

CORH Values – Season 2, Episode 4

Jason Clower on Social Justice in China

Dr. Jason Clower joins us to discuss the history and theory of social justice in Asia and in particular China. We look at Confucian ideas of Human Rights, differences in conceptions of the just society in China and India, racism in Modern China and other parts of Asia, and the history of slavery in the region.

Podcast Link: <https://anchor.fm/csuchico-corh/episodes/Season-2-4-Jason-Clower-on-Social-Justice-in-China-e111co5>

Transcript:

Hello, welcome to CORH Values, the religion and humanities podcast produced by the Department of Comparative Religion and Humanities at California State University, Chico. I'm your host and chair of the departments, Daniel Veidlinger. Jason Clower, Welcome. Thank you. It's great to be with you. Great to hear you again. We had a really interesting talk last season about disease and health in China. And this season, as listeners know, our theme is social justice and how it ties into different civilizations and religions around the world. And we're going to use your expertise in East Asia to talk a little bit about social justice in East Asia. I think this should be a very interesting topic. It's one maybe people won't know as much about as they might about it in the Western tradition. So why don't we start off by simply talking about the concept of human rights. We hear a lot about human rights nowadays. And social justice, of course, is closely connected to that. And I'm wondering, in ancient China, was there a concept that is in some ways similar to what we might think about as human rights in the West. This is not a casual question that Chinese scholars of Chinese, scholars of Chinese philosophy have spent decades disagreeing about this question. A consensus position is that traditional Chinese thought doesn't have anything that ports directly to our notion of human rights. The question is, can you back translate the idea of human rights into traditional Chinese philosophy? The reason that there's no one to one correspondence or a direct analog is that traditional Confucian philosophy doesn't have anything like the Western notion of rights that are independent of responsibilities or rights that can be defended against of legitimate authority no matter what. Yes, because that's one of the key elements of the Western understanding of human rights. That it's always there even if it's inconvenient for the authorities, right? The famous example being, if we have the right not to be tortured, which is one of the human rights that are given in the Universal Declaration. What if there's a terrorist has planted a bomb somewhere and you're trying to figure out, do you have the right to torture him, to find out where that bomb is to save the people are not, of course the answer is no, you do not have the right to do that. Even if, I mean, let's put aside the psychological question of whether torture really works to elicit a response, because many people say it doesn't, but let's just imagine that it would, would you have the right? And of course the answer is no because we do then it means there isn't really the right not to be tortured because precisely the right is only meaningful when there's a reason why people would want to torture somebody. It's in that case when you still can't, that gives it meaning is a right rather than China that key elements is not really there. You're saying in traditional China that is missing. Let's take the example of torture in classical Chinese jurisprudence because it's, it's a perfect illustration. The Chinese justice system in imperial times, the authorities had every right to torture people and they might not torture justice suspect, they were also entitled, entitled to torture the plaintiff. If they thought that the plaintiff was up to no good. Their judicial system was always very watchful of people. What they doing, what we translate as petty fogging, trying to file unwarranted legal grievances against people and maybe bear false witness against them to try to get ahead. And so a magistrate was entitled to check the plaintiffs story by putting them under torture. Now, that said, there was also huge official reluctance to be harsh with people. It was one of these cases where in principle, the authorities could do anything. In practice. They were often severely prescribed from doing much at all. The magistrate could torture witnesses, but it was, it was understood perfectly well that first, if you did this too liberally, it could make the citizens disgruntled, Ed. It was not going to improve quality of life or satisfaction with rule in that locality. And second, that it was not just impractical, but the morally, the last resort that the Confucian purpose of government, the yardstick by which it measured it itself was, are we creating better people with better lives? And even

