

AHIMSA

Buddhism and the Vegetarian Ideal



By Bodo Balsys

Obeisance to the Gurus.

Om

Thanks to Laura Inwood and Ruth Fitzpatrick
for their assistance.

© Bodo Balsys 2001
Maitreya Sangha Dharma Centre Australia
Email: lovejoyinfinity@yahoo.com
All rights reserved.

ISBN: 0 9592656 8 4

Contents

Preface

The Harmfulness of Meat Eating	1
War upon the Animal Kingdom	15
The Merchandising of Animals for Products	28
The Psychic Perspective	33
The Story of Animal Rebirth	40
Slugs versus Cows	47
The Highest Yoga Tantra	56
Healing and Meditation	84
Environmental Considerations	99
Conclusion	110

Appendix I

An Extract from the <u>Lankâvatâra Sûtra</u>	114
--	-----

Appendix II

A Brief Exposition on the Nature of Karma	124
---	-----

Appendix III

The Factor of Meat Eating	129
---------------------------	-----

Appendix IV

Levels of Tantra	137
------------------	-----

<i>Index</i>	140
--------------	-----

Preface

The purpose of this book is to try to better inform those Buddhists that consume their brothers of the animal Kingdom as to the reasons why they should try to refrain.

I apologise for any inner turmoil that may be evoked in the reader in response to the content of this short treatise. However, it is indicative that such readers are at least considerate enough to care. In any case if such emotions are stirred, it can be said that if the immediate (albeit transient) pain is enough to produce a response of change within the reader, in order to save the life of even one animal, then the writing will not be in vain.

I understand that there are many social mores and customs inbred in all people. These are generally well entrenched and accordingly govern the lives of those born into that society. This does not mean that change is not possible, and indeed history abounds with the stories of how such changes have perpetually happened in all societies. Change is inevitable, it is one of the key pillars of the Buddha dharma, and indeed, is a must in this arena of compassionate concern. There are many reasons for this, as are given below.

This writing is dedicated to all those who are willing to think and act compassionately. Its focus is necessarily slanted towards Tibetan Buddhist monks because they have set their sights high in spreading their dharma to the West, and thus inadvertently and rightfully so have purported themselves as teachers in many arenas. Their rich culture and teachings on wisdom and compassion are examples that many in the West are inspired by, apart from this major problem of a seeming hypocritical stance with respect to their four-footed brothers.

If Tibetans wish to rightly ethically educate people then all forms of hypocrisy must go. They must therefore sacrifice aspects of their customs and personal desires in relation to their eating habits. They would then be setting an admirable example, sounding out a great message for the world at large. Particularly so for the ever growing number of Western Buddhists, who continue to seek guidance from their Tibetan teachers and who inevitably pose the question, ‘Should we be vegetarian?’ It would heal a great wound that is being carved by the erroneous responses presently given to them.

If we are to root out all ignorance we must rightly educate all whom seek to develop *bodhicitta*. Rather than encouraging apathy through submissive responses, let us deliver the message loudly and clearly, that needless killing and suffering is wrong. In doing so let us begin to open the gateways of compassionate understanding in the whole of humanity and work to create a world where needless killing does not occur. It must start with the most loving and compassionate beings on Earth, those whom have devoted their existence to relieve the suffering of all sentient beings, those beings whom have placed

the evocation of harmlessness and compassion at the forefront of their lives. As we strive to relieve all forms of suffering: that being the greatest calling of our lives, let us give to each other all the encouragement and knowledge and insight to do so.

This book is in the form of a compassionate plea that calls upon Buddhists to utilise their power and influence to the greatest means possible. So may it be that our compassionate understanding is expanded and the strength and power of the Buddha's way is purified and energised for many milleniums to come.

May we all continue to grow infinitely in *wisdom and compassion* and walk the Bodhisattva Way.

Om Mani Vajrapâni Hûm!

