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BTT 0:02   
Establishing yourself in the whole space in that way: staying and learning to be composed in there, in wholesomeness whatever that wholesomeness might be.  
  
ANT 0:15   
How, let me ask you this: how you compose then...how would that composure come to be then?  
  
BTT 0:30   
Well, as you're saying, is being able to see the determination...  
  
ANT 0:37   
...The relationship between the two...Exactly, because that's so it requires a discernment of the principle of that relationship. So that's, that's what the relationship is.  
  
BTT 0:52   
To even be able to dwell in the nature.  
  
ANT 0:55   
To be able to be properly established in a state of non-anger, so like in this particular example, because that's what people fail to see because, yes, everybody can value silence over talking we can feel more peaceful inside...you can see as fast and requires more determination more, more resolve makes your mind stronger. But none of them sees it in a in a in a relationship, like silence in relation to speaking and because if you were to see it, and even when you're not silent, you will be partaking in silence, you wouldn't be affected by speech. So if you were to see the proper order, proper relationship between fast phenomenal fasting in your experience and phenomenon of eating, in your experience, then if you might be properly established upon the discernment of that relationship, not upon the act of fasting, the act of fasting doesn't establish you, doesn't establish your mind. That's why the Buddha said that self-mortification won't result in liberation. So you need to do it to an extent until you discern the perception of the phenomenon of it. But doing it in itself, doesn't necessarily what for sure doesn't free you, it doesn't do anything for you, is the sermon of the principal in relation to eating from the point of view of fasting, that's what that knowledge is what establishes your mind. Then basically, whenever you're eating, you won't be affected by that eating, you will remain properly established, you won't be pulled by the food. So you overcome sensuality in that, in that example, in the example of state of non anger, which is really great. And even for anger, people, it's more common, you're not angry. It's just when you have the bursts of anger, that's what you focus on. So you can spend all your time being non angry and still remain an angry person. If you don't discern the principle between non anger and anger, that can then free your mind from anger. Then you won't be affected by anger. [What if I'm...] Same, that's the most general: wholesome and unwholesome. Sensuality is unwholesome, unsensuality is wholesome. Anger is unwholesome, non-anger is wholesome. All these things I'm talking about these examples will come down to even a more general example which is wholesome, abandon everything unwholesome by discerning the relationship between wholesome and unwholesome.  
  
BTT 3:21   
So I was thinking, you, you only notice the dependence, dependence if you want to go higher, if you want to have high wisdom. Because seeing at best wholesome is determined by, the not, the unwholesome.  
  
ANT 4:00   
In a way. Yeah, it is defined by it.  
  
BTT 4:03   
That's defined by that. So, but when you notice that, it leads you higher.  
  
ANT 4:10   
Yeah, that's that's what I meant when I was saying in the past, I don't know if you meant somebody else...heard about it...start keeping the precepts in the beginning, you have to keep the precepts. But then if the wisdom starts to be developed, through practice, then you don't keep them, they keep you. And the precepts are not about what things you should be doing. It's more about the behaviors that you're not doing. It's the negative aspects and that's what establishes you. So its not you're actively holding on to precepts, that kind of gives you a buffer zone and a boundary and a safety net. It's things that you don't do that you discern, through doing the precepts and one of the things that don't do, unwholesome things. So it's the negative behavior in regard to unwholesome things that's what defines that basis of practice? It's exactly that thing, you can be wholesome in your life, but not discern should be right. In the heart of everything wholesome, you do, there is the opposite possibility present as phenomenal as something that's not being done at the same time. So at the same time, there is something that's done, which automatically defines something else as not done. And that needs to be seen. Because if you see that a thing that you don't do, and your mind that discerns it, then that becomes your establishment. And then you don't have to do even what you were doing in order to maintain that establishment. Now, it simply you not having to do anything is what establishes it. So it's effortless.  
  
Not having to do, basically, by discerning that you're not doing unwholesome, you don't have to do wholesome. That's what I'm saying. That's how you get established, by not discerning that you are not doing unwholesome, you have to actively keep doing wholesome, which means you don't go beyond the two. And by discerning what I'm talking about, you should discern that's how you go Beyond Good and Evil, as they will say. So by discerning that you are not doing evil, you don't have to do good.  
  