though you might have to use something like torture as a last resort to prevent sub, much greater evil. To torture somebody is by definition, contrary to happy people with happy lives. It sounds like you're saying that there's a kind of fundamental utilitarian outlook to a lot of the Chinese ethical thought that we're talking about is that because I know there's a lot of discussion about China and how it maps onto the traditional categories of ethical thought in the West, right? The main ones being utilitarianism and deontology, where you have a rule that basically formulates what you do you regard. Regardless, I can say irregardless, that I recently found out that irregardless is actually a word that means regardless. Interestingly enough, Amelie, It's not form of as one of those words. It's used so often that the classical dictionaries Oxford and Webster are accepting it as entries. Irregardless means regardless. But anyway, the point is, the anthology is the idea that rules to guide how you behave regardless of the consequences. And the other one is virtue ethics, which is often associated with Confucianism from what I understand. But now you're saying there's also a strong utilitarian element to it as well. It's a, the question of whether traditional Chinese moral philosophy is best understood as a virtue ethics or, or a deontological ethics or a utilitarian ethics which everybody denies strenuously. That question is another of these hotly contested ear resolve football ones, because the, the basic concepts just don't match up quite well enough for everybody to agree without a lot of interpretation. But yes, yes. See, here's the thing about Chinese political philosophy. It's, it's hard for us to grasp now because we have made liberal government something very close to a religion, not just a civic religion in the sense of a set of minimal shared symbols that bind us together as a social unity. But I mean that after 400 years of the age, of an age of reason and the enlightenment and the American Revolutionary Civil tradition. It's almost impossible for us not to stand up and salute whenever somebody invokes the word democracy or will of the people. But China has never been that way. And there's always been a broad agreement with a sentiment that was expressed in the English-speaking world by Alexander Pope, who said, I believe, four forms of government, let fools contest. Whatever governs best is best. So if within a culture like Chinese civilization, There's a pretty broad consensus about what the goods and values that we want out of a government, then any form of government that delivers those reliably is legitimate. And so in that sense, we could say that the political philosophy that gets organized around questions like, can we torture, can we practice capital punishment? If so, how, what are the proper procedures to prevent abuses? Those are all open for negotiation. And I, one of the things that's very interesting to me about Chinese thought and religion over the last couple of years is that they had to grapple with these questions in a much more fundamental way than we have. We, we've never come close to seriously considering the possibility that perhaps what we call democracy is actually just a sham or a, a, a bad idea, right? They've had to weigh monarchy, anarchy, democracy, oligarchy, German constitution, Japanese constitution, French constitution, the British Constitution, American constitutions. All of these things weigh them all as live possibilities that they might actually adapt for a couple of 100 years. So if we just look at what recently happened over the last year with the pandemic. And this ties into what we talked about last time. So China lock down more seriously than any other country. You are just not allowed to leave plain and simple your apartment, unless there was a really compelling reason, I think even then you would need permission in this kind of thing to go. And in doing so, they were able to essentially eradicate the virus. And I think the death toll is something like 45000 in China compared to 500 thousand here. But people obviously knew that I was happening in America and said, But I still wouldn't want that because I wouldn't want those kinds of restrictions on my freedom. So it sounds to me like you're saying that in China in general there isn't in fact, all that much lively debate about whether the government's approach to this problem was right or wrong. Probably the fact that it kept society together and kept the death toll extremely low means that most people in China would without much question except that this was the right, they don't do the right thing to do. They're not looking to American saying I wish we'd looked like that right now, a moment ago I was speaking about classical Chinese philosophy. A country's largest, tiny, I'm sure there's plenty of lively debate about whether the authorities handled things too harshly. But to paint in very, very broad strokes. Chinese civilization. And this includes Taiwan too, which is a western like liberal democracy. Broadly speaking, Chinese civilization has a much higher tolerance for letting the authorities exercise authority according to their discretion without prefabricated, unbreakable rules, called writes, binding them. And at the end of the day, as long as the authorities deliver a good outcome, they are good authorities. I see. Okay. Yeah, that's a good way of putting it. Yeah. Let's just be clear that as an expert in East Asia and my expertise is South and Southeast Asia. When we talk about these massive regions and people always ask us questions, you know, to the Chinese feel this way, to the Indians feel that way. These answers, of course impossible to give because as you rightly point out, there's many different opinions in these