1

The Harmfulness of Meat Eating

The eating of meat cannot in any way be considered to be helpful to the practice of the dharma, neither can the slaughter of animals be considered to be consistent with the Buddhist teachings of compassion, (*mettâ, ahimsâ, karunâ*), of loving kindness, or of the nature of the evocation of the enlightenment-mind.¹ The cruelties associated with the slaughter of the animal Kingdom for human consumption, the pain, fear, and distress suffered by the animals in the entire process of being fattened for butchering, as well as the environmental disasters wreaked upon our planet through the meat industry, are very well documented, and should be understood by all

¹ *Bodhicitta* - which can be translated as the consciousness of compassion.

who claim to be developing *bodhicitta*, or who wish to. There are now many books on the subject. We also have statements purported to have been said by the Buddha, as in the *Sûrangama Sûtra*, which states:

The reason for practicing dhyâna and seeking to attain Samâdhi is to escape from the suffering of life, but in seeking to escape from suffering ourselves why should we inflict it upon others? Unless you can so control your minds that even the thought of brutal unkindness and killing is abhorrent, you will never be able to escape from the bondage of the world's life...After my Parinirvâna in the last kalpa different kinds of ghosts will be encountered everywhere deceiving people and teaching them that they can eat meat and still attain enlightenment...How can a bhikshu, who hopes to become a deliverer of others, himself be living on the flesh of other sentient beings?²

How can you truly be a spiritual being when you kill (animals) via the consequence of eating meat? Your intention to not harm is negated by your intention to eat meat. You are the perpetrator of suffering upon others. Your Buddhist vows are useless, let suffering rule the world you inadvertently say, as you eat the cow. You are killing effectively in the name of your spirituality, as if your dharma is clean. The spirituality starts to be defiled when the knife comes down upon the lamb and you eat its flesh, or by driving the car with the intention of supper, ie, you go and patronage the butcher shop, whereby the killing has been done for you.

Buddhists who wish to justify meat eating often state that the Buddha said in the *Jivaka Sutta*, 'that in three cases meat must not be eaten: if it has been seen, heard, or suspected that it was intended for the person'.³ It should however be noted that this statement was given by the Buddha solely because of the problem faced by ordained monks when begging for food, and given meals containing meat by their hosts. Rather than reject what was given to them (a thing seen as charitable and a deed generative of good karma for that individual), the Buddha said that they would eat only under the strict

² Version from: *A Buddhist Bible*, ed. Dwight Goddard (New York: Dutton, 1952), pp. 264-5.

³ The entire conversation reads thus "Jivaka told Buddha that he had heard that people killed living things intending them for Buddha, and that he ate the meat prepared on that account. He asked if such persons were truth-speakers and did not accuse the Lord falsely. Buddha replied that it was not true, but that in three cases meat must not be eaten: if it has been seen, heard, or suspected that it was intended for the person. If a monk who practises the brahma-vihara of love accepts an invitation in a village, he does not think, "verily this house-holder is providing me with excellent food; may he provide me with excellent food in the future." "He eats the food without being fettered in the future." He eats the food without being fettered and infatuated. "What do you think, Jivaka, does the monk at that time think of injury to himself, to others, or to both?" "Certainly not, Lord." "Does not a monk at that time take blameless food?" *Jivaka Sutta* (M.N.I. 368). Quoted from 'A Comparative Study of Jainism and Buddhism', by Brahmcahri Sital Prashad, p. 246-7.

conditions mentioned above, "without being fettered and infatuated". By the last statement, the Buddha regarded the mind's non-attachment to whatever came to a monk as most important, thus to be non-attached to what food one ate, or being infatuated with food.

Of course, the Buddhist may say that he can eat meat without being fettered to the thought of so eating, etc, but could he do so if it was direct poison that was offered to him to be eaten? Does not what one consumes directly affect the physical body and mind, even of one's ability to rightly meditate? One must give a thought as to the type of life one is to live, and for the road to enlightenment ahead of one. One must think clearly on what is consumed, or any other type of action that one might do, as to the harm it may or may not cause the body, mind, or to other sentient beings. If one does not do so, and yet claims to be "unfettered" then one is foolish, indeed very much fettered to continuous karma-producing action that such myopic self-deceptive thought will surely produce. It is like putting a blanket over one's head and then claiming that the darkness that one sees is Nirvâna.

