

## MORALITY, BODY, AND MIND

*Somparn Promta*

---

As Buddhist ethics is the advice given to human being as a guideline of life, this makes it impossible for Buddhism not to examine one important question usually posted in philosophical ethics. That question says, "If what is right means what human being can do, how Buddhist ethics responds to this?" For the reader staying outside the circle of philosophy, some more knowledge about this question is needed. It is well known that the basic task of ethics is to give a moral rule claiming that what should be counted as good. In presenting a moral theory, it automatically implies that the philosopher who owns that theory is trying to convince the audience to follow what presented in that theory. In the past, many philosophers tried to present moral theories and said, "This should be followed by those who want the right things." It can be said that in any moral theory there must be a thing called 'moral ideal' playing the role as the advice to follow a path described in the theory. One day, there was some philosopher noticing, "In the past, when we try to invite people to do what we believe to be a good thing in our moral theory, it seems that we all ignore one important thing. That is, before we try to invite people to do something, we must know that such a thing can be done by human being. It is a time to reexamine our theory if it can be practiced by human being or not." We will understand the significance of this remark through this example. Suppose I am a trainer of a football team. I set up the rule to be followed by the team, "In every match, our team must take the goals not less than 30." This statement is an ideal. But as we know that there is no football team in the world can do this thing; so, such ideal is finally meaningless because it requires doing a thing that no one in the world can do. In the same way, in any moral theory, there is some kind of ideal stated. Some ideal could be meaningful and some meaningless. All depends on just one fact: *such ideal can be practiced by human being or not.*

Buddhism says a lot about the elimination of desire. It seems that not only Buddhism that teaches this thing, other religions in the world also do the same thing. What we will do in this paper is to reexamine the Buddhist teaching concerning the elimination of desire. Recently, I saw the TV news reporting that a Buddhist monk from the southern part of Thailand cut off his sexual organ. This monk was reported to heavily suffer from meditation practice for years. It is not meditation that makes him suffer. The suffering comes from the feeling that even though he extremely tries to overcome desire by practicing meditation, finally he still realizes that desire remains inside his life. One day when sexual feeling occurs, he takes a knife and cuts off his penis. This action suddenly happens from highly frustration. What I think after watching this news is, "Where desire lives in our life?" This question is important, but it seems that it is always ignored by most teachers of Buddhism.

Once I have read a book written by a biologist. He says, in the book, that all philosophy in the world is presented to the reader as if Charles Darwin never lives in this world. I think this suggestion can be applied to religion as well. The monk I have mentioned above is trained by Buddhist theory which believes that desire is a mental phenomenon. Desire according to this understanding is located in the mind. So, by

training the mind, one day we shall win. I believe that what occurs inside the monk tells another thing different from what he has learned. Cutting of sexual organ may result from the feeling that desire is located in the body.

It is recorded in the *Pali Tipitaka* that as soon as the process of enlightenment was completed, the Buddha had said the following words, mentioning someone (or something) as the *House Maker* within his life.

I have traveled through so many long times  
 To discover the House Maker  
 As I could not find you  
 I have been reborn again and again  
 Now I have caught you, the House Maker  
 After this you can never produce the house for me  
 All that belong to you are destroyed by me  
 My mind is totally liberated \*

In the commentary to the *Tipitaka*, it is said that the House Maker, which referred to in the Pali term as '*gabakaraka*,' is what Buddhism calls '*tanha*' (which normally translated into English as desire.) It seems that the widely-accepted traditional interpretation of this term has followed what is said in the commentary. *I have another opinion on this subject.* I think that most Buddhist thinkers understand that desire belongs to the mind. In the *Abhidhamma* literature, desire is classified into the category of the components of mind. As the result of this understanding, the body has no role in our life. All depend on the mind. I do not think that this line of understanding corresponds to what the Buddha has discovered, especially when considered from the above statements. I have basic assumptions to be proved that the body plays the important role in our life not less than the mind and the House Maker that the Buddha refers to in the above statement *belongs to the body*, not the mind.