ancient and large civilizations. However, in trying to answer in an interview like this in the course of half an hour, we have to make some generalizations and I just want to listen is to appreciate that. Otherwise, we would spend this whole half hour just dissecting each statements and same, but in this region it's likely not to be felt in this time period, but okay, let's make that E So let's move on. Okay, I'm good at it. In China, there's a phrase that's on everybody's lips all the time. Full one. It means our parents, the officials or our mom and dad, the authorities. And now people, people will usually kind of roll their eyes when they say it. Our parents, the epistles. But what they're saying is that in IIT safe since in East Asian civilization, in Confucian civilizations, the authorities are expected to behave like your parents. They are expected to care for the people the way parents care for their children. And they have the kind of broad, theoretically unlimited, discretionary authority to raise and protect their kids, however, they think best, right? Yeah, I mean, this is something that I've noticed in my studies of Chinese versus Indian traditional philosophies that in China there is very much a reciprocal relationship that is emphasized in the various philosophical writings on these matters, right? And as you say yes, in the same way, a father is not to be listened to just because the raw fact there your father, but rather they have to show love and care in raising the children properly and later also because there's this thing called the Mandate of Heaven, right, which is the right hand rule is given to you and you can lose it. If you don't rule in the interests of a harmonious society, which is different from the Indian traditional conception of the social hierarchy in which the leaders born into the cast, the shadow, a cast. And by virtue of being born into the cast, that is what gives them the right to be a ruler. So there's not a reciprocal relationship. I mean, many people have pointed this out that in many of the Indian texts it talks about, for example, that the husband should be worshiped by the wife. And it specifically says, even if he's a bad husband, if he drinks, if he gambles, he is still to be worshiped. So that's a very different conception rate. The raw fact of him being the husband gives him the right to be the husband that goes for the kings and the Brahmins, of course it's okay. So here's a question about that. And I, I need is a philosophical buzzword. Irr, rule utilitarianism. I'm sure our listeners are familiar with the philosophical definition of utilitarianism, which is usually defined as the greatest good for the greatest number. That is, whatever produces the best outcome will be judged the best. And so one of the, one of the familiar objections to utilitarianism is that by a pure utilitarian standard, it would seem that you could commit horrible atrocities and justify them because they produced some greater good. And, and also that it's, hey, it's not obvious to everyone in the moment whether the, whether the abuses they commit are actually going to produce the good outcomes that they promise. And so one kind of scaled down safer version of utilitarianism is called rule utilitarianism. Where we decide, okay, we commit to a set of rules or principles and where which, if followed, will tend to produce the best outcome. Even if sometimes following them creates momentary inconveniences or setbacks. And so a lot of people would say that about like, uh, rights for the accused in our system of government, that we have these high standards of proof and we have things like Miranda warnings. And sometimes they make it more difficult for the organs of justice to do their work, but it is better in the long run that they follow these rules and it produces a better utilitarian outcome. Okay, so it without established. Here's the question. When the Indian texts say that the wife is towards that her husband as a god, even if he's a ***** , is there's some sort of apologia for that. That says, Because even if we worship a few ***** , we're mostly going to end up producing a larger good in spite of it, I don't think that there's any utilitarian aspects to this at all. I think it's just an ontological feature of the world. But this is the way it's supposed to be. Wow. Well, I mean there, well, let's say there's certainly is the idea that there's a thing called Dharma, right? Which is the rules and duties of people in society. Yes, and that if people don't follow the dimer, then society will collapse, right? I mean, there is an if then element, yes, which is a kind of utilitarianism, right? If we don't follow the Dima, then society will collapse. But I don't think it necessarily gets into the specific reasons as to why would collapse and give examples. Well, because if, you know, people did, women didn't honor their husbands. Well, what if a woman thinks that her husband has been bad, but really he hasn't, and then she starts not listening to him than the family falls apart for no reason. Like I don't know if the texts go into that much detail about this. But Buddhist texts talk probably more about the utilitarian elements than Hindu texts. Because I mean, there's the checkup at TC Hernandez Sutta and their stories in there about kings not following their dharma. And what happens when they don't mean there's a famous story about punishment saying that a king ought to punish. Because, because, I mean, not just because the dimer says that if you do this wrong, you should get this punishment. But that there's a reason behind it. Because if you don't, then people will just start to do these bad things and they'll say to their friends, Hey, if you do it, you live in this kingdom, you won't be punished. So let's go all, let's all go to that kingdom where we know that this king is not punishing and we'll do the crimes there. I mean, that's outlined in suit up