BTT 6:20   
To say, to establish your mind with metta, kindness, it's really it's not ill will.  
  
ANT 6:30   
You establish metta by discerning the phenomenon of not not by basically by not engaging with a phenomenon of ill will. So by doing no ill will, or other by not doing ill will you establish loving kindness automatically. You're not emulating or fabricating or cultivating actively loving kindness. You do it in a negative in a negative way, in the sense of its the recognition of negative things or things that are not done, that's what I mean by negative thinking not done. That's automatically that which is not included in that which is not done, it was done.  
  
BTT 7:13   
Because in that example, kindness, if I wanted to develop kindness, then I went out what are kind of things to do? Okay, smile at people, say good morning, stating that in the eye, final words can help them. That's, it's very different, it's very different.  
  
ANT 7:42   
That's, that is better to do than being rude to people. So that's the first step, is somebody engaged in ill will, it's good that they start doing the actual kindness. By doing the actual kindness, they can start discerning that they are not doing their ill will. The more they discern the phenomenon of ill will and their lack of engagement with it, the greater they get established in the opposite, which is non ill will [which is kindness], which is automatically kindness. So then they don't have to keep bringing acts of kindness in emulating kindness in order to get the state or phenomena of kindness because they automatically habit through this state of non ill will, that they have established. So that's what I mean, you have to start to like you had to start fasting a bit to restraining yourself in regard to the food to then recognize that their state of not eating is actually more fundamental than the state of eating, you spend far more time not eating than eating. You spend far more time not engaging with food than engaging food, yet you get...the food and the food is a food. So you can you can you can have it in theory as much as you like, but you won't discern the principal until you actually start fasting to a degree, restraining yourself not constantly just chugging the food down your throat. Because then you can't start discerning that principle, once you discern the principle, then yeah, you're going to have to keep holding on to your fasting and stuff, because you will automatically be restrained in regard to food. That's basically the whole point of sila. That's exactly the nature and how you how you will overcome it as a fetter. Silabbata paramasa needs to be taken by puttujuna in order to start practicing. But it is a fetter, but it's a better fetter than the fetters of sensuality and anything else. So you replace initially so that you can come out of it and a sotapanna would overcome silabbata paramasa, but what I'm what I'm telling you now basically, by this description. By taking it, in order to discern the principle in regards to a phenomenon of wholesome phenomenon wholesome when you are bound by your discernment, your full knowledge of the phenomenon of not wholesome, that's it. Then you're automatically wholesome, even if you don't actively, neurologically, tightly, think about the actual things you must not do and the rules and whatever else, then your behavior becomes natural, naturally aligned with the rules, give or take on this. But fundamentally, you can't do anything that's truly unwholesome in the sense it will compromise the virtue. So the arriyas in the suitors, would sort of forget about the principal and then they will commit loads of offenses as the Buddha would say something's great offenses. Really, all you have to do is establish the principle and the impurities back. That's why the drunken sotappana was just drinking and drinking, not practicing. And then then, he composes his mind toward...his life was...which is greater: death or life? Death. Which is greater: not eating or eating? Not eating. Basically, he recognizes the principle. Which is greater: not drinking or drinking? Which is greater: non sensuality or sensuality? By recognizing lines established...Celibacy or non celibacy? Exactly. Because most people are basically not engaging in, in a in a non celibate act. Most people will be celibate if you look at their behavior, in a sense of they're not constantly engaging in sexual intercourse, for example, but they're not really celibate, because the mind is fully bound with sensuality, but you will be celibate, well first by taking the determination to be celibate, and then by discerning the principle: which is greater, which is more fundamental? And discerning the relation between the two and then simply by not engaging in sensuality, you are a non sensual person (i.e., will be on sensuality).  
  
BTT 11:41   
So if you go to guarding the doors of the senses. So basically a distraction, sensual distraction, non sensual, or non distraction. Non distraction.  
  