To understand what I am trying to present, let us consider some phenomena occurring in our life. We have a family. I mean we have father and mother. And some of us have son or daughter. Our father and mother also have their father and mother. The relations between people in the family have something unique in a sense that we do not have such relations to people outside our family. I used to imagine a thought-experiment story and ask myself how I think about this story. The story is that. Suppose Mahatma Gandhi has a son and his son has a boy of the same age as the most beloved friend. This boy usually comes to Gandhi's house to play with Gandhi's son. As this boy is a good boy, Gandhi loves this boy very much. Sometimes Gandhi thinks that it is possible to say that the love that he has on this boy is not different from that he has on his son in terms of quality and quantity. One day these two boys are suddenly sick by some disease. The doctor who takes care of these boys tells Gandhi that the boys need some kind of blood. After a medical exploration, the doctor finds that Gandhi has this kind of blood. This is the good news, but the bad news is that the blood that the doctor can draw from the body of Gandhi has a limited amount to cure one boy only. Gandhi now is confronted with a serious dilemma. He should give his blood to which boy. The story says that these two boys share everything alike except one thing—one boy is a son of Gandhi and one boy is not. I am inclined to believe that even though Gandhi is a man of highly moral mind in a

---

\* My roughly translation from the Pali text—*Somparn Promta*

sense that a man of moral mind is a person who does not love only his own children but also love other children in the world, in this case finally *Gandhi will choose his son*.

What I want to suggest from the above story is that. If people in general moral standard being confronted with the situation said in the story I am rather sure that they will not feel any dilemma. But in the story I have designed the story to be concerned with Mahatma Gandhi to show that even in the case of the man with highly noble mind who feels the dilemma at first finally he will choose his family member. In the case of general people, we can say that desire plays the major role in choosing family member. But we can never say such a thing in the case of Mahatma Gandhi. I think that when a person chooses anything from desire, he or she will never feel oppressed in such a choosing. On the contrary, if a person feels a pain in any choosing, it means that his choice does not come from desire. The problem is: if the choice of Gandhi does not come from desire, it comes from what?

I think that the other thing standing opposed to desire is what I call the *necessity*. Gandhi chooses from necessity. But there are many kinds of necessity, so the point is Gandhi chooses from what kind of necessity. Before we can answer this question, we need to know what necessity is. According to me, one sense of necessity is determination. There is some factor playing the role behind Gandhi's choice. That factor is the boy he chooses is his son. In terms of biology, the factor pushing Gandhi to do such a thing is Gandhi and the boy he chooses share some biological data. The boy that Gandhi does not choose does not have such a thing with Gandhi.

From the story above, we will find that the body has the meaning in human actions. Some modern biologists believe that the gene is the most influential factor that determines how people act. It seems that from biological perspective, what Buddhism calls desire is located in the body, not in the mind. I think this understanding could provide some contribution to the study of Buddhist teaching concerning desire. Going back to the story of Gandhi, if we consider his action through the frame of mind, there must be nothing different between his relation to his son and his relation to the boy who is the friend of his son. According to Buddhism, the mind is an *isolated entity* (let me use this word, I fully know we cannot use the word 'entity' for the Buddhist mind, but I have no word to use) in a sense that the mind has no relation to other mind except inside its stream. The mind of Gandhi has nothing connected to the mind of his son. The minds in these two people are totally independent from each other. Likewise, the mind of Gandhi also has nothing connected with the mind of the friend of his son. These two minds are also totally independent from each other like the above case. But, considering from the frame of body, we will find that between Gandhi and his son there is a link in a sense that his son is nothing but a copy of his body while such a link cannot be found between Gandhi and the friend of his son. From above, we can say that the body is not isolated entity. One body can connect to one another body through biological connection. Logically speaking, if we can prove that between two things there is some link, to say that the link between them is the factor playing the role behind the action performed by the first thing for the second thing is more reasonable than to say such a thing with two things that have no any link found.

