunction don't Thou shall not do that, but to feel inside that you want The system doesn't want to go in that direction. The system wants to go to being cleaned to being unconscious, say if you don't like the language of clean or purity, to go to into place to avoid contraction, to avoid stress, to avoid remorse to revoice kind of regrets to avoid this whole inner world that can arise when we're operating under attachments. And you could feel that and that becomes that becomes the guide. So, it turns out that in world religions or in the world's history, when human beings have stopped turning towards gods and religions to provide guidelines for how to live from the outside this is what they tell To come to back in the ancient Greek time, they would some of the Greeks have kind of put aside the gods, the Greek gods. And they relied on a kind of pleasure principle. they relied on the human ability to feel you know, it's a pleasure and pain maybe it's not maybe not the best terms, but you can feel inside of yourself when something feels right or good or feels enjoyable or since since a well being and when something takes that away. Utilitarian philosophy of Jonathan Mills, give me first name, had the same thing did away with the gods and religion to external reference point and tell you what to do. And what's the reliable information you have? Is something like something that's called the pleasure principle. You really pay attention to yourself what's going on here, you get the information here. More recently had Freud who did the same thing. Freud also didn't rely on external. And he also had this idea of pleasure principle as a guide, I think. So Buddhism also had this. So if you're not going to rely on external authorities, whatever they might be, but to rely on your own evidence, finding your own way, the Buddhist Buddha did coin to where the criteria could be. And that criteria has a lot to do turns out it has a lot to do with forces inside that have to do with the English we will call the ethics and forces that begin with greed, hate and delusion, but play out and all kinds of unethical behavior in the world. So Buddhism has training in what can be called ethics. But Training and ethics is a training in learning to pay more careful attention to yourself so that you become the reference point for it. So the most

common word in the ancient language that sometimes translated to English as ethics is the Pali word is sila. Si la doesn't mean ethics. It means something like virtuous behavior. And, and it's mostly described by the things a person, abstains, abstains from when abstains from killing, from stealing from sexual misconduct from lying from getting drunk or getting intoxicated when stains from slanderous speech, from gossiping from divisive speech, when abstains From being avaricious, and when abstains from having hostility, these are the core abstentions that Buddhism teaches, that are called sila. That in the West, we often called ethics. The feeling about these sila, this ethics thing, whatever is the attitude that can exist is one of loving the lighting in it.

And this was also surprised when I was first went to Thailand, that this idea that that one sila, living a life of goodness can bring a tremendous amount of joy. And I thought it was really weird when I'm going to Thailand these people were joyful about their ethical integrity and what I didn't ever grew up with any sensibility that that was could be the case So, here's a. So hear the word, this translation of this ancient text. The word sila here is translated as virtue, the thing that Buddhist love, the thing which is really at the heart of the movement towards liberation and freedom. It's not just about being mindful. It's about being mindful. So we could have sila, we can be mindful so we can free ourselves, of being driven by these roots, these attachments that bring us suffering. So the perfection of virtue. the perfection of virtue, should be thought about as follows. Even the waters of the Ganges could not wash away the stain of hatred, yet the water of virtue is able to do so. Even yellow sandalwood cannot cool the fever of lust, yet virtue is able to remove it. virtue is the unique adornment of good people, surpassing the adornments cherished by average folk, such as necklaces, and airings. Virtue should be reflected upon as the basis for rapture and joy, as granting immunity from fear of self reproach, the reproach of others punishment and the need and a terrible rebirth. Virtue should be reflected upon as the basis spirits should be reflected upon, as praised by the wise as the root cause of freedom from remorse as the basis for security. virtues surpasses material wealth because thieves cannot confiscate because it enables one to achieve supreme sovereignty over one's own mind. Virtue surpasses the sovereignty of warriors, kings and priests. Virtue surpasses the achievement of beauty for makes one beautiful even to one's enemies. It cannot be vanquished by the adverse adversities of aging and sickness, since it is the foundation for states of happiness, virtue surpasses such dwellings as palaces and mansions, and a copy accomplishing the difficult task of self protection. virtue is superior to troops of elephants, chariots and infantry, as well as such devices as mantras, spells, blessings, for depends on oneself, not on others. esteeming virtue as the foundation of all achievements As the soil for the origination of all the Buddha qualities, the beginning and the Chief of all the qualities issuing in Buddhahood, when should guard diligently and thoroughly perfect virtue as a hand guards its eggs. So on one hand, we can say that Buddhism really, because of this problem with language, that maybe Buddhism doesn't have ethics ethics. On the other hand, we could say, Buddhism is only ethics. That's all it is. It's an IF and if you want to be liberated, if you want to be having lasting, enduring happiness, it's kind of an ethical transformation that goes on. That happens. And, and part of that ethical essence, transformation doesn't come from doing ethics, but being ethical. It comes from developing ethical sensitivity, ethical sensibility, an ethical inner compass, an ability to find your way, and to find that it's a nourishing supportive. If you want to feel safe, if you want to find a way in life to, you know, to have all these beautiful qualities and to have joy, it's the ethics. And perhaps one of the reasons why enlightenment, the freedom feel so good is because the way we get cleansed from these roots that are operating in us, inside of us.

