Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 17th, 2023 at 6:59 AM
Title: Re: Is the nature of the mind cognizant of itself?
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is a self conventionally, which is all that is being referenced.
Yes, in deluded relative truth, but not in the nature of mind - and that is the question that the OP was asking:
Is the nature of the mind cognizant of itself?
The comment regarding "rang rig" being shorthand for so so rang go rig pa'i ye shes, "a gnosis that is personally known for oneself," being an accurate conventional term, is just to point out that the term can apply to a conventional self (because conventional selves are just useful nominal inferences). Using the convention does not mean you are reifying a self, is my point.

Jules 09 said:
These statements are being asserted in a different context, they do not undermine the necessity or advantage that accompanies an intellectual understanding of the teachings. Using these quotes in an attempt to discredit "intellectual" views is a nihilist attitude. Context is king.
No, it is precisely this context in which Tsele Natsok Rangdrol uses these statements in his text The Heart of the Matter, published in the book Heart Lamp (pages 101-102.)

Here is the preceding paragraph:
The heart of the matter to be explained here,
Uniformly taught by most learned siddhas of the
New and Old Schools,
Is that the difference between Mantra and the
Philosophical Vehicle
Lies not in the view but in practicing
The vital points of skillful means.

There are some who claim a huge difference,
But, this old simpleton has found that
The essential point, the crucial meaning,
Is that - although the nature of the view is the
same -
Any difference merely lies in forming or not
forming a conceptual attitude,
Or in having or not having personal opinion and
fixation.

Although no defining characteristics exist in
themselves,
The attempts to establish intellectually,
By scrutiny and conceptualizing,

The various claims that something is empty or
not empty,
And with or without limitations,
Is never taught to be the view of Mahamudra
and Dzogchen,
And to believe "It is free from limits!" or "It is
emptiness!"
Is nothing other that straying from the view.

Rather than holding a view of mind-made
assumptions,
Realize your indescribable and unformed innate nature,
Through nakedly recognizing self-knowing
wakefulness,
As the basic state of what is.

krodha wrote:
He is just pointing out the difference in method between the practice of common Mahayana and Vajrayana. The latter is based on abhiseka, not on intellectual analysis. Then for atiyoga, the method is based on a pratyaksa, not intellectual analysis.

Again, pointing out these crucial differences is not to undermine the value of an intellectual understanding altogether. Hence "context is king."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 17th, 2023 at 2:13 AM
Title: Re: Is the nature of the mind cognizant of itself?
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Pssst, there is no "self".

krodha wrote:
There is a self conventionally, which is all that is being referenced. "Rang rig" in an ati context simply means a personally intuited gnosis that manifests through your own recognition.

Jules 09 said:
Yes, there are certain intellectual views that have been expressed many times on this forum.
So what?

krodha wrote:
Those "intellectual views" are informed by the tantras and commentaries of the great atiyoga luminaries. They are not some sort of fabricated intellectual views if that is what

you are implying.

Jules 09 said:
As Tilopa said:
Kye ho! This self-knowing wakefulness
Lies beyond words and the reach of thought.
Likewise Maitripa:
All phenomena are empty of their own identities.
The conceptual attitude which holds them to be
empty dissolves into itself.
To be concept-free and hold nothing in mind,
Is the path of all Buddhas.
And the Buddha in the Noble Eight Thousand Verses (Prajnaparamita):
Subhuti, that being so,
this transcendent knowledge fully remains as inconceivable action and thus is not the domain of common thought.
Why is this?
It is because it does not involve the attributes of (dualistic) mind and mental events.
"Empty" means the complete absence of mental constructs.

krodha wrote:
These statements are being asserted in a different context, they do not undermine the necessity or advantage that accompanies an intellectual understanding of the teachings. Using these quotes in an attempt to discredit "intellectual" views is a nihilist attitude. Context is king.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 15th, 2023 at 3:56 AM
Title: Re: Is the nature of the mind cognizant of itself?
Content:
Vajrasambhava said:
I'm trying to understand how cognizance has always been present as an inherent part of emptiness.
If I'm not wrong, the mind essence Is empty and cognizant, these two things are inseparable.
How comes that emptiness has this quality?

krodha wrote:
It is probably more effective to approach this in understanding that the mind is innately cognizant, and the mind is also empty. Rather than trying to say emptiness is cognizant. Inseparable emptiness and clarity are how the dharmata of mind is defined.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 5th, 2023 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Nature is a way to attract people
Content:
krodha wrote:
Perhaps emptiness is understood as “interdependence” in a pop culture rendition of the principle, however in reality Nāgārjuna is clear that if you interpret emptiness as interdependence (parabhāva) then you are holding a view that is a guise for inherent existence (svabhāva).

PadmaVonSamba said:
I think from Nagarjuna’s perspective, he’s probably warning against falling into the trap of thinking that any “thing” is established through dependent origination.

Sunyata or emptiness can be described as dependent origination. it’s a useful reference as far as helping to really understand the concept, but they aren’t exactly the same thing.

Dependent origination means that all appearances (apparent phenomena) arise dependently and conditionally, and don’t exist on their own.
Sunyata means that even though appearances arise, even dependently, there’s still no “thing” that’s been established.