Buddhism occurs in the world to help people in curing natural disease called by Buddhism as '*suffering*.' According to the teaching of the *Four Noble Truths*, suffering is the result of desire. To cure suffering, desire must be eliminated. This statement is clear. But the problem is where in our life desire is located. Traditionally, Buddhist thinkers

point out that desire is located in the mind. To say that desire is located in the mind is not the same thing with to say that desire is a mental phenomenon. For example, when we walk for shopping for hours we are thirsty. The thirst is a mental phenomenon. Or we can say that the thirst is occurring in our consciousness. But to say that the thirst is located in the mind could be misleading. We know that the thirst is a physical phenomenon resulting from a reduced amount of water in our body. The body has alarming system to alert us when there is some situation that can harm the body occurring. In the above case, the body knows that there must be a certain amount of water reserved in the body system and now that amount is reduced down to the point that can harm the system, so it alerts us to drink. From this point, the thirst is nothing but a signal sent from the body system to us through consciousness. So, exactly speaking, the thirst is not located in the mind. It is located in the body. Drinking water is physical action. Water is material. So if material entity can eliminate the thirst, it is clearly evident that the thirst must be physical phenomenon too.

In early Buddhism, human life is explored by the Buddha through the teaching of the *Five Aggregates*. According to this teaching, a person consists of five things: body, feeling, perception, mental formation, and consciousness. The first thing is material, the rest are immaterial. I would like to point out that the Buddha does not say that desire is located in which aggregate. After the time of the Buddha, the Buddhist thinkers explain that desire is classified into the aggregate of mental formation. By this understanding, when a person dies, his mind still exists and that mind will be reborn in another body. Desire that located in the previous mind will be transferred into another mind. So a person carries desire within his mind from the moment of fertilization. In the *Abhidhamma* texts, it is said that the mind not only carries desire but also carries the *kamma*. It is personal *kamma* that determines how the new body will be formed. The good *kamma* performed in previous life will form a good body; the bad *kamma* will form a bad body. I accept that this theory is very interesting and can be used to explain the complicated phenomena in human diversity that why some persons are of the good health and some are of the bad health, etc. However, this understanding seems to overlook the importance of the body.

In his short story named *Father Sergius*, Tolstoy seems to have a view that the true enemy of the priest is nothing but his biological data inside his body. It can be said that in the eye of Tolstoy the conflict in the life of Father Sergius is the conflict between the body and the soul. I think that we can find this kind of view in the life of Buddhist monks like Ikkyu. The Zen monk named Ikkyu had written a number of poems expressing that why natural needs such as love should be viewed as the enemy of enlightenment. Love that Ikkyu has in his mind is sexual love, the love that plays the role behind the making of family in human life. Some years ago, I used to read the books written by the author who is the ex-monk in Catholic Church. The author says the same thing with Tolstoy and Ikkyu.

The point I am trying to present is that. In leading a life to the goal that religion says the highest goal a person is normally advised to overcome desire. In Buddhism the practice of *dbamma* for enlightenment is normally explained as a process of mind training. We name this process as *cittabhavana*, which directly translated as the cultivation of mind. Under the guidance of this belief, we lay most of attention on the mind and try to cultivate it according to the texts or as our teachers have advised. My question is: can we eliminate the thirst by fixing our consciousness. I believe that there

could be a mind control method that can eliminate the thirst from our consciousness. In ancient India there were many mind control practices recorded in the *Pali Tipitaka*. Even though we can use the mind to control the thirst which I interpret as a physical phenomenon, some problems still exist. Why we should use that method which needs very much energy. Why we do not use the most simple and direct way—drinking water.

When I was educated in the *Sangha School*, I was informed that Buddhism distinguishes the difference between physical suffering and mental suffering. The thirst is physical suffering and this kind of suffering Buddhism does not teach us try to overcome. It is only mental suffering that Buddhism teaches us to eliminate through the elimination of its cause namely desire. I think the problem in the distinguishing between physical suffering and mental suffering is that how we know which is physical or which is mental suffering. For example, when we are a boy or a girl, we do not know a thing called sex. We are angry when somebody among our friends says that we and that girl or that boy are the lovers. But this has completely changed when we are adult. Love in Buddhist teaching is suffering. When we are children we do not experience this kind of suffering because *our body is not ready*. My question is: how we distinguish between thirst and love.