The only proper way to interpret the Buddha's statement above (from a Mahâyâna perspective) is that the consumption of meat was not at all agreeable to the Buddha, or to his disciples and he would rather them abstain altogether. However, the practice of begging for alms (in an unfettered manner) required a consideration of the merit of the kind donor offering food. By accepting food from the donor the monk facilitates the production of a good karmic/dharmic connection with that person, which will grow in future lives to be a positive interaction as the monk goes on to become a Bodhisattva and then a Buddha.

The offering of food allowed a possible discourse on the Buddha dharma. The possibility of this type of good karma being denied if the bhikshu rejected the food offering from the host had to be weighed up with the ideal of strict vegetarianism. Nevertheless, the spirit of the Buddha's teaching is clear - do not eat meat if it is in any way avoidable. If monks accepted meat produce in foods under the guide-lines set out by the Buddha (ie. 'if it has been seen, heard, or suspected that it was intended for the person') the karma of the monks with the animal Kingdom would be minimised and be counterbalanced with the good karma of the monk's interrelation with the host. In our consideration the term 'unfettered' really means that which leads to the walking of the Bodhisattva path, and consequent Buddhahood.

In any case the *Jivaka Sutta* is Theravâdin, and later Mahâyâna texts, such as the *Sûrangama* and *Lankâvatâra sûtras* made it very clear that eating meat was wrong and totally unacceptable.

Monks used to literally roam the country begging for alms and this was the way they ate, thus the rule was accept what you are given. However the truthful fact is that now it is rare to find Buddhist monks of the Mahâyâna schools begging for alms/food. They are given money or donations and are fed thereby. Thus they have a choice now to truly exercise their compassion in being selective as to what they eat, and what food they buy, and here clearly, they continue to choose to buy meat. To properly follow the teaching of the Buddha, one must not purchase meat or consume it either, as then

one's intention is the consuming of meat that has been slaughtered for one - or for the monastery.

In analysing the Buddha's statement, '*if it has been seen, heard, or suspected that it was intended for the person*' in the modern day context, we see that monks in fact violate all three rules.

1) It matters little whether the butcher knows or does not know who is purchasing the meat, he knows that the monks in the monastery eat meat and that is good enough for him as a cause to kill the animal. He must kill because he has *seen* 'you', that is 'a' or any number of Buddhist monks patronising his shop. It does not matter to him which of 'you' comes to buy the meat for the monastery.

2) In the present day case the monks go directly to a butcher to purchase with full knowledge of the fact that they are to buy a carcass that they will consume - producing direct karma with the animals. The butcher has *heard* the monks asking for meat, therefore he supplies it to them. They have *heard* that his prices are the cheapest, therefore they will patronise. The butcher has *heard* the monk's request for cheaper meat and to compete with other butchers he makes the produce of his slaughter most competitive. Thus the story runs in our societies, whether the purchaser be monks or laity purchasing for monks matters little in this equation.

3) The servant of the Monastery sent to purchase the food thus goes directly to the killer, whom from then on *suspects*, with some certainty, that he will return to purchase the products of the butchery.

We see in the above that present day monks do not at all follow the spirit of the Buddha's concession to his monks, or the nature of ahimsâ. Neither can such actions be justified by any twist of the imagination.

What we are essentially talking about is a very basic law, that of supply and demand. If there is no need ie., (demand) for umbrellas because it ceases to rain, then the supply will quickly cease also. So too, if there is no meat eaters, ie., if the human race became vegetarian then there would be no need to kill for food. There would be no demand and thus the supply would also cease to be. People would get *all* of their nutritional supplies from pulses, vegetables, nuts, and fruits. The greater demand would produce a greater supply of these things, (and they would be cheaper), instead of the uneconomical and environmentally destructive process of supplying carcasses to eat. No one would be motivated to supply dead animals because no one would buy them and such these creatures would be relieved of undeserved suffering. The sheep herder would become a soy bean farmer and so on, producing the ramifications of good will, and compassion throughout society. The butcher would cease to exist.