ANT 11:56   
There is essential distraction, then there is a distraction that's a non sensual distraction. And then there is a non distraction. So you can't just leap from sensual distraction to complete non distraction, you have to replace sensual distraction with a non sensual distraction, which is basically holding on to right holding on to views in virtue in silabbata paramasa will be a non sensual distraction, because you're still on the level of action. But it's the opposite. You have to do that in order to replace the very unwholesome sensual distraction by not engaging in sensual distraction by body by speech, you will eventually be able to not engage by mind. And you will be able to do so why, because you then abandon your account the non sensual distraction. So when non sensual distraction cannot enter you, what can be said for that which is even inferior to it, which is a sensual distraction, that becomes inconceivable. That's what the Buddha meant, like you replace the grief of the household life with the grief of renunciation of the life of the monk, you replace the joys of household life with the joys of renunciation. You see, as as greater, structurally fundamentally, phenomenologically greater as a phenomenon. It's more fundamental. And saying, you will be abiding in a noble silence simply by stopping mid sentence, if you want, you can establish your mind to that point, whereby you're not in...you're talking, the moment you stop talking, the mind goes back into silence, because it never left. But you can't do that if you never practice silence, if you never practice restraint of your speech, you just been chatting and talking all constantly whenever there was an impulse to do so. But obviously, you certainly won't do that either if you just for the rest of your life refuse to utter a word. They won't necessarily reveal the principle between speaking and non speaking. The verbal determination, if you try to discern the principal being pointed at...that might make you help discern it. So that's why you can't put the profit practice on dhamma that results in wisdom in any method or technique because it's all about what you do, it's about the recognition between things that you do and you're done. And that's neither will you do it nor you don't do. So you can't pin down the practice in a mere mechanical behavior, repetition or avoidance of certain things. Yeah, avoidance of unwholesome is necessary as a basis. But that's not the...the Buddha was, the Buddha was quite clear. He said the Dhamma is not vinaya. It's not vinaya. It's as clear as that...many people have many monks can't distinguish that. They think if there's no vinaya there's no dhamma. Dhamma is not vinaya: a very clear statement, followed by that there is no practice of Dharma, without presence of vinaya without presence of virtue. So Aha, there is something to be understood there. You understand that you will be free from silabbata paramasa you truly understand it, which is basically what I'm expounding on here. That's what I'm trying to explain. So your non sensual behavior needs to become established, you need to actually do it. Because by doing a non sensual behavior, you can't at the same time do the sensual behavior. But then yeah, you can spend the rest of your life neurotic and focused about your rules and in virtue, and never discern the principle in regard to hold on, it's not about me, doing the virtue by virtue is actually defined by not doing the non virtue.  
  
And that's a little different there. So that's why you can't put the practice into into certain meditation or just watch that to do this will walk like this. No. It makes no sense at all, if it comes down to if you recognize it actually, when I was supposed to do is discern the principle within wholesome and unwholesome that's why the Buddha would like to...she asked him to go on the retreat and give her a brief instruction, all he said was whatever you know is unwholesome abandon it whatever you know, is wholesome, cultivate it. So she went in the mountains based on that done the rains retreat and became an arahant. So you can see that it cultivating unwholesome sorry, cultivating wholesome means, basically cultivate, discern, dwell on it, bhavana, bringing into being until it's understood, because she wasn't in the mountain, and doing charity work or some other wholesome things that people usually...is good. No, she was completely secluded. So when it said to be cultivating wholesome means, yeah, you don't do unwholesome, you're already cultivating wholesome, when you know that that's what you're doing. If you're unaware of the principle, that by not doing unwholesome, you're automatically wholesome. So you don't have to then do wholesome. If you don't listen to that principle, you remain bound by wholesome. Consequently, you...that why sheer adherence to the rules and virtue can result in good rebirth because you've been doing good actions, but it cannot take you outside of the sphere of karma, sphere of action. That's all there is for those with the right view, which is where the dhamma begins where the right view begins. So if you was in relation to that, so insistent when people come and ask them questions that that there is, don't, don't focus, don't think you can put it in a technique or something. And they say I find it helpful or something, it's not. your criteria of what's helpful, it's not right, or it's not existing, often. So what's helpful is just what feels good for most people. Because if you adhere to some you think this is what I should be doing: basically, that is definition of silabbata paramasa, virtue and duty. I need to be doing this. And that's the first fetter. The first fetter that prevents you from becoming an arahant. So you you then well, if a person has some transparency, they will think okay, so I can either adhere to this neurotically for the rest of my life and do this, do this technique and whatnot, and remain a puthujjuna. Or I can really figure out what it meant by that, because these are the words of the Buddha, that silabbata paramasa, its basically definition of virtue and duty its the first fetter.  
  