According to me, the difference between thirst and love is not that the former is physical and the latter is mental. For me both are deeply located in the body and manifest themselves in our consciousness. We will understand the importance of the body by tracing back its history. Even though Buddhism and biology are different disciplines of thought, there is some sameness between them. Buddhism is a religion that teaches two things, as pointed out by Buddhadasa, namely natural things and natural laws. By the teaching of natural things, Buddhism states that all in the universe are naturally created, not by God or anything possessing properties like God. By the teaching of natural laws, Buddhism states that everything in nature is co-related as cause and effect. There are natural rules determining how things will be. There is no any authority that can interfere with the rule of nature, even God. In some *Sutra* in the *Pali Tipitaka*, it seems that the universe according to Buddhist teaching is under the evolution. What I try to say here is that the picture of the universe in Buddhist teaching is not a thing that suddenly created by God or any divine powers, but gradually evolved by natural causes. This spirit of Buddhism seems to make Buddhism and natural sciences not greatly different. Among the *Five Laws of Nature* taught by Buddhism, the *Law of Seed* is stated. This Buddhist law can be well compared with the law of biology in natural sciences. Furthermore, it is interesting that in some *Sutra* the Buddha himself says that human biological data are dynamic, not static. That is the form of human beings as seen now is not the same with the one that used to exist in the long past and will not remain the same in the long future. So, biological evolution is not a strange thing in Buddhist teaching.

The body has its own very long history. In terms of species, our human body has passed so many experiences in struggling for existence. We know that some species have completely disappeared from the earth. The only reason that makes them disappear is: they cannot adapt themselves to handle with surrounding environments. Human species seems to be the most powerful species in the present as the whole world is completely ruled by us. Please consider that the term 'us' in the previous sentence totally refers to the body. I would like to say that our body should be considered as an *independent system*. The *Doctrine of Anatta* in Buddhism, according to me, seems to support this understanding. The body works by itself and has various kinds of system to protect itself.

A thing called 'instinct' is nothing but an *automatic tool* produced by the body to support its existence. The picture of the body could be more understood by imagining that it is a biological robot working automatically and having various kinds of program to struggle for its existence.

I think that one of the most important questions to be asked by the Buddhists is: *Who am I?* Traditionally, it is said that the 'I' does not exist in Buddhist teaching. The *Doctrine of Anatta* is much used to insist above belief. I accept that the 'I' has many meanings. The meaning I want here is 'empirical I,' not 'metaphysical I' as meant in traditional meaning used by the Buddhists. Suppose now we are sitting at the front of a mirror. We see a person in the mirror and normally this person is understood by us as 'me.' In daily life, we automatically feel that it is 'me' that walking, studying, sleeping, and so on. What I want to suggest here is that the *Doctrine of Anatta* as I understand teaches us to reexamine such a feeling. In short, this doctrine suggests that some of the 'I' that occur in our consciousness are not the 'true I' but some are. So, the first thing to be done by the Buddhists to follow the way leading to the cessation of suffering is to distinguish which is the 'true I' and which is not.

At this stage, I would like to suggest that, for me, the 'true I' in our consciousness is one thing and the 'false I' is another thing, and the 'false I' is nothing but what called by the Buddha as the '*House Maker*.' Even though there are two kinds of the 'I' in our life and these two are basically different and sometimes contradictory, in the life of worldly person the House Maker is the one that dominates everything. This domination makes the feeling of harmony in a sense that we do not feel there are two persons inside us. Precisely speaking, in the life of worldly person instinct plays the major role in every action. So, the life that dominated by the House Maker will not feel any dilemma because all phenomena perceived by the House Maker are reduced into one single frame: *I must protect myself and everything belonging to myself*. At the beginning of the paper, I have raised a thought-experiment story saying that Gandhi has been confronted with a moral dilemma that between his son and a boy who is not his son which one should be chosen by him. This story I have raised to illustrate that moral dilemma will occur only in the life of a person that the House Maker is not the only one that determines the whole life. In the case of Gandhi, I believe that it is the 'true I' inside Gandhi's life that makes him oppressed in that choosing, but finally the House Maker in Gandhi's life wins. If this case occurs to a worldly person, there will not be any dilemma because inside the life where the House Maker is totally a dictator every event will be reduced into one single frame: *I must protect my son*.