For example, an ocean wave hitting the beach arises due to dependent origination, due to causes and conditions. At the same time, there’s no fixed moment when any unchanging entity truly exists that’s an ocean wave. The pending conditions didn’t somehow produce something permanent and unchanging.

krodha wrote:
For Nāgārjuna, dependent origination (pratītyasamutpāda) and interdependence or dependent existence (parabhāva) are two different things. Conflating them is problematic.

The consequence of pratītyasamutpāda (dependent origination) is anutpāda (nonarising). The consequence of parabhāva (interdependence) is svabhāva (inherent existence).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 4th, 2023 at 8:42 AM
Title: Re: Buddha Nature is a way to attract people
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
From the foundation of Greek culture, there is no concept of emptiness as something positive. In fact, Greek philosophy denied the negation of being.
India, like the Mayas, developed the mathematical concept of zero. Buddhism is the religious product of this. In both Madhyamaka and Yogacara, emptiness implies a sense of dependence, as dependent origination is the basis for explaining emptiness.

In both the Yogacara and Madhyamaka doctrines, emptiness implies a sense of interdependence as well, so it shouldn't evoke a feeling of abyss. However, the ideas of emptiness from others are simpler and less repulsive to be understood by people.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps emptiness is understood as “interdependence” in a pop culture rendition of the principle, however in reality Nāgārjuna is clear that if you interpret emptiness as interdependence (parabhāva) then you are holding a view that is a guise for inherent existence (svabhāva).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 12th, 2023 at 6:22 AM
Title: Re: Buddha Nature, Dölpopa's Shentong and Parmenides's Thesis
Content:
Karma Dorje said:
A Shentong view is useful at the time of practicing vajrayana sadhana. In fact, I can’t see how one could hold an exclusive rangtong view at the time of vajrayana practice.

krodha wrote:
You might have a very liberal idea of that “shentong” is.

As for myself, I don’t see it as necessary, useful or even interesting in the least. I also find that most people who cleave to a shentong view don’t really understand the trödral view they oppose so strongly.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 11th, 2023 at 10:57 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen
Content:
Fa Dao said:
How/why/and in what way is Dorje Drolo connected to Dzogchen? I have heard a few Masters mention this but didn't go into any real detail

krodha wrote:
Drollo is a particularly wrathful emanation of Padmasambhava.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 3rd, 2023 at 12:27 AM
Title: Re: Buddha Nature, Dölpopa's Shentong and Parmenides's Thesis
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Dölpopa View:
The essential feature of a Shentong interpretation of tathāgatagarbha doctrine is that the Buddha is figuratively within all beings as their unchanging, permanent, non-

conditioned nature... Buddha is by all [tathāgatagarbha-sutra] accounts considered to be non-conditioned, eternal, unchanging, bliss, compassion, wisdom, power, and so on. For Shentongpas [i.e. the adherents of a Shentong understanding of scripture] the fact that Buddha is non-conditioned means the essence of Buddha is complete with all the Buddha Qualities in a timeless sense'.

krodha wrote:
The only difference between this view and non-shentong tathāgatagarbha views is the assertion that these qualities are fully formed.

As was said elsewhere on this forum, shentongpas have a weird neurotic obsession with these Buddha qualities and then make up a variety of baseless polemics to argue for their “fully formed” condition.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2023 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: Breathing through nose vs. Through mouth in Dzogchen (continued)
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've always practiced breathing gently through the nose.. And was also taught this is appropriate due to the correlation with stimulating the central channel, but I recently came upon this teaching titled "Key Points In Dzogchen Practice" written by "A Carefree Vagrant" the opening lines include this...

"...look with wide open eyes and without support into the sky straight before you, since the eyes are the gates for the manifestation of wisdom. As for the key point of speech, let your breathing flow naturally, not through your nose but very gently through your mouth. There is a reason for each of these points, so do not disregard them or think them unimportant."

Sounds like an important thing to take note of.. Anyone know what the significance of breathing through the mouth is? (as opposed to nasal inhalation?)

Note to moderators: I would have posted this in the meditation section but seemed more appropriate here given that the insight is based on what is correct in the context of dzogchen specifically.

Vajrasvapna said:
If you breathe through your mouth in general, it can have a significant negative impact on your health. The book "Oxygen Advantage" explains this. During practice, it can lead to a different mental state, although the biological effect of breathing through the mouth is to reduce oxygen in the brain.

krodha wrote:
You made a new thread to address a question I asked over a decade ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 27th, 2023 at 3:11 PM
Title: Re: Dissociation and Awareness
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
then it’s going to be pretty hard to connect it with biophotons.
When the teachings say that the nature of the mind is luminosity, it means that awareness is like a lamp in the sense that when you light a lamp in a dark room, it’s now illuminated and you can see what is there. Likewise, awareness is luminous because it is that which allows us to detect and experience things.
It doesn’t really have anything to do with beings supposedly radiating light.

krodha wrote:
Luminosity is just a synonym for “purity.”

natusake said:
On what grounds? In the sense that luminosity is not distinct from the emptiness of the mind?

krodha wrote:
See this thread:

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?t=19600

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 27th, 2023 at 10:30 AM
Title: Re: Dissociation and Awareness
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:
What is your understanding of the meaning of the term “luminosity” in the Buddhist context?

Vajrasvapna said:
It's something I can't express with words.