in the dynamic higher. So they do talk about these kinds of things explicitly in Buddhism. What if people don't follow this rule, that rule and how it bleeds out into society and causes problem. Obviously it's complicated because on this particular score, I think theoretically for sure there is a greater understanding and China that there are practical implications of these laws. And if people then there's a reciprocal nature to these relationships. And if the person in power does not do their duty, then the people underneath them do not really have the same sacred duty to follow them in India, I think that's definitely not so much the case, right? If the husband or the ruler does not follow their duty, then that's kind of their individual problem. But you as somebody under them, still have to obey them. I think that is certainly the case. And I mean, the caste system is specifically and abjectly something in which if you are born into a lower caste, There's no actions that you can take to raise yourself to another cast, right? Except for one big thing, and that is the key. That is that in theory, don't forget the reason you got into the position that you're in is for something that you did in your past life. So yes, did do things that the actual actions that you decided on, right? So you acted in a way in which you made moral choices that were good. And that's why you now are being rewarded by being in this position. So in a sense, there is a kind of utilitarian aspect to it. It's just that it's not based on this life that we're now in. It's based on a previous life that if you do these good things, you will get good karma and be reborn in a higher position. Okay, here's a, here's a hypothesis. Maybe some, maybe what we're talking about here was what the Brahmins were saying. And we've got lots of writings from the Brahmins and the Brahmins didn't recognize such a thing as utilitarian justification for rule. But maybe the shot three has the, the ruler cast had their own kind of in house political philosophies that can reasoned in a utilitarian way. And maybe they even wrote these down somewhere on one hand for sure that this ossified social hierarchy is certainly much more the case in India theoretically in the Brahmins theories as you say, than in China. But in practice, I think Chinese societies probably been more fixedly hierarchical than India because one, as you say, the non Brahmanical groups might have had their own. And even within sort of Vedic or Brahmanical decided there were lots of Rebels. I mean, probably more rebels and there were people who stood with it such that overlying the bulk of the population has adopted boxy attitudes towards their position in society in which the idea that well, as exemplified in Buddhist writings as well, right? The, the true Brahman is not the priest who is born into it, but any human being who acts in a loving and generous way, right? So I mean, those ideas are certainly presence in India. I want to take one thread from this and move into something that connects a little more readily to the social justice movements that we see in America today because we've been talking about very broad concepts of human rights and social organization. But let me ask, let me tease out one particular idea. That is, so in India you've got the caste system, which is based on hereditary. I mean, the reason you are at the highest caste, the Brahmins or the priest, is because you were born into it. The reason you're in the lowest caste, often called the shoe drugs, the servants you might call them is because you are born into it. And of course, if we look at what's going on in America today, a lot of the discussion about Black Lives Matter and racism has to do with the idea that there are injustices in society that are based not on your behavior, but on the sheer fact that you are born into one group or another. And that's a lot of the criticism that people level again and the injustices we see in our society. Why should it be that somebody just because they're born into, let's say, an African-American community or as you know, there's been some violence against Asian Americans lately, just because you're born into that community that you would suffer certain challenges in your life and that's not fair. So I'm curious, in China, presumably in the early period like pre Confucian. Probably. I don't know much about it. That's why I'm asking, but probably heredity was again, a very strong factor in the social situation that you live through. So if you were born into a powerful family, you would have a lot of power. And if you are born into a weaker family, then Confucius, from what I understand, one of his revolutions, what was that? Your knowledge and learning and your abilities basically your merit should be what decides your position in society. So I'm wondering, is that a misunderstanding of what Confucius said? And also, if it's a correct understanding, is that something that really Chinese people through time have been conscious of, that they're trying to move from an unjust society in which your hereditary basically determines the social features of your life. And moving from that towards a meritocracy or that am I misreading? That's, uh that's that's a wonderful question. I wish that I had been taking copious notes as you asked it because there's so many cool threads that branch off from there. But so when we're talking about China, It's important to remember that we're talking about a whole civilizational family That's really the size of Europe. Yes. Right? And we're talking about a recorded history of about 4 thousand dish years. And so it's more like a huge game board on which games have been played out for 4 thousand years. And rather than a unified country, it's been unified at certain points. It's been fractured at other points. And one of the things that political science