In his book named *The Blind Watchmaker* Richard Dawkins argues that the world is not designed by God or by anything. Even though some arguments in this book are not strong enough to discredit the theist assumption about the creation of the world by God, the main argument in the book throws the light on the nature of the world in a way that given by Buddhism. First of all, the House Maker in Buddhist teaching could be extended to living organisms other than human beings. Buddhadasa says in his famous long article entitled *Superior Complex* that the fact that plants also have instincts to preserve their own existence is so obvious, so even though traditional interpretation of Buddhist teaching does not accept that plants have the mind Buddhadasa says that the fact that plants have the mind is something we can never deny. For Buddhadasa, every living organism (human being, animal, and plant) has the instinct. As the instinct belongs to

the House Maker, so we can say that all living organisms in the world are governed by the House Maker.

The Darwinian biologists such as Dawkins think that the world has evolved through the blind forces of nature. The world has no objectives. The evolution of living organisms could be said blindly driven. No one can predict the future of the world. There is a famous sentence in Darwin's theory saying that: *the fittest survives*. But the word 'the fittest' according to Darwin does not refer to any specific species. Human beings seem to be the most fittest as we can rule the whole world. But such understanding is not true. It could be possible that one day there is some natural accident seriously harming only human species. So, the wisest is not necessarily the fittest. Likewise, the strongest is also not necessarily the fittest. All depends on fate.

The German Idealist philosophers such as Schopenhauer said that life is nothing but *the will*. According to these philosophers, the will is a blind force that pushes human life to run ahead. Run for what, there is no answer. Sometimes we run for nothing. However, it seems that for Schopenhauer only to exist can be counted as the whole meaning of life. Schopenhauer said that life is *the will to live*. After Schopenhauer, another German philosopher named Nietzsche said that life is *the will to power*. For Nietzsche, to have the power over other is the meaning of life. Looking from Buddhist perspective, the House Maker has three forces in itself. The first is *the will to have*. The second is *the will to be*. And the third is *the will to not be*. I think that the will to live in Schopenhauer can be compared with the will to be in Buddhist philosophy. And the will to power in Nietzsche's view can be compared with the will to have in Buddhist philosophy. It should be noted that the last will, the will to not be, is not mentioned in the views of these philosophers.

In Buddhist texts, sometimes the House Maker is identified as *ignorance*. 'Ignorance' in Buddhist teaching contains several meanings and one important meaning is that ignorance means doing without questioning whether or not it is reasonable to do such a thing. The struggle to preserve its own existence found in any living organism, in general, could be viewed ignorance. The House Maker in living organisms has the varieties of the degree of ignorance. I mean that ignorance in living organisms is different depending on the history of each species. We usually take it for granted that human species is of least ignorance comparing with other species. But such understanding is problematic. As I have defined ignorance in terms of doing unreasonable things, it should be questioned that among the species of the world is it true that human species is the one most doing unreasonable things. I think the answer is yes. The accumulation of the wealth and suicide could be cited as an example of the absurd things done by human species. These two actions, I believe, can be found only in human species. The most importance is that these two actions cannot be explained in terms of self-preservation. Animals do not commit suicide and they do not accumulate what beyond the basic needs. Normally, we define ignorance as something being opposed to intelligence. From this definition, we think that human beings are of the least ignorance among the species of the world as we are of the most intelligence. However, this definition is not used by Buddhism. Sometimes, intelligence found in human beings is a source of suffering. Anything causing suffering is counted by Buddhism as ignorance. It should be noted that in the view of Buddhism human species possesses the most potential to suffer comparing with animals, so this implies that we are of the most ignorance. Or, we can say that the House Maker inside human life is of the most power, the blind power pushing us to run ahead without questioning why. Animals stop eating

when they feel full and start searching for food again when they feel hungry, but human beings search for everything hour by hour not necessarily from being hungry. A millionaire still tries to make money. This is the role of the House Maker in human species which differs from those in animals.