PadmaVonSamba said:
then it’s going to be pretty hard to connect it with biophotons.
When the teachings say that the nature of the mind is luminosity, it means that awareness is like a lamp in the sense that when you light a lamp in a dark room, it’s now illuminated and you can see what is there. Likewise, awareness is luminous because it is that which allows us to detect and experience things.
It doesn’t really have anything to do with beings supposedly radiating light.

krodha wrote:
Luminosity is just a synonym for “purity.”

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 27th, 2023 at 10:26 AM
Title: Re: Dissociation and Awareness
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
I see the concept of biophotons as an explanation for the phenomenon of luminosity.

PadmaVonSamba said:
What is your understanding of the meaning of the term “luminosity” in the Buddhist context?

Vajrasvapna said:
It's something I can't express with words.
Do not get stuck in any idea, leave aside all concepts:
remain in the bliss of self-arising wisdom. Precisely this is
the state of self-arising clear light, the capacity for spiritual
action of the state of the supreme source.
The Kunjed Gyalpo

krodha wrote:
Alright well luminosity has nothing to do with biophotons.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 27th, 2023 at 6:05 AM
Title: Re: Dissociation and Awareness
Content:
krodha wrote:
Disassociation is a more extreme form of delusion than our already deluded normal condition. The idea that a disassociative state resembles vidyā or jñāna is pretty absurd in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 26th, 2023 at 10:25 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:

Passing By said:
Isn't discriminating awareness one of the five pristine consciousnesses though?

krodha wrote:
Discriminating wisdom or gnosis knows that entities are distinct conventionally, but not ultimately. Conventional entities are only nominal in nature from the standpoint of discriminating wisdom, so there is no contradiction.

Passing By said:
What do you mean by "rendered invalid" ?

krodha wrote:
Perception, saṃjñā, defined as the cognition of discrete entities (because it is a cognition that apprehends the characteristics of an object), seems very valid to us normal sentient beings who dwell in our karmic vision, but āryas in equipoise do not perceive substantial entities because they are recognized to be nonarisen. Nonarising means a nonconceptual recognition that entities never arose in the first place, and this means "perception" is not occurring, it is rendered invalid in awakened equipoise which is the domain of "nonperception." Nonperception does not mean appearances vanish, like some sort of inert void or formless absorption, it just means the practitioner has realized that entities are nonarisen, and that entities were never actually there from the very beginning. Appearances still manifest, but like images in a dream, you know the dream tiger is not a real tiger, for example.

Passing By said:
Wouldn't it be closer to phenomenology instead of epistemology since the framework/method of the Four Lamps/Four Chogshags in Dzogchen relies on direct perception in one's own personal experience rather than intellectual analysis? Same goes also for Two Stages sadhana in the other inner tantras

krodha wrote:
We can say epistemology through the lens of phenomenology, but epistemology is paramount because knowledge (vidyā) is the liberating factor here, not some sort of absorption into an ontological principle like a puruṣa in Vendanta and so on.

Further, the most potent form of knowledge (vidyā) is specifically a knowledge of again, noarising, which undermines ontological status. You are right though that we are seeking to understand consciousness, mind, etc., which is what phenomenology is concerned with.

The major disparity I was pointing out was between epistemic and ontological soteriology. We can agree that all of these systems, Vedanta, Shaivism, Buddhism, etc., are all concerned with phenomenology, understanding consciousness/mind. Those other systems may even claim that they approach an understanding of their ultimate natures through knowledge (epistemology) but, there is always a subtle ontology at play for them, whereas in the buddhadharma, the type of knowledge we champion actually liberates us from that limitation, and it is therefore unique and unshared.

Passing By said:
I see, so you meant correct perception vs flawed perception in which case, yes I see how it can be called an epistemological approach.

krodha wrote:
Especially because knowledge is the gateway to correct perception and a lack of knowledge is the cause of flawed perception. Everything hinges on knowledge.

Passing By said:
I thought you were invalidating discriminating perception entirely as in "Buddhas literally do not perceive individual objects at all" in the sense that to their eyes, they do not see different forms of different objects and similar for their other senses

krodha wrote:
Not like that necessarily, no... but depending on how extreme you want to get we do have luminaries like Rongzom asserting that Buddhas literally do not perceive individual objects at all. Which is technically true, but must be understood the right way. There are still appearances for Buddhas, but no objects. Perhaps “the form of an object” as you put it, if you define that as the collection of appearances that were previously misconstrued to be an object. Recall that from a Buddha’s point of view they do not have eyes and so on, per the Heart sūtra, for example.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 26th, 2023 at 6:50 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
Passing By said:
What do you mean by "rendered invalid" ?

krodha wrote:
Perception, saṃjñā, defined as the cognition of discrete entities (because it is a cognition that apprehends the characteristics of an object), seems very valid to us normal sentient beings who dwell in our karmic vision, but āryas in equipoise do not perceive substantial entities because they are recognized to be nonarisen. Nonarising means a nonconceptual recognition that entities never arose in the first place, and this means "perception" is not occurring, it is rendered invalid in awakened equipoise which is the domain of "nonperception." Nonperception does not mean appearances vanish, like some sort of inert void or formless absorption, it just means the practitioner has realized that entities are nonarisen, and that entities were never actually there from the very beginning. Appearances still manifest, but like images in a dream, you know the dream tiger is not a real tiger, for example.

natusake said:
Is this what is meant by liberation through signlessness? i.e., nothing directly perceived is imputed as a sign (nimitta) of an entity? Then, signless absorption is not classed as a formless absorption?

krodha wrote:
Yes, this is what signlessness or an “absence of characteristics” is referring to. It directiy pertains to the nonarising of phenomena (dharmas). The definition of “dharma” in this context is “that which bears characteristics,” and so when nonarising is realized, it is seen that there are no entities which bear characteristics, and if there is no entity that alleged characteristics belong to, there are no characteristics.