established about Europe was that Europe proliferated ideas and new ways of doing things when it was fractured and at war, it turns out that political division is a cradle for innovation because it sets off this competition among warlords or heading rulers who are forced by competition to do things as efficiently as possible. And it turns out that when there's that fractured political instability with a bunch of contending rulers. That's a great recipe for meritocracy because the rulers who cling to breeding and pedigree are quickly gobbled up by the rulers who are willing to use people of lowly birth who happened to be wicked, good at what they do, yeah, okay. Confucius participated in, in redefining what a noble was, a junzi, which previously meant something like a prince or a son of the ruler. He drew, he redefined it in terms of moral behavior. The person presenting, yeah, the person who is disciplined and, and virtuous is the true gene, right? So it's a very similar maneuver to what happened in South Asia. Yes. We hear a lot about these tests, Confucian testing, that would go on. So is the idea that in pre-modern times we talk in medieval times, you would have tests administered by the states and they would just go through towns and villages, pick this, this kids that are the most intelligent and test them and see if they would be good workers in the government. Is that really? Yeah, but what happens if it is really what happened? China was doing this in the Han Dynasty, 2 thousand years ago. It was setting up government run academies for in principle just about anybody know, anybody who could afford to have their kid in school and not working in the fields, right? And giving them a government sponsored education in government sponsored subjects with the aim of training and picking the very best people to be put into the key government jobs so that the government could do its work as well as possible. So now let me narrow it again to the really interesting question for this season's theme. And that is, was there a racist elements to the ways that the Chinese thought about who would even be eligible to go to these schools. So if you had a student from a village that was, who knows what we go or Mongol or Manchurian or whatever one of the ethnicities would be. Have you read about, I mean, pre-modern people talking about them in racial terms of saying, Well, because this person is from this or that ethnic group or race or whatever you wanna call them. They are therefore not eligible to take these tests or they're obviously not going to do well on these tests. So why bother? Is that kind of thinking? Now, present? It. It kinda depends on when the 4 thousand year history of the civilization we're talking about. But rod lease be gain. No, that wasn't present. Now, I don't want to, I want to be careful about giving people the idea that the Imperial China or modern China were places of what we would call social justice ideals. They were not. If, if you want to, yeah, there's almost nothing about modern China that is politically correct. And if you want to hear ear sin Jing, ideas about race, you just tune in to any Chinese popular media. One. If I'm, if I'm remembering correctly, a recent study, a recent survey of Chinese academics asking the question, are people of different races fundamentally different and some more talented than others? I believe that, that, uh, the number of Chinese academics answering, yes, the races are different and people of different races are more or less talented. Was roughly 100% Yes, this paper race in, in China today is taken by virtually everybody as being very real, very important. That is, having great moment and consequence for the way an individual develops and write that person's capacities. If it's, if you're familiar with a set of ideas, sometimes called an English race of realism. Roughly speaking, everyone in China as a quote, unquote, race realists. So Let's keep that in mind. As I now deliver this pan, a direct to Chinese civilizations open-mindedness on questions of race, right? Because before you do that, I just want to say that my guess is that a lot of the modern attitudes you're talking about or actually adopted from Western ways of thinking and are not natural outgrowth of therapy. There are reasons to think that they aren't just importations of European ideas, but had, but rather had precedent in China before large-scale contact with Europeans. And that's it. That's, if I recall, that's been well documented by a superb scholar, Frank decoder in the UK. But yes, i, 20th and 21st century Chinese thought about race does also partake of lots of seeds of 19th century German and Japanese and Anglo-American racial thought that that is absolutely radioactive in our part of the world today. But those seeds were planted in the ground in China in the 19th century and then covered over and have turned into indigenous plants there. Right? Okay, but let's get onto the pennant direct gap so that the panel direct is that compared to other civilizations that I can think of, China has been admirably culturally conscious rather than racially conscious. Now, again, as I said, China has had many, many, many dynasties over the last four millennia. And those dynasties that Last 234 centuries a piece, it generate their own particular cultures. But some of those dynasties had been kind of xenophobic and many, many the xenophobic dynasties had, had very good reasons to be xenophobic. Like they are being actively plundered by nomadic invaders who are ethnically different and are behaving very poorly, right? Like Genghis Khan. But there have also been lots of, of Chinese dynasties that have been Zen of philic, or at least pretty ethnically blind by the standards of world cultures. That is, for lots of China's history. If you want