BTT 18:38   
If I just read a bhikku should, put his put his intention to object composure in the morning, afternoon. And when I read that I think I should do I should do that.  
  
ANT 18:55   
But what is the object of composure? Do you know what the object is?  
  
BTT 18:57   
Well, you know, take wholesome as opposed to the unwholesome.  
  
ANT 19:03   
Exactly, so that would be the Yeah, because you can call that object as well. But most people are the people: What is an object? Well, I don't know: a smiley face, or clay pot, a Buddha Rupa, something, give me an object. Give me something...no, recognition of unwholesome, if that's your present thought is the object that you can focus on. As a result of it, you will discern the relationship between the wholesome that's automatically being defined simply by not engaging in unwholesome.  
  
So another thing I was thinking about, if one sees that I'm not engaging in unwholesome that's therefore I dwell in wholesomeness.  
  
BTT 19:48   
Quiet, it's a peaceful state effective acts of...still. And I say, okay. Well, the, one is determined by the other.  
  
That says that neither are mine [yeah, exactly]. So so I think was, what is higher than what is the higher perception?  
  
ANT 20:23   
It's what I'm talking about. It's going Beyond Good and Evil, good and bad.  
  
BTT 20:26   
So the higher perception is self?  
  
ANT 20:32   
Sure, fundamentally, but that is all there is only for the right view, not self. A puthujjana can have high perceptions in regard to sensuality, even guide to virtue and duties upudhanas that they can free themselves from in regard to views, but they can't have a high perception in regard to self and not self. Which if they do so they will be sotapana. But it is exactly that's when talking about the discernment of the relationship of wholesome and wholesome takes you above wholesome and unwholesome, takes you above things that you're doing, takes your above action which means it cannot be appropriated, because only things that you can do are appropriated. Things on that level are things that are regarded as mine, for me as myself, things that you can exercise, even like ...mental levels of control. That's that's that that sense of control is necessary basis for a sense of self it is the sense of self. So, when you go beyond in terms of the discernment of that relationship, that means that neither that unwholesome, well that means that you will see that Yeah, wholesome is defined by that which is not done in terms of unwholesome and consequently unwholesome is the absence of wholesome so there is no need for you to hold on to anything those things define itself. That's why it's the terminations that's why ignorance of those of that the termination relationships results in appropriation of things that's why [...] is the first. Non ignorance of that relationship results in disowner of ownership of that relationship so you don't own either good or bad, either wholesome or unwholesome, we go beyond it. Because your actions are completely unnecessary redundant, there is no room for them. unwholesome is defined by wholesome, wholesome is the absence of unwholesome, but obviously for as long as your behavior has been engaging in unwholesome you've been perpetuating that mistake maintaining that mistaken view.  
  
BTT 22:41   
But if you can see self and not follow the [...] to self.  
  
ANT 22:50   
Then it's automatically not self.  
  
BTT 22:52   
But self is still there is something that you holding.  
  