This is a key insight, so much so that Nāgārjuna states in his Lokātītastava:
You [the tathāgata] taught that those who do not realize that characteristics do not exist are not liberated.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 26th, 2023 at 6:28 AM
Title: Re: Lama Lena feat. Garchen Rinpoche: Dorje Phurba
Content:

dharmafootsteps said:
To answer the question, LL seems to have her students attend GR online empowerments in order to receive things she can't give herself. I've no idea if this is just piggybacking off existing GR teachings, or if it's an arranged collaboration though. Perhaps a LL student could give more info.

heart said:
Right, she can give Dzogchen but not Vajrakilaya?

Tata1 said:
I know she did vajrakilaya retreat with wangdor rinpoche. But it seems she doesnt usually give tantric wangs

krodha wrote:
I heard she does not give them at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 26th, 2023 at 6:02 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:

krodha wrote:
This is why “perception,” the ascertaining of discrete objects, is rendered invalid.

The Āryātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:
Since all phenomena are naturally luminous, one should fully cultivate the perception of nonperception.

Passing By said:
Isn't discriminating awareness one of the five pristine consciousnesses though?

krodha wrote:
Discriminating wisdom or gnosis knows that entities are distinct conventionally, but not ultimately. Conventional entities are only nominal in nature from the standpoint of discriminating wisdom, so there is no contradiction.

Passing By said:
What do you mean by "rendered invalid" ?

krodha wrote:
Perception, saṃjñā, defined as the cognition of discrete entities (because it is a cognition that apprehends the characteristics of an object), seems very valid to us normal sentient beings who dwell in our karmic vision, but āryas in equipoise do not perceive substantial entities because they are recognized to be nonarisen. Nonarising means a nonconceptual recognition that entities never arose in the first place, and this means "perception" is not occurring, it is rendered invalid in awakened equipoise which is the domain of "nonperception." Nonperception does not mean appearances vanish, like some sort of inert void or formless absorption, it just means the practitioner has realized that entities are nonarisen, and that entities were never actually there from the very beginning. Appearances still manifest, but like images in a dream, you know the dream tiger is not a real tiger, for example.

This is why the soteriological catalyst for liberation in Madhyamaka, atiyoga and so on is rooted in epistemology, rather than this stringent division between phenomenology and ontology that you are continually proposing.

Passing By said:
Wouldn't it be closer to phenomenology instead of epistemology since the framework/method of the Four Lamps/Four Chogshags in Dzogchen relies on direct perception in one's own personal experience rather than intellectual analysis? Same goes also for Two Stages sadhana in the other inner tantras

krodha wrote:
We can say epistemology through the lens of phenomenology, but epistemology is paramount because knowledge (vidyā) is the liberating factor here, not some sort of absorption into an ontological principle like a puruṣa in Vendanta and so on.

Further, the most potent form of knowledge (vidyā) is specifically a knowledge of again, noarising, which undermines ontological status. You are right though that we are seeking to understand consciousness, mind, etc., which is what phenomenology is

concerned with.

The major disparity I was pointing out was between epistemic and ontological soteriology. We can agree that all of these systems, Vedanta, Shaivism, Buddhism, etc., are all concerned with phenomenology, understanding consciousness/mind. Those other systems may even claim that they approach an understanding of their ultimate natures through knowledge (epistemology) but, there is always a subtle ontology at play for them, whereas in the buddhadharma, the type of knowledge we champion actually liberates us from that limitation, and it is therefore unique and unshared.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 24th, 2023 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Psychology: You have to be somebody before you can be nobody (?)
Content:

OB1 said:
I cannot imagine what a " nonperception " would be. It sounds like some extreme meditative absorption.

Kai lord said:
Not necessary, one can experience that during deep sleep, deep coma, height of orgasm, etc.

OB1 said:
Well then, deep sleep, orgasm, etc are "direct perceptions of emptiness". Is that Malcolm means? I really don't know.

krodha wrote:
Nonperception just means you are not perceiving entities while in awakened equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 22nd, 2023 at 5:37 AM
Title: Re: Longchen Nyingtig opportunity
Content:
heart said:
I think you should do the whole 10 days.

yagmort said:
frankly, i am not sure if i should attend. you know my situation. you think i should?