So perhaps that was a confusing talk. You know, and I trying to pull these different pieces together somehow for you and try to explain something. I don't know how idea. Yes, please. Still,

I was



I was confused when, you know at the beginning you were saying that the Buddha was saying don't rely on anything. Don't rely on teachers don't rely on text. But then when you are reading other texts in from the Buddha, he was saying, Don't the wise think this?

Yes. So the way it works here is this, those things are censored by the wise Are those things so, if you think, think of someone who, maybe the person that you have the most respect for because of their wisdom, their kindness the way they've helped you in your life, someone who's been a teacher someone that you really kind of helped you out a lot and really really want the best out of you supported the best to come for you and us feel so grateful this this wise good person was in your life and you know, they know you and you're about to do something they kind of like really? Oh, that's not a good idea. Oh, that's the I'm really disappointed now. Wouldn't that have an impact on you?

It does, but that's a contradiction with the fact that the beginning he said don't believe in anyone else.

Ah, the maybe it's too hard. To only rely on oneself. But it's not saying rely on this. I guess he's saying that but I think that I, I guess it's maybe it's contradiction. But is there a difference between maybe there's a difference between wise people and gurus in our lives. But I think that there were social creatures, and we're liable to make mistakes, liable to be diluted. And sometimes it's really good to take into account the people we respect a lot, what they think and what they feel and where they're where they're at, and to be accountable to them. So if they get disappointed in us, I think that's interesting information.

I have a different interpretation. Please

tell me.

So, if you're thinking don't would that be censored by the wise? I'm hearing it as Do you believe you yourself? That is Something that the wise would sense. Yeah, maybe so I'm using my own inner compass. I'm not using the wise compass.

I'd like murder No, you know I, I see a word like that and I now I want to go back and look at the Pali the original because the English translation so sometimes the English translators have something nice translators have a little bit of puritanical English, you know, they kind of you can see how they I've looked enough at the original and see how some English translators kind of lean in certain directions with their translations. So I don't know what the censored means. But also the other thing that's problematic, like what you're bringing up is this word of this idea of blameworthy and no and praise some people they shouldn't be concerned with blame and praise. But it's not really the case is it? Never I mean, certainly people can be neurotically concerned about great blame and praise. But it was such a, you know, social creatures and we're so who we are as parties, you know, Social. So what, what role does our community have? And what role does there's some house taking into account that community around us have in finding our way? And how do these two work together? There's can they work together in some way? Or is what a protection for the other. And that's one way of seeing it is that maybe people cannot really stick. It's dangerous to only rely on yourself. And plenty of people have done this made mistakes. And you can only rely on other people. That's also problematic. But if you have the two kind of talking to each other, and kind of and being accountable to each other and debating each other, then maybe it's actually safer than one or the other. And so maybe that's why we have these two together here. What do you think?

I think I would edit the text.

Great. Great. Yes, please.

I guess a kind of two part. First, I remember you talked about faith in the practice before. I wonder how that fits into this issues of ethics. And secondly, also, it seems that the role of the teacher is quite important in most Buddhist practices, and how does that relate to becoming more ethical? Yeah. So the word faith that's you know, it's also a you know, I apologize for taking this saying this over again, the semantics. This is also you know, an English word that that's it's a little bit unclear whether it should really represent Indian Buddha Word, the Word that's often called translated as faith is sada. And some translators prefer confidence. And the end the function of this sada is to get you started on your practice. So if you're going to take a class, you probably not going to sign up and pay your hundreds of dollars for the class, unless you have some modicum of confidence that it's going to be worthwhile that the teacher is going to know know, the subject and things like that. And so to have some confidence in order to start the path to find out these things for myself. So some people like the word confidence, I like the word faith, because faith is an element of the heart. I feel so emotional quality, and so we can have an emotional relationship to the things that inspire us or inspiration is kind of a an emotion, I guess. And it makes us happy or makes us warm. removers kind of. And so some people I have a lot of faith in this practice. I've done it a long time, and I've seen it benefits from it and, and it just lives in me in a way that I just have tremendous love for it. Trust in it. I like the word trust. But it's but it's kind of verified. trust it. It comes from knowing something that I discovered through this. So I don't know I'm not real. I'm kind of meandering with an answer. So I don't know if you would be more specific or try again or maybe you want to define what faith is maybe we can be a little bit