ANT 22:55   
Well it's not yourself there. Because self is defined not but what's what, what what is there, self is defined by whether what's there is being held is mine or not mine. So by seeing self as something there, that means it's already can be regarded as not mine. Just see what I mean. So that sense of self there would be there, you've seen is not self sorry, is not mine. First thing needs to be acknowledged the sense of self you deny there is no self there's no self you never see that which is yourself. Why is that seeing is seen as a phenomena if it's if it's a phenomena, it's something that has arisen, if it's something that has arisen, it cannot be that master behind the arising behind the manifestation, that controller, why because it manifests as partakes in the same thing shares the same nature. It's not mine. Yeah, but that's also the only ones Yeah, that is higher than mine. So so in a way you can use that that affection like which is greater not mine or mine? In general, in what what is more: things that don't belong to you, things that belong to? Of course, things that don't belong to me is far more numerous in this world. That is greater than things that belong to you, then you can use simply that discernment on quite mundane level in a way and actually develop your mind on account of it. Because if you stick to it discerning you will see that then whatever is yours, is completely gratuitously accidentally so, which means you are not in control of things that are taken to be yours, which means Oh, they're not really mine. They're basically things that are yours are really things that are not yours that are just closer to you. The things that are really not not yours. So it's not like oh, this is not mine. And this is mine. It's like this is not mine, not not mine, and this is not mine. But fundamentally, none of it is yours. All of it is not mine.  
  
BTT 24:54   
But then for an arahant, not mine is higher than that. Because not mine is opposed to mine.  
  
ANT 25:08   
Yeah, that's what an arriya needs to keep doing. That's why he said, not I am, not mine, not myself. That's [...] He goes, he doesn't even need to do it anymore. It cease completely notions of mine and not mine notions of wholesome and unwholesome notions of good and bad have gone, he went beyond. It's a path he went beyond.  
  
BTT 25:29   
So, what is the highest determination? Determination that he [...] What is the highest...  
  
ANT 25:41   
Nibbana is the highest.  
  
BTT 25:42   
Yeah. What is the highest thing he sees? This is determined by that. This is [...] here. So you see, yeah, [...ceased] [...] determinations have ceased.  
  
ANT 25:56   
And that's determined by all his previous efforts towards ceasing the terminations but that's gone that's irreversible.  
  
BTT 26:05   
So there is nothing dependent on...  
  
ANT 26:08   
That's that's the undetermined, Nibbana [...]. That's the definition of exactly. There's nothing dependent on anything anymore. Nothing taken his mind anywhere, anyhow, in any manner, any shape or form at all. Possibility is gone.  
  
BTT 26:23   
It's not mine anymore.  
  
ANT 26:24   
No, no, he doesn't need to say it.  
  
BTT 26:47   
And about life and death. So would you say that, life is activity, or what is higher than that?  
  
ANT 26:57   
What is greater than that? Yeah...  
  
BTT 27:00   
[...] fundamental.  
  
ANT 27:01   
Yeah, because if life will be far more fundamental, death will just not be manifested.  
  
BTT 27:07   
Something different is like say there is anger, non anger.  
  
ANT 27:11   
Well, it's different because it kind of involves you in it in your entirety. Anger, not anger offers you some perspective. It's kind of my but this is life and not life.  
  
BTT 27:23   
So I can't stop doing life.  
  
ANT 27:24   
Life and death are basically on the level of Nibbana and not Nibbana. Determined and undetermined. But in the in the same manner, when I say like [...] if you if you if you recognize that you can die at any moment, then your whole life, anything your past your future, your hopes, everything, your fears, your desires, everything, everything, family, everything. It's just it becomes quite insignificant. Because you're No, no go away, and you cannot possibly prevent it in any manner. If you truly contemplate that you realize how circumstantial your entire life is. There is no great greatness a little priority of it all or a set of personal [...] completely it could have been otherwise. That's the record isn't like oh, it it is the one that the Buddha correct is it? It could not it could not be for me, it will not be for me. or something and then the Buddha corrected in saying, it won't be for me, it will not be for me. As in the greatest of the puthujjana's views that the Buddha said [...] it could not it could have not been for me, which is kind of basically almost surmounts the entire life. You don't quite get the whole relationship thing between the sankhara and sankhara down between the determined but you can abandon a lot but the one who [...] will say it will not if know for sure that in the future won't be for him because there is no room for the ownership in the present nor in the past nor in the future. So he corrects that statement just slightly. Like from a first person to a third person, something I forgot a long time.  
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