After enlightenment, the Buddha had traveled through the lands to teach what discovered by him. There could be many ways to understand what the Buddha teaches. A way I would like to mention here is somewhat called '*naturalistic approach*.' By this approach, what the Buddha knows through enlightenment is nothing but the facts hidden in nature. Buddhadasa says that the Buddha has discovered four things. The first is natural things, the second is natural laws, the third is the duties to follow natural laws, and the fourth is the fruits resulting from the following of natural laws. So, it could be said that Buddhist morality is not something isolated from the facts found in nature. Or, we can say that when Buddhism teaches us to do or not to do anything, such advice is partly based on awareness that human beings are naturally created. Specifically speaking, Buddhism has total awareness that man is composed of body and mind. The body has its own history. It is a complete system with autonomously self-defending and self-preservative tools. This is natural fact about human nature, but a half fact because besides the body man also has the mind which is another complete system in itself like the body. So life in Buddhist perspective is a conjunction of the body and the mind. In the first sermon given by the Buddha to a group of five ascetics, the Buddha has mentioned three moral systems. The first is hedonism, the second is asceticism, and the third is Buddhist morality. The first two are called by the Buddha as the extreme practices, while the system given by the Buddha himself is called a *middle-way* practice. I think that being 'extreme view' of these two systems closely depends on their relation to body and mind. Hedonism is nothing but a moral principle which lets the body to lead the whole life, while asceticism is nothing but a moral principle which allows the mind, or the soul, to lead everything in our life. So, the *middle-way-ness* of Buddhist morality is considered from its balanced practice to body and mind. If we accept that the governor of the body is the House Maker, Buddhist ethics, in general, does not think that the only way we can do concerning the House Maker is to treat it as our enemy!

A term 'extreme' (*anta* in Pali) partly means having no compromise, while a term 'middle way' (*majjhima* in Pali) partly means containing a compromise spirit. Sometimes we say that compromise means lack of standpoint. I think the compromise spirit in the middle way principle does not mean like that. On the contrary, 'compromise' is a standpoint. However, it should be noted that compromise in Buddhist teaching is a result of the analysis of the truth of the world. Sometimes Buddhism is referred to by Buddhist thinkers as a religion of analysis. Analysis here means not using the black-and-white logic in considering things. Looking through the eye of analysis, the House Maker and we share some things providing benefits for each other. This fact is a basis of why Buddhist morality does not think that we should reject the House Maker absolutely.

We should understand that when we 'think' it could be possible that the thought occurring can be of the House Maker or the 'real I.' Consciousness is shared by us and the House Maker. Normally, people do not know 'who is thinking' when they think. Moreover, sometimes when the House Maker thinks, it does not allow us to know; but all we think the House Maker knows. Looking from this point, the 'real I' shares only some part of life with the House Maker; most parts of life are possessed by the House Maker. Some religion in the world, for example Jainism, thinks that the body is not our home. I



think that both Buddhism and Jainism speak of the body as the house and we as the mind or the soul are merely the guests. Inside the house, there is the permanent owner named the House Maker. Why it allows us to stay inside? What benefits it gets from us?

According to Jainism the body is material. By its nature matter is inactive in a sense that it cannot do anything by itself. Unlike matter, the soul is an active entity in a sense that it can do something (*not everything*) by itself. By the combination between matter and the soul, life occurs. Life as a result of the combination of the matter and the soul allows the body and the soul to do so many things which cannot be done by them in a state of separation. The interpretation of Buddhism done by me says different view from what said in Jainism. According to Buddhism, matter as an independent system from the mind can evolve by itself. I do not mean that the matter is not under the law of causation taught by the Buddha, but want to say that the matter can evolve under the law of causation in which all surrounding factors are material. However, I accept that Buddhism and Jainism share the view that in some situation both matter and mind cannot do something and such a thing will turn to be under control by life after the process of combination. And this is why the body allows the space in it for the mind.