to take on Chinese civilization. Great. Chinese civilization has always been known in all dynasties to be the best in the world. And to make China the center of the world and possibly the only civilized country. And then if you adopt that civilization, great, welcome to the club, which is not the case with all of the Semitic countries, like Japan, for example, is sort of well-known for not really accepting people who were not Japanese into as full members of Japanese society even if they adopt all of the customs and manners. Yeah, Japan. So in that sense there is a racialized the elements to their thinking that's not present in China. Yes, I a, I don't know much about Japan and so I have to be up front about that. But you can, Japan is so interesting to China person like me because it's kind of like the China that could have been riots. It's like somebody took Chinese civilization between the Han and the Tang dynasties and then put it in a time capsule buried at somewhere else for 1500 years just to see how, how, how the parallel evolution would go exactly. Yeah, sure enough, Japan is famously racially homogenous and I'm told not even super hospitable to ethnically Korean people who have lived there and in Japan for generations and who speak Japanese as their native language and right. And also Korea is his. Even in recent history, Korea has not been known for a broad minded racial tolerance. So I want to finish off with one more question and that is, do you know much about the history of slavery in China? Did China have a sense of slavery in the way that we understand the West? Or did they just have serfs who were kind of tied to the land? And that's just the way they live, which is not quite the same thing as if there was slavery. Was it heritable in the way it has been in western cultures and therefore gets associated with race, or is that just not part of Chinese history? The boy, If you ask An Orthodox Chinese historian, that is a historian who's been trained in the official Marxist-Leninist, Maoist ideas of the regime. That historian will be practicing a Marxist framework in which human history passes through four stages of primitive socialist society, followed by slave society, followed by capitalist society, followed by socialist communist society, and so on. At least the last time I was at the Museum and Tenement Square. The Chinese history was defined, has having a, a period of newly show whey slave society. I can't. So that's the, that's the official historiography. The official historiography. Historiography says, yes, there was a time when China practiced slavery. And I think then they would go on to say that it mostly had to do with official involuntary, involuntary servitude to dynastic rulers. For example, the Great Wall of China. You know, it, it didn't get built by union labor. Hey, it got built by slaves doing corvee labor, right core of a, Exactly. So that might be all that's meant by that. However, I do happen to know just from being a student of, of weird dirty corners of Buddhist history. That in, in the Northern and Southern Dynasties, around 400, 500, maybe six on it. The 400 through the 500's. Ad. Chinese monasteries enjoyed official status and they could own slaves. Yes, right. Indicates to me that they probably weren't the only institutions that held slaves. And I think that's another of those things where depending where along the 4 thousand year history of China you're looking, you find people either being bound to the land, whether they want to be or not, or able to move. And and that that barometer rises and falls. It's not like it started in indentured serfdom. And then there was a steady progress toward freedom of movement. ****. China has, China barely has Jain, it has only just recently done away with its system of household registrations rights, which forbade you to move from one area to another without official permission very recently, right. And that's in housing. But it certainly sounds but regardless of the specifics and again, you're asking a question like that was a little tricky because what is a slave is something we have to discuss to begin with. But certainly from what you're saying, it doesn't sound like it's racially connected in any way. Not certain ethnic groups of these 55 that were traditionally used to sleeves or anything like that, this rising now. And in fact, China, Chinese Buddhism has always been highly allergic to anything like a caste system or vestiges of a caste-like system that remained in India. To famous examples are places where Chinese people, Chinese people would inherit. Chinese people inherited centuries and centuries of Buddhist philosophy and doctrine had developed in India over a very long time. And China just got these all at once in a huge fusing information dump. And they had to sort of sort through these things themselves and try to figure out how some of these contradictory doctrines made sense. And one of the very famous cases was that Chinese people got very confused by Buddhist texts from India that talked about these things called Goto does, or lineages. That seems to imply that the people from some birth lineages might be condemned to a lesser form of enlightenment, like forever, just because they didn't have the good fortune to be born into a better family. And they were especially troubled to hear about these people called it something because who seemed to be faded to never be able to become enlightened. Because they had been born into a bad lineage. And this was extremely troubling to Chinese people who just didn't think that it made any sense, either in Buddhist terms or just kind of plain common sense justice terms. And so this was a famous case where one of the leading

Chinese Buddhist authorities of the day who didn't know Sanskrit, but he did know Buddhism. He thought the spirit of Buddhism just said, I'm calling it right now. These are baloney. I'm calling it right now. They are inauthentic, they are not Buddhist. Those more ethnically hinged Indian Buddhist experiments. We're never going to fly in China. Buddhism in China had to market itself as an egalitarian, fairly humanistic enterprise or it was going to get nowhere. Thank you so much Jason, for being with us and I look forward to talking to you again. Thank you. Apparently, I can become over-excited and talk too much about China anytime. That's great. Well, we'll have you back many more times. Thank you and take care. It was a pleasure. If you'd like to learn more about the Department of Comparative Religion and Humanities, please go to our website at CSU Chico.edu slash C O R H. That's CSU CH ICO.edu slash CORH. I want to point out that the opinions expressed here in do not necessarily reflect those of the faculty and staff of our departments. I am ashamed that I've talked so much. I had meant this to be a back and forth. No, no, it's fine. It's fine. I just got my shot yesterday. So I'm a little woosey.