LN is huge and full of sadhanas which i don't have intent to do. also, i would rather receive empowerment from a teacher i trust and who will be guiding me, and you know my choice. what's your thoughts?

krodha wrote:
There is immense value in creating the tendrel with the teacher, lineage, cycle, etc., so that you may re-encounter them in another life if you do not practice that particular cycle in this life.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 7th, 2023 at 8:08 AM
Title: Re: No guru, no dzogchen?
Content:

Tata1 said:
I really dont understand what you dont understand.
Its quite easy, you go to a teacher, he gives pointing out instructions, you dont know wtf happened, you apply the methods given to you by the teacher, you eventually start to get glimpses, this glimpses become more often, you go beyond doubt...etc

krodha wrote:
Same thing Dudjom Rinpoche said:
A Dzogchen Master starts with "direct introduction" with everyone. If they don't "get it" then one starts to use all the infinite methods and means to help bring about the experience of Rigpa. When one has the experience of Rigpa, then one confirms the validity of one's path now being "remaining with Rigpa" as path. Then, one simply continues in that state.

heart said:
I doubt that is a quote.

krodha wrote:
It is from his text on the three statements of Garab Dorje.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 7th, 2023 at 5:22 AM
Title: Re: No guru, no dzogchen?
Content:

Tata1 said:
No. In saying 99% of the people in any sangha who receive pointing out instructions dont get confindence in the view soy they have to apply methods to re introduce themselves again and again until they gain certainty (which is the first point).

Pretty basic standard dzogchen practice procedure

Jules 09 said:
So, now you appear to be saying that 99% of people in any sangha do actually recognize rigpa the very first time they receive pointing out instructions, but they don't gain confidence in that recognition. ?

However, ject did not say that, at all.

ject wrote:
In the last event? I cant recall receiving any instructions to have a direct experience or being introduced to my nature.
I have never participated in any of his events before so maybe it was there but I completely missed it.
Or maybe I did not understand the translator etc.
It is also possible that I am confused about the terminology.
I am also completely oblivious to my "real condition and potentiality".

Tata1 said:
I really dont understand what you dont understand.
Its quite easy, you go to a teacher, he gives pointing out instructions, you dont know wtf happened, you apply the methods given to you by the teacher, you eventually start to get glimpses, this glimpses become more often, you go beyond doubt...etc

krodha wrote:
Same thing Dudjom Rinpoche said:
A Dzogchen Master starts with "direct introduction" with everyone. If they don't "get it" then one starts to use all the infinite methods and means to help bring about the experience of Rigpa. When one has the experience of Rigpa, then one confirms the validity of one's path now being "remaining with Rigpa" as path. Then, one simply continues in that state.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 31st, 2023 at 1:56 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
krodha wrote:
Don’t forget the rare ambidextrous yogis.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 30th, 2023 at 12:25 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
Malcolm said:
If you think that she is implying that Candra is hinting at an ineffable experience, I disagree with her. If you think she is implying that gnosis is ineffable, I agree with her.

The problem here is the lack of definition of “experience.”

stong gzugs said:
Very helpful clarification, thanks. I think PadmaVonSamba below raises some good points, which I build upon.

PadmaVonSamba said:
How do you know they have no characteristics I’d they aren’t experienced?

stong gzugs said:
This is a great point, PadmaVonSamba! Here are some questions that might clarify what's at stake here:

If jñana is defined in terms of a consciousness that doesn't arise because its support-object has no signs, per Cāndrakīrti, that's basically what happens in dreamless deep sleep. In deep sleep, there are no signs (unlike in waking life or during dreams) to serve as object-supports and no consciousness arises. But we are typically also unaware: there is no experience of deep sleep, which is why we only infer that we were in deep sleep after we wake up from it. In contrast, when we practice night yogas, we can maintain awareness even as we drift from waking life into the dream-world and the dream-world dissolves into deep sleep, such that deep sleep can be experienced. There still is no positive sign to serve as a support-object for consciousness, but one still remains aware and experiencing. So, which of these are more analogous to jñana as you and Cāndrakīrti define it?

Further, how does resting in the non-arising of consciousness cultivate positive qualities to benefit others? If the non-arising of consciousness, without being aware of it, was helpful in this way, couldn't you put people under a medically-induced coma and they'd come out as better people? If not, then doesn't this imply that one must maintain awareness and experience the non-arising of consciousness to produce benefits? Such that awareness and experience can persist in the absence of (dualistic) consciousness?

krodha wrote:
Jñāna is the luminosity of the mind, fully active and engaged, not an unconscious state.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 30th, 2023 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
How do you know they have no characteristics I’d they aren’t experienced?

It’s like in the Surangama sutra: if you cover your eyes so that you can’t see, then how do you know you can’t see, if you can’t see?

You know through eye consciousness.

krodha wrote:
An absence of characteristics is a synonym for the realization of emptiness. If there is no core svabhāva or entity which objects are comprised of, then there is no entity to possess characteristics, and thus there are no characteristics.

Important insight, as Nāgārjuna states in his Lokātītastava:
You [the tathāgata] taught that those who do not realize that characteristics do not exist are not liberated.
This is why “perception,” the ascertaining of discrete objects, is rendered invalid.

The Āryātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:
Since all phenomena are naturally luminous, one should fully cultivate the perception of nonperception.

PadmaVonSamba said:
It’s the same with directly experiencing that which has nothing to experience. To rely on has/hasn’t is still to dwell duality. At the level of consciousness being discussed here, that duality would have long been transcended.

krodha wrote:
Again, because entities are realized to be non-arisen, the basis of imputation which was previously mistaken to be an object endowed with specific characteristics is recognized to not actually constitute or create the entity it was previously misconstrued to characterize (through the lens of delusion). In the absence of an entity, existence and non-existence, having no substantial referent, are undone and as a result all views (and characteristics) are exhausted.