The Buddha before being enlightened was a prince. He had parents and was married with a son. So, his bodily life could be considered in terms of biology. The history of the Buddha can be traced back into the past through two lines that determined by the body and the mind. The body of the Buddha comes from the bodies of his ancestors that can be traced back to the first moment that the first life occurs in the earth. But the mind of the Buddha does not come from his parents. It comes from another mind occurring as a stream back to the somewhat infinite past. The problem of 'when the first mind of any series of minds starts' is one of metaphysical problems explored by ancient Indian thinkers. This question is ignored by the Buddha. However, the texts of Mahayana Buddhism seem to say that the body and the mind come from the same source. It is the space. I do not want to discuss this question. A thing I want to suggest here is that Buddhism seems to accept that the mind and the body are two lines of reality and there are some necessities that bring these two lines merged together. The necessities are found by each line; they are the necessities to have other line to make use from. I am inclined to believe that the body has its own intelligence. The gene works silently inside the body. It knows how to do such and such things in certain circumstances. This is undeniable intelligence. Moreover, I think that the more the body has experiences with the mind the more the body realizes to adjust itself. I would like to call this kind of body as a *learned* body. So, it could be said that it is the wisdom of the body to allow the mind sitting in. Looking from this point, the body and the mind are not necessarily the enemy of each other. We can view them as the friends; I believe that this understanding might be in accordance with the principle of middle way taught by the Buddha.

Normally we understand that what called '*meditation*' in Buddhism is a training of the mind. I do not deny this, but I would like to add that meditation should be viewed to cover a training of the body too. Richard Dawkins, in his book named *The Selfish Gene*, admits that even though the gene is selfish in a sense that it is driven by the most profound instinct to act for a group that shares the same genetic entities with it, the gene some day will be cultivated by something to have the broader mind. The way Dawkins says about the gene is closely near the saying about the leaned body in Buddhism. It could be possible that the gene being cultivated by meditation will turn from being selfish into unselfish. The noble persons called in Buddhism as the *arabanta*, in my view, are not

only of unselfish mind but also of unselfish body. There are many stories recorded in the Buddhist texts saying that these noble persons by nature can never harm others. Surely, it is the pure mind that plays the role behind this, but the texts seem to say that the process of 'can never harm others' runs deeply beyond the mind. I would like to say that the noble persons in Buddhism have the instincts purely cultivated so that they can never harm anything in the world. They do not think 'how to choose' when confronted with a situation that could lead to the harm to others. The inner instinct does not allow the choice. There is only single way to do: no harm. It is well known that the *Sakya* clan of the Buddha was destroyed by the army of other state. The *Sakya's* army was well trained in using the weapons. But after the practice of the *dhamma* taught by the Buddha, all of the *Sakya's* soldiers decided to die. They do not defend themselves. They can never kill. For me, this story might not be explained without referring to the gene. Self-defense is a normal phenomenon generally found in living organisms. It is run by the selfish gene. Logically, at least from Buddhist logical point of view, if any living organism decides to die, not to defend itself, the gene inside such organism must not be the selfish one.

From all previously said, it could be summarized that body and mind in Buddhist perspective are considered as two independent systems in their origin. Later these two things have merged into oneness for some purposes. The body has its own objectives that can be summarized into one sentence: *to make the house*. It seems that the very basic belief of the body concerning the world is that the world is a place worth making home. So, the body has tried in every way to make itself live forever. But such an attempt does not fit the nature of the body in that it can never be eternal. So the way left for the body to do to meet the objective of being eternal is to copy itself before dying. This is the origin of reproductive instinct found in all living organisms in the world. The mind in Buddhist teaching seems to have what we call reproductive instinct too as it reproduces its copy moment by moment. For Buddhism, the mind is not permanent entity like the soul in Hinduism or Christianity. The mind in Buddhism is a series of consciousness. One consciousness happens and then shortly decays; another consciousness happens as a copy of previous consciousness and then shortly decays again. In this phenomenon, it seems that there is a process of self-reproduction as found in the case of the body. The question is why the mind reproduces itself. Does the mind have the instinct like the body? The answer from Buddhism is no. The mind does not reproduce itself in such meaning. The mind of the noble persons like the Buddha and the *arahanta* still happens and decays moment by moment. Unlikely, the body of these noble persons has stopped completely to reproduce a copy in the name of son. It is believed that sexual instinct in the body of the noble persons has totally disappeared. Certainly, purely biological processes such as the continuation of cells still work as before. But this cannot be viewed as a process of self-reproduction *because its objective is not to make the house*. Likewise, the continuation of mind cannot be viewed as a process of self-reproduction too because its objective is not to make the house.