We can also look at this from a slightly different viewpoint. We have a law in the West that makes the receiving of stolen goods illegal. By making this illegal it essentially stops the thief, or limits his progress. There is no similar law that prohibits the butcher from selling his goods, thus animals needlessly die due to the views and commonplace attitudes of people whom willingly purchase flesh. They see not the life of the animal and why it was killed. It is paralleled in consumer groups in the process of thieving. If you have possessions in a house and you get burgled, then part of the reasons

for the pain of being burgled is the cost of having to replace what was taken. The animal once consumed must be replaced, and this is the pain of the animal Kingdom, the continual replacement of slaughtered animals by new animals for human consumption. People don't just kill once, they kill again and again. Thieves don't just steal once, if they can get away with it, they steal again and again. The receiver of stolen goods rewards the thief for his thievery, as does the meat eater reward the butcher for his killing. Just because you didn't kill the animal yourself doesn't make it right to subscribe to the killing of animals.

So, how many more generations of animals (ie. how many billions of future individual units) need to get slaughtered because of this "replacement factor", that Buddhists have not yet thought about.

You have been killing and maiming animals for years and have not seen that marketing, as we call it in the West, means cause and effect, supply and demand. Those people steal possessions only because a demand is there to achieve access. Making a parallel between the karma of killing and the karma of stealing means that both animals and property can only be interfered with, if another group of people are willing to pay for that product. The understanding as how karma works here is simple.

The laws of our societies are made to withhold the stealing from within,⁴ as much as can be prevented. This means that to prevent animals from being killed the consumer group has to radically change it's diet, change it's preferences, and to consider the argument of pain and suffering to prevent further harm.

Many Buddhists also look to the way the Buddha is purported to have died as another excuse for their eating meat. However, it should be noted that the Buddha didn't necessarily eat pig meat when he died; it can also be argued that he ate "a poisonous truffle (a species of mushroom)".⁵ But the symbolism of eating meat, here as

⁴ If caught, the thief often denies that he stole, in a similar way that meat eaters often deny that they cause any harm. Stealing from within, refers in part to, internal lying to oneself that meat eating/stealing is justifiable despite what they know in conscience to be the true situation.

⁵ This is explained in detail on pp. 23-35 in the book *To Cherish all Life* by Roshi Philip Kapleau. Part of what he states is:

In view of the first precept's prohibition against causing another to take life, it is appropriate to inquire how meat-eating Buddhist priests, monks, and teachers justify such a transgression. Question them and they are sure to say, "Don't you know that the Buddha himself ate a piece of pork offered to him at the home of one of his followers? Although normally he did not eat flesh foods, his sense of gratitude would not permit him to refuse it. Like the Buddha, we gratefully eat whatever is put before us, without preference or aversion"...And then they will add, "And are you not also aware that the Buddha laid down the rule that one must refrain from meat eating only if one knows, hears, or suspects the animal has been killed specifically for one's own consumption?".....monks, teachers and lay people have taken refuge in these supposed actions and statements of the Buddha to justify their meat eating, implying that if the Buddha himself ate flesh foods when it was offered to him, surely they have warrant to do likewise. What they gloss over with respect to the first proposition is the research of scholars, the majority of whom contend that it was not a piece of meat but a poisoned truffle (a species of mushroom) that caused the Buddha's

'pig meat', being deadly to the human form is correct. Why was not the symbolism rightly utilised by thinking Buddhists as a reason *not* to eat meat, instead of trying to justify their morally bankrupted actions in consuming their defenceless cousins?

Could you chomp on a living animal? If not, your desire to eat meat means you have to kill it first, so that it doesn't wriggle about, and you don't have to be peeved by the truth. To eat meat assumes killing first and many meat eaters would discover the truth of animal suffering if they actually had to slaughter each animal first before consumption. In future lives all the sickness you have caused, by your desires to kill, will descend upon you. Here the suffering is in a different form than for that of the animal slaughtered, but for the senses, the experience will be a closer approximation. You are just experiencing exactly what you caused in another's life by your previous desirous consumption. The reality of the suffering you have caused will be yours in the future life. Little difference this or that life, but Buddhists are aiming to transcend suffering by breaking free of those activities which cause harm to others, and thus from having to incarnate again to pay back the karma in a future life.