In his Mūlamadhyamakakārika, Nāgārjuna clarifies that the pacification of views and characteristics is contingent upon insight into emptiness whereby existent entities that are capable of existing and/or lacking existence are recognized to be unfounded. He likewise chastises those of “little intelligence” who assert otherwise:
Some of small intelligence, see existents in terms of “is” or “is not”; they do not perceive the pacification of views, or peace.
“Peace” here again is intended to illustrate an absence of characteristics, so again we come full circle with the importance of an absence of characteristics. The Ārya-tathāgatācintyaguhyanirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:
"Nirvana is peace" denotes actualizing the absence of characteristics.
Candrakīrti concurs in his Madhyamakāvatāra:
The absence of all characteristics is peace.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 29th, 2023 at 5:22 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:

krodha wrote:
Madhyamaka, atiyoga and so on are stating that via accurate epistemic insight, ontologies are undermined and this releases the phenomenological, conscious aspect of our experience from the confines of all dualisms. Even beyond the limited species of nonduality you are advocating for which is an awareness devoid of subject and object.

stong gzugs said:
Yes, this point was already discussed a few pages back. Per KTGR and others, the gzhanstong claim is that the analytical meditations that prasangikas do to purportedly attain "accurate epistemic insight" basically leave behind a subtle form of conceptualization and habit for negation that gets in the way of actual nisprapañca.

krodha wrote:
Of course they do, they have to try and legitimize their advocacy of gzhan stong with some sort of polemical claim. Now, whether there is merit to said claim will be something gzhan stong pas will obviously confirm and non-gzhan stong pas will deny.

stong gzugs said:
So, rather than freeing up phenomenological experience, they constrain it.

krodha wrote:
Clearly it is the claimants of the inferior substantial nonduality you are championing who constrain it.

But these arguments are old, we can see Ju Mipham addressing the same issue in his commentary on the Madhyamakālaṃkāra, the dbu ma rgyan gyi rnam bshad 'jam dbyangs bla ma dgyes pa'i zhal lung:
Without finding certainty in primordial purity (ka dag), just mulling over some 'ground that is neither existent nor nonexistent' will get you nowhere. If you apprehend this basis of emptiness that is empty of both existence and nonexistence as something that is established by its essence separately [from everything else], no matter how you label it (such as an inconceivable self, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Īśvara, or wisdom) except for the mere name, the meaning is the same. Since the basic nature free from the reference points of the four extremes, that is, Dzogchen (the luminosity that is to be personally experienced) is not at all like that, it is important to rely on the correct path and teacher. Therefore, you may pronounce 'illusionlike,' 'nonentity,' 'freedom from reference points,' and the like as mere verbiage, but this is of no benefit whatsoever, if you do not know the [actual] way of being of the Tathāgata’s emptiness (which surpasses the limited [kinds of] emptiness [asserted] by the tīrthikas) through the decisive certainty that is induced by reasoning.
He continues to address the difference in Liquid Gold:
The Cittamatrins deconstruct both subject and object in a mere empty intrinsically knowing pristine consciousness (gnosis).
And like the Inlaid Jewels Tantra states:
Since intrinsic knowing [rang rig, svasaṃvedana] is devoid of actual signs of awakening, it is not at all the pristine consciousness of vidyā [rig pa'i ye shes].

stong gzugs said:
When you get away from sutra and into tantra,

krodha wrote:
Here, as seen above, we are discussing the distilled essence of tantra, which you gzhan stong pas arguably deviate from due to your preference for the mere substantially nondual svasaṃvedana (devoid of signs of awakening) you are promoting in this thread.

stong gzugs said:
i.e., into rangtong Ati vs. gzhanstong Kālacakra, this all has to do with how one relates to the visual appearances in these respective practices, which we've already agreed to bracket off from the current conversation, to not go down that whole rabbit hole again. If you use the search function, you can find the prior conversation between Malcolm and myself on that.

krodha wrote:
What it actually has to do with is your reification of that phenomenological aspect. Unbeknownst to you.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 29th, 2023 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Guru yoga of the white A is a method of guru yoga, but guru yoga in general is just resting in the “view” of ati.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 29th, 2023 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
Malcolm said:
Can you explain to me which of the eighteen dhatus this “ awareness” belongs to?

stong gzugs said:
The part about phenomenology vs. ontology and Madhyamaka making a category error is what's crucial. In the conversation between Śankara and Madhyamaka, attempting to situate awareness within one of the dhatus is trying to win the argument by terminology, because by definition the dhatus are knowable things. So this rhetorical move has to be rejected a priori. So awareness, as Duckworth is describing it using a non-partisan term, is something we can all experience, is our subjective sense of being an active witness to experience rather than being a zombie. What's the difference between subjective experience when you're waking, vs. when you're put into a coma? A sense of awareness.