Cosmologically speaking, the theory of body and mind in Buddhism has too many things to be explained, but it is not the objective of this paper to clarify these topics. The main objective of this paper is to explore the mystery of life through the exploration of body and mind; and it is hoped that there might be some point in Buddhist perspective striking our thought. As Buddhism has a variety of moral lessons ranking from the most basic to the most advanced, the view to the body then varies depending on which step of morality we are considering. Basically, for the people who feel that a moral system they

need is a basic one, the body should be treated as a closely family member. In our family, relations between persons are linked by heart. Sometimes the body may do something foolish, but as a family member it should be allowed to do such a thing that not harming itself seriously. As the body and the mind share the same consciousness, what is tasted by the body is also tasted by the mind. The body has its own basic nature to taste the sweetness of the world, so even though in doing a foolish thing of the body (looking from the moral standard set by the mind) some positive goodness can be found. That is the body has brought the pleasure into life. The Buddha never rejects the making of money and using the money to buy pleasures. What he rejects is the blindly making of money and the blindly using of money to buy immoral pleasures. However, it should be understood that this is the basic moral system for worldly people. Buddhism has other moral systems more advanced beyond this.

The mind is not created strong by its basic nature. Its strength will occur by the training. So, people with the mind in standard qualities are those who admit that they need a basic moral system. A few people in the world need an advanced system. But the fact that very few people need the advanced morality is considered by Buddhism as not a problem. The Buddha never worries about this. Reasonable hedonism seems to be accepted by the Buddha. However, as what we call pleasure contains some negative sides, an advanced morality is designed for a person who feels something beyond that. The body in advanced mode of Buddhist morality is more strictly treated. The following example can be illustrated what are the basic concepts in advanced mode of Buddhist morality. A man is sick with some slightly pain. The doctor says to him that there are two ways to deal with his sickness. The first way is: he can take the wine to reduce the pain. The second way is: he must take the medicine to eliminate the pain. In choosing the first, he should accept that the pain must not disappear; the wine merely reduces the pain. The good point in choosing this way is the man is not forced to do a painful thing. Drinking the wine is pleasurable. But the bad point in this choosing is the man will never destroy the sickness, what he must do again and again is to drink the wine. In choosing the second way, the man is forced to do a painful thing. That is he must take a strong medicine. The good point in choosing this way is that the sickness will be completely eliminated and merely doing such a thing only one time. But the bad point is that the man is forced to do a painful thing. Between these two choices, which is the best? The Buddha never claims which one. All depends on the man.

*Nibbana* as the ultimate goal of practicing the *dhamma* is designed for those who are extremely bored with taking the wine to temporarily reduce the pain of life. At this point, it can be said that we who choose that way will to depart from the house created by the body. It is not merely a departure in normal sense, but something containing more meanings. Normally, when we depart from something such as our house, that thing still exists. But in the case of *nibbana*, after the mind departs from the body, the body will not exist anymore. So, it can be said that the final goal of life in Buddhist teaching is the total extinction of the mind and the body from self-reproduction. Before that point, the body and the mind are trained gradually by *sila*, *samadhi* and *pañña*. These processes are nothing but the cultivation of body and mind as oneness to one single point. I believe that *nibbana* can never be attained without the agreement between body and mind to stop making the house. Ultimately, I think that Buddhism differs from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche in that for Buddhism the body has its wisdom in a form of the potential to be trained by the mind. It does not contain only *the will to live* or *the will to power*. Some

day the body will be learned so that it can do something against the will as said by these philosophers.