Your attacks of sickness are but the karma of paying for your former life activities, of making others suffer as a consequence of you. Many sicknesses are largely the result of the killing of innocent animals and of their meat ingestion.

Indeed, sickness is largely the result of general emotionality and of killing - of other humans in former lives, of destroying of that which is good and healthy in our societies, and similarly in each individual human unit. It really concerns the killing or maiming of the principle of bodhicitta, and where bodhicitta is stifled and denied, there is a cause of ailment, suffering.

Your belly is the flagstone that displays the reasons for the killing. Therein lies the karma of the living and the death. You are a walking gravestone. You hold all the actions to that which produces the bones, clean and white. You hold them in the skeletal remains of your dinner.

The bulldozers come to the ignorant, (they are your desires) to retrieve the bones to find the cause. What was the cause of 'its' death you say as you hold the bone up? Its cause - a society (or any particular individual) who choose to nourish their bodies by the killing of an animal, another less worthy in their eyes to live. You have no right to judge; all life is precious. The flagstones made of the bones wave in the burial of common sense, and in favour of the logicality of a vegetarian diet.

death, and what they ignore with respect to the second are the Mahâyâna scriptures, which unequivocally condemn meat eating.

Kapleau then goes into the scholarly research and ends with:

Laying aside scholarship, what reasonable person can believe that Chunda offered the Buddha a piece of pork when the latter came to pay him a visit? As one of the Buddha's followers, surely he would have known that flesh food was not part of the Buddha's diet. (Very likely Chunda didn't eat meat himself, as most Indians still don't today.) Why, then, would he have offered meat to the World-Honoured One, a person so sensitive to the sufferings of all living beings that he would not drink milk from a cow during the first ten days after its calf was born?

The gravestone has on it the name of the animal that died, the society in question, and the particular being who ate it. A gravestone is but a flagstone that has all the records of karma imprinted upon it, the reasons for death and what other pain the animal received.

To be a loving being one must love only the dharma. ‘Dharma’ means that meat eating Buddhist monks have to reincarnate to cleanse the karma of meat consumption. To do so they must then educate others, in non hypocritical ways, as to the nature of the pain caused by such acts. This means that the breath of life sucked from the animal is only atoned for (consolidated) by the fact that those that killed will reserve similar karma. The light shines on. Buddhists darn your socks, there are flaws, holes in your logic, the logic that must support your feet for the walking to enlightenment.

We expect more Buddhists to be vegetarians. Today we need more examples of vegetarianism, and the Buddhists who are pledged to be so. In the world of spirituality, we receive impressions/visions via the third eye and see that the aura of the Buddhist community is not clear or clean, and that they should be making an example of true spirituality for the world at large. Radiance is what we expect from those who aspire for the Bodhisattva path, not the dull auras caused by meat prânas⁶.

You enslave animals by your will to eat meat. Your carnal desires lassos its neck with every thought of supper. How can you fry it in the pan without enslaving your desires to it? You have cheated it of its life and paid for it in money; how can you expect the good karma of coming back a sage (for example) when you have fortified your desire around the carnal act of killing? Your good Buddhist dharma and ego for spiritual life is just that of enslavement of bodily form to meat, and your desires voraciously manifest as the hunter. The hunt for meat is the intent to kill. How can an animal not suffer with your desire to eat meat? The animal must suffer - if you eat meat you kill. The killing comes first. It is of little worth if you’ve got someone else to do that killing for you because of the society you live in. Essentially the karma is the same, it is that of intent to harm, and this is followed through by the law of karma. By “intent to harm” I mean that the truth is that your intention *is to* harm an animal even though you lie to yourself that this is not so, inventing all types of excuses as to why eating meat is justifiable. The irrevocable fact is that the animal is killed because of you thus lying. It is harmed, its life is prematurely curtailed.

Whatever someone kills you eat, and whatever you eat you kill, is simply an equation of the direct sequence of events to the butcher’s shop. The same goes with accepting meat from families that feed you, (whether through begging or by being a member of that family). Inadvertently, if with this ‘acceptance’ you put your ‘feelings of compassion’ out into society, you can not help the butcher who is employed by you to kill, to slaughter, you cannot help the death of one innocent animal in many. Maybe you are ‘compassionate’, but its suffering is yours. For this you are karmically indebted.