That sense of awareness can be treated both as subject (as it's the one who is

witnessing events) and object (as we can talk about it, albeit imperfectly, like we're doing here). Attempts to refute it as an object through arguments are themselves witnessed by it as a subject. Whether you privilege the arguments that refute it as an object (ontology) vs. the experience where you are yourself aware of that argument (phenomenology) is a matter of starting assumptions. Fact is, perhaps aside from nirodha samapatti, the phenomenology of awareness always remains, no matter what sort of Madhyamaka analytical meditation you do. You can collapse the sense of self in the skandhas, but that collapsing appears within spacious awareness. Otherwise, there would be no actual recognition of no-self-in-skandhas.

krodha wrote:
This is why the soteriological catalyst for liberation in Madhyamaka, atiyoga and so on is rooted in epistemology, rather than this stringent division between phenomenology and ontology that you are continually proposing.

The phenomenological aspect of our experience is already corrupted by the deluded perception of ontological constructs. Madhyamaka, atiyoga and so on are stating that via accurate epistemic insight, ontologies are undermined and this releases the phenomenological, conscious aspect of our experience from the confines of all dualisms. Even beyond the limited species of nonduality you are advocating for which is an awareness devoid of subject and object. That too is refuted, as we see in Atiśas writings that are echoed by prominent atiyogins such as Longchenpa et al., dharmakāya does not even admit jñāna, and so on. Jñāna ceases to operate. The purpose of that clarification is to undermine attempts at reifying that phenomenological aspect, like you are doing.

You are an advocate of a substantial and reductive nonduality, which is a deviation. True nondual insight, is insubstantial and nonreductive. This is the meaning of the emptiness of emptiness and so on. Your view errs very close to the edge of tīrthika treatments of that phenomenological aspect.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 28th, 2023 at 7:39 AM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Again there is vipassana meditation, like that offered by the Thai forest ajahns and bikkhus you reference, and then there is the species of “clear insight” as classically described in Mahāyāna texts...

stong gzugs said:
I don't disagree with you that vipassana practice and vipaśyanā as actual insight into reality aren't coextensive. I just said that the section of your statement which I quoted, where you describe vipassana practice as a glorified form of śamatha, is factually incorrect, which it is. The whole innovation of vipassana practice is claiming that you can gain insight into the three marks of existence without first cultivating serious

śamatha. Vipassana practice is not a glorified form of śamatha, but is rather a method explicitly designed to bypass śamatha, which became particularly useful in the political context of combating Western colonialism in Burma and Thailand, among other places in SE Asia.

krodha wrote:
Vipassana meditation, no matter the type of dhyāna it is, is not yet awakened equipoise, and so it is basically akin to an analytical or active form of śamatha. Hence “glorified.” But you’re welcome to disagree, I don’t really have a horse in that race.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 28th, 2023 at 7:07 AM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Vipassana style meditation and the real meaning of vipaśyanā are two different things. The former is just a glorified style of śamatha meditation...

Terma said:
This is spot on, actually...

stong gzugs said:
The quoted statement above is just factually false. Vipassana style meditation was explicitly a rejection of śamatha meditation. Bhikkhu Sujato wrote an entire book about it that's worth reading called A history of mindfulness: How insight worsted tranquillity in the satipaṭṭhāna sutta. It's https://santifm.org/santipada/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/A_History_of_Mindfulness_Bhikkhu_Sujato.pdf.

krodha wrote:
Again there is vipassana meditation, like that offered by the Thai forest ajahns and bikkhus you reference, and then there is the species of “clear insight” as classically described in Mahāyāna texts, such as the Akṣayamati-nirdeśa, which defines vipaśyanā here:
The consciousness that perceives the entry into reality is called "vipaśyanā." So-called vipaśyanā is perceiving phenomena correctly, perceiving phenomena as they are, perceiving phenomena truly, and perceiving phenomena as not otherwise, perceiving phenomena as empty, without characteristics, without aspiration, perceiving phenomena to be unformed, likewise, nonarisen, unproduced, insubstantial, just as they are, pure, and as isolated. It is perceiving phenomena as unmoving, inactive, without self, wholly without grasping, inseparable, one taste, as the nature of space, and nirvana by nature.
This is describing an ārya’s equipoise, what we atiyogins would term the “state of trekchö.”

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 28th, 2023 at 6:47 AM
Title: Re: Why so gray?
Content:
Meido said:
FWIW, we have been asking the same questions in the Western Zen world. Part of the answer to "why so gray" seems not only to be the aging of the generations initially interested, as mentioned above, but also a bit of a gap in subsequent generational interest that occurred for a number of reasons.

The reaction of many dharma centers to this has been to try to create targeted programming they believed would draw younger folks (for example, programs focused on social justice issues), and to ease up on the rigor of practice forms and retreats. But this has largely backfired.

What I am seeing now is that centers stressing a more traditional, rigorous practice approach are the ones attracting the 20-somethings. Those younger practitioners I've spoken with indicate they were searching specifically for something genuine, and are hypersenstive to anything they perceive to be watered-down, compromising, or (especially) pandering to them. So, perhaps Gen Z for the win: they've got existential angst and urgency to spare, and seem not to shy away from the challenge of practice.

Not sure if any of this applies to Dzogchen places, but thought I'd share.

krodha wrote:
I know there was a group of Bönpo lamas for awhile that all decided that westerners weren't ready for anything beyond superficial topics. This is why we saw a large collection of lha retrieval teachings and other basic topics being recycled. They concluded that the western palette just was not ready for anything more. I can only assume this did backfire, as it probably failed to interest practitioners who were/are ready for more in depth teachings.