gray. Okay, so then the second question about the teacher the Different Buddhist lineages, different Buddhist schools have different kinds of relationships to teachers. And there's a wide range of what those relationships are like, in, in, in our lineage, ours kind of school. That tendency mostly is to not see a teacher as a guru, but rather see it more like a spiritual friend. So more like a friend who supports one, offer some guidance, but it's not meant to be the authority, who ordains what's true and what you have to do and has injunctions about how you supposed to live your life. But rather, you know, it's not someone who has authority to require anything of anyone. But it's more a friend who can teach and make suggestions and be supportive and, and be a guide to something degree. I like to think of a teacher as someone who's also a practitioner. So in some ways, maybe set practitioners a little bit further along the path than you are. And so you can learn from that person to be supported. And then we have some some schools of Buddhism where the, the teach them in, in some in some extreme versions, the teacher is supposed to have absolute authority, you know, and it's gets gets pretty intense. You're, you know, whatever the teacher says you're supposed to do and they mistoria milah wrapper. And if you know Miller, EPA was milarepa was kind of a hermit monk in Tibet to went to kind of to India, I guess, to study with his teacher marpa. And as I understand the story, as I remembered now, when he showed up to study with his teacher, his teachers, first thing he said was, I want you to build me like a stone house or something here. So he built it. And they No, no, it's in the wrong location. I'd like to have it over there. So he took it all down and build it up. No, no, no, over there. I think the first place and for years he that's what he did. But Martha was his teacher. So the teacher said to do something, you do it.

So there's there's a wide range of options in Buddhism. So you could pick, you know what you'd like? everything in between. But be careful. The consequences can be vague. Yes.

Thank you, when you began by saying that, Buddhism, the early Buddhist texts, pars, the terrain of spirituality, religion and ethics in some different way, I was expecting sila, but I also thought perhaps the word Dharma would come up. Maybe the talk is complicated enough that you don't want to cry to go there. But isn't Dhamma cover some of the sort of basic, almost seemingly universal ethical principles that we live by things like hatred does not cease by hatred and the concept, contents of the precepts. These things don't seem to require lots of subtle word parsing to make sense of them.

And if you know it's complicated these topics

he you know, I I kind of like to think that the Buddha wasn't a Buddhist. And he probably wasn't teaching Buddhism he was teaching but it wasn't a religion in conventional terms that we'll be thinking now. And he didn't put himself up as being a prophet. And he wasn't thinking put himself up as being someone who channeled ultimate reality or ultimate truth. It was a person who had discovered something about freedom and then tried to teach that to other people. And that freedom has a lot to do with clinging or non clinging. And so he taught a path of non clinging in the earliest, probably the earliest texts we have of the Buddha, when it was that Buddhism or his teaching came least system at least systematized. He has this amazing statement or statement he says it repeatedly that you shouldn't take anything as the ultimate. For religious people, that's pretty difficult. I mean, that's what religions want. They want what's ultimate. And he's not interested in the ultimate. So what is he interested in? He's interested in not clinging because clinging is a source of suffering. And he doesn't want he's concerned with people not suffering. So it might be naive or might be simplistic his solution what he points to, but hard to understand how it really applies to all our lives. But his goal his whole thing was to support people so they would not suffer once people aren't suffering live your life. You don't need philosophy then you don't if suffering, if not suffering comes with not harming anyone. You don't need ethics, I guess. And you don't need Buddhism. So in this kind of analysis kind of presentation, what the Buddha was teaching was kind of a form of therapy, the therapy to help people become free of suffering. But it's kind of reductionistic to say that it's somehow kind of almost seems to diminish what Buddhism is. Because I think the way it diminishes it is that, at least in my mind, when I think of that, just call it the kind of therapy for suffering is that the transformation of the heart so that all these roots of greed, hate and delusion, all the attachments we have, are completely uprooted. It is such a radical transformation of the person, it's so thorough, it creates such a different vision of the world and how to live, that you can't just call them a little bit of therapy. And it's it's like, it's, you know, and that's why it's big, you know, it's kind of like offers a radical, all encompassing new vision for how to live in the world. And so, you know, then now we're getting close to religion again, you know, you know, orientation of what's, you know, how to live, you know, a whole new orientation with, with which to live our lives, therapy, you know, you do therapy, and then you're good. And, and then you have other things that are important for you, and you live your life. But with this, this transformation that comes through practice, it's like the most it's like the most meaningful, valuable, fullest thing that people experience. It becomes their life. Not you know, I, you know, you know, I did this Buddhism thing and now I'm on to other things. It makes sense. Okay, we're over now. So for some of you want to ask me a question afterwards I can stay here and I'm happy to answer and as I said, I didn't really have a talk today I just had a topic that's been on my mind. And so I kind of just, you know, try to pull it together for you and if it was too complicated, I apologize and, and you can you can just, you know, leave it here if you don't have to take it with you.

So, thank you. Good night.