⁶ The vital or psychic energy in the body that vitalises it in all of its aspects. There are five different types of prâna, which are explained in my book *Karma and the Rebirth of Consciousness*.

The killer has his sights on all humans in the local area where he intends to sell meat. Therefore, when meat is produced his expectation is the likelihood of a man, someone like you, intending to eat fish, sheep, cow, goat or pig. He kills it so that you are able to eat it. If he did not kill it, it would not be in the family that hosts you. Therefore when you agree to the contract of eating meat, you agree to the killing of the animal - you are condoning the custom of meat, of killing for consumption. Animals are killed for human consumption. It is as simple as that.

This unthinking "acceptance" of families also means that children are automatically fed meat and meat products and are educated thus to think that this is a most worthwhile practice. Consequently the harm (of false beliefs) is perpetuated in our societies through many generations. As a karmic consequence myriads of sentient beings suffer and sickness perpetuates everywhere.

We can also look at a hypocritical culture, where the young deer or lamb is worshipped as a childhood hero,⁷ when in effect all that happens to them (these "heroes", if you like) is the procedures of the meat industry; canned, crushed and made into little fixations of "I like this and that" in terms of meat and meat products.

The term 'I like' does not personify the experience - to truly like something means to preserve it at all costs in the form it was intended, ie, the idolised animal form, and not the can of meat, or meat product, which is presumed worthy for human consumption. Does this childhood love deserve such disrespect? Surely children do not determine what fodder they will have to eat? It is forced upon them by unthinking adults. This adult enforcement of cruel, insensate eating practices must go, as it tramples upon the sensitive psyche of children and corrupts their love for animals. It educates children to be distinctly unloving when in fact we must teach them the bodhicitta way.

Free the cattle, liberate the children from ungainly thoughts, teach them the truth by unveiling the images of animal suffering, and make the vegetable gardens grow. Tell the children that I will not have a hand in the meat industry, or in an intent to kill, and when I see meat on other's tables, I will not condone their intent to kill either.

Do we bring babies into manifestation, just to kill them in later life, and expect them to thank us for a plan to bring them into incarnation? Do we give them a pre-worked out life length in unison with the joys of conscious experience until that point in time where we choose to exterminate them in the way that we currently treat animals? I do not think that a race of animals, or indeed, any woman or man, would be happy at the point of pre-incarnation to think that 'marvellously' they would be given a pre-ordained timed period to fit their life into before they are slaughtered. The decision to slaughter basically comes from the fact that people think that they own cows, sheep, etc. If they applied this logic in deciding to have babies, then they would be able to kill their children at a certain date as a consequence of determining the fate of their possessions.

⁷ As is 'Bambi' the famous Walt Disney character. Such imagery is also given to us in the Jatâka tales where the Buddha often sacrificed his life for the sake of animals.

I am overjoyed at least that mothers do not think that they own their children enough to treat them as an animal. Is this because they love them? Perhaps then we see that Buddhists, for all intents and purposes, do not love animals as much as they claim. What differentiates animals subjectively from humans in this consideration? Compassion, as a law of love, may blend and heal their wounds of unlovingness, and if there is no 'I' at the centre of being (according to Buddhist philosophy) between the species of man and that of a dog; then what differentiates humans from animals and the way one would treat either species? It should be a specific concern, considering the Buddhists relatively talented thought of reincarnating into them. The Buddhist explorers of universal love and consciousness might learn a thing or two from human psychology, of the motives for killing, and the motives for not killing, in accordance to the law of love if they reflected more upon why they consume meat. They should note that the same type of love, as a justifiable effect, stops a mother from pre-planning a determined life span for her child or children.

Meat eating has been told to us as being unnecessary in Buddhism, mainly because of the suffering caused. Yet how many millions of Buddhists survive on the slaughter of the beloveds we ask? If all those Buddhists, individually and in groups, eat and consume meat products, then all that is happening in terms of karma is that those Buddhists, (who should be living examples of compassion for the world) are killing animals. For the compassionate, the response is simple when they view the bleeding ventricles of the animal falling on the floor, and they can imagine that its last thought as it is dying is its questions, 'why', 'what for?' And would animals think thus: 'well Mr butcher/consumer/Lama, you are a saviour with the knife, and what a cruel saviour you are, that you would take any life away for your greedy purpose'

Shame, shame on you out there, I say shame on you for not producing karma of a good kind. You Buddhists should know better, and those who actually are vegetarians should've at least tried to educate their fellow brothers who did fall into this karmic hell-producing form of action. After all its your teaching to realise the empirical laws of karma, and you should meditate on them well, but you have forgotten the cow and how it lives in your belly of discontent, its death is the burial in your stomach - as you meditate on the reasons for life and suffering. The cow suffers in the throws of death because of your consumption, and this you have ingested into your constitution, it has become part of your aggregates, the skandhas and *samskāras*⁸ that you will carry onto future lives. Why can't you leave animals alone in the fields? Why do you have to employ the butcher to chop your meat? He is far too busy creating and cleansing karma of his own. How can you thus love the cow, as you should, as well as all other animals and products of Nature? You symbolically sit in a jail with the horse of mind wondering why one suffers, with most of your karma of death and the suffering of animals resting in your belly.

Clean up your meat eating *samskāras*, (the one who meditates on 'suffering'), otherwise you will suffer the karma. For you will,

⁸ Volitional tendencies developed in each life. See my book *Karma and the Rebirth of Consciousness* for a complete description of these.

and it is deadly. For you have already inadvertently chosen so to die. Get back to basics, go to a pro-vegetarian diet, to eating the vegetables that have evolved to be consumed by the animal Kingdom as part of their evolutionary thrust; get on with life so that you won't consume and create so much karma. If Buddhists truly loved as they should according to the doctrine of bodhicitta, then much sickness would be ameliorated and premature death for the life principle ended. For the agonising throws of death are synonymous with that of the animals that you have caused to die prematurely. Thus you linger in cycles of pain before you die. You are always looking to the causes of suffering, so what are the chains of action which prove repetitive incarnation necessary? Myriads are held thus in thrall.

You have to look at your belly to see why you have caused so much pain on others, keeping the chains intact. You are suffering and yet you make another suffer. You, the teaching element, teaching the butcher to kill for your supper, so you can eat meat. Your responsibility is to rightly teach the butcher, to show wisdom, to explain that the cutting down of a lamb is aggressive. Instead you sing praises to the butcher of it being fine. Your selfish mentality betrays the life of the lamb and also the *lack of* knowledge of the teacher. What is expected of you is to teach the butcher 'no, do not kill'; it is bloody to eat from him!

The consumption of animals means death, nothing less. Do not destroy the vital principles of life, abstain from eating animals, fellow Earth dwellers. Those with little sense and with common abilities see not the harm it causes to the man and the animal body he has incarnated into, for both are one. Those that read these words however, should have a far greater sophisticated aptitude for clear reasoning. Therefore, clean your plate of the filthy swine, or the mutton, etc., and move on. You are not about meat eating, you are about love, and for that you are truly grateful. If you eat the lamb, animals that cripple you not, then the leg used by the harnessing of abattoir procedures remains your karma. If you cannot abstain from the flesh of others then I have reason to believe you have not fully understood karma, or its definition.⁹ You are part of the world's callous, ignorant attitudes to the mass slaughter of animals with the samskâras of appetite for meat and blood.

This only proves that Buddhists who eat meat had previous lives as non-Buddhists where the concept of *ahimsâ* was not part of the cultural norm and the samskâras have been brought through to this life. They should not persist in further engendering such samskâras when clearly their Buddhist education gives them the unique opportunity to cleanse them once and for all and to thereby firmly set their feet upon the Bodhisattva path. Why therefore do you pretend to be a Buddhist where compassion for all sentient beings is taught? Fix up your samskâras and actually follow the Buddha dharma as it was intended by the Buddha for you to do.

⁹ People's hazy understanding of the doctrine of karma is where the real problem lies. This is a subject of such great import that it will be discussed in detail in the first volume of my seven volumed *Treatise on Consciousness*. There is a brief explanation of karma in Appendix II.