Another example, you gave a teaching last year, or the year before about accessing samādhi through the senses – which was incredible by the way, thank you – but it seemed to be the rare exception in terms of subject matter, at least through the program that offered the webcast at the time. I'm sure you teach stuff like that all the time to your dedicated students but as a one-off webcast it certainly stood out in comparison to what else was being offered by whatever other teachers were involved with the group in question.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 27th, 2023 at 11:53 PM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
merilingpa said:
I agree in principle what Malcolm is saying but in practical terms there is very few who

practice without first gathering the accumulations and doing purifications through ngöndro, yidam and different sadhanas. All the great lamas and Rinpoches have that approach. Longchen Nyingthig ngöndro is very highly praised and most people wont be doing Yeshe Lama without first doing that.

natusake said:
I have not done so at all. I did a little bit of vipassana-style meditation for about a year before encountering Dzogchen teachings and that's it. I'll let you know in a few years if I'm a failed practitioner or not.

krodha wrote:
Vipassana style meditation and the real meaning of vipaśyanā are two different things. The former is just a glorified style of śamatha meditation, the latter is actually the awakened state we aim to actualize even in atiyoga.

That being the case, this thread is really about the role of śamatha in Dzogchen, because vipaśyanā is awakened equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 27th, 2023 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: So what exactly does it mean to take refuge?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Taking refuge is the simple acknowledgement that everything in samsara is suffering and there is no refuge in samsara at all. Therefore you take refuge in the triple gem because it is the only means to be liberated from suffering.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 27th, 2023 at 2:08 PM
Title: Re: debating and attitude in the meantime
Content:
jet.urgyen said:
As many of us have discussions over the forum, is there any etiquette principles for debating dharma related matters? Insults and silence are allowed when there's no argument or when someone doesn't like how it goes?

krodha wrote:
You said some wild stuff and got flamed for it... should probably just accept it and take it on the chin. The response you got was not undeserved. Also an apology would be nice.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 27th, 2023 at 7:27 AM
Title: Re: ChNN and formal trekchö practice
Content:

Vasana said:
Is anyone able to send a pic of the contents page(s) of the new Trekchod book from ChNNR? (In a pm)
I want to see how much of it is different from the recent Longsal commentary series on Trekchod.

krodha wrote:
Can someone share a link to this new book? I only see the trekchö longsal commentary in the Shang shung store.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 27th, 2023 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong pas really think the equipoise of gzhan stong and so-called rang stong are different? Or is this just your own fantasy, stong gzugs?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 26th, 2023 at 11:32 PM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
OdeKirk said:
Does empty of other treat emptiness as nothingness?

stong gzugs said:
No! It's the exact opposite. As this is a very fundamental, basic, bedrock point, I'd really recommend turning to some texts, as such points probably aren't best understood through a forum. I have some text recommendations https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?t=36501&p=649978#p649978 but perhaps https://www.amazon.com/Buddha-Within-Tathagatagarbha-Interpretation-Ratnagotravibhaga/dp/0791403580 by Shenpen Hookham would be a good bet, as she was a KTGR student and you seem to have a connection with him or affinity to him.

But, as a bit of a response, if you look back through the conversation here, there are two key arguments from the Aṅgulimālīya Sūtra to grok: (1) To say a house is extrinsically empty of people isn't to say that the house is therefore intrinsically empty of itself (as it still has its own structure of walls, roof, etc.), so "emptiness" doesn't just mean one thing, it can mean something is empty of itself or empty of something other than itself. (2) If someone takes a hailstone home and it melts, and then they see a gemstone and assume it will also melt, they've made a mistake, because not everything is empty in the same way.

With these lines in mind, when you read sutras or tantras, and see the word "empty", you have to discern more precisely whether that thing is actually inherently empty (like a

hailstone) or not (like a gemstone), and whether it is being described as such, or not. Buddha nature is a gemstone that doesn't melt and too many people have mistaken it for a hailstone that does. Buddha nature is empty of obscurations (like a house is empty of people), but is replete with innumerable buddha qualities (like a house is full of its own structure, like walls and a roof). Dölpopa did exactly that kind of reading in his voluminous Mountain Dharma text, and thus integrated and reconciled the sutras and tantras to reveal the definitive meaning of the Buddha.

natusake said:
Does emptiness of other consider emptiness of self as nothingness?

krodha wrote:
Pretty much. I've never met a gzhan stong pa online who actually understands classical śūnyatā — Nāgārjuna, Candrakīrti etc., none of them have a grasp on it. And gzhan stong warps their ability to understand further with baseless straw man views. It's kind of sad really.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 26th, 2023 at 1:02 PM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
Malcolm said:
The minute you say something is not empty, you enter into limitations.

stong gzugs said:
The third turning is about precise distinctions. Here's a more precise rephrasing of your statement: the minute you fail to distinguish between types of emptiness, you enter into limitations. The Tathāgatagarbha is (other)empty of all afflictions (parabhāvaśūnyatā) but not its inherent buddha qualities, whereas afflictions are (self)empty of any inherent essence (svabhāvaśūnyatā).

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong pas love to pretend their view is the only one where "Buddha qualities" are preserved. Absurd.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 26th, 2023 at 3:12 AM
Title: Re: ChNN and formal trekchö practice
Content:

jet.urgyen said:
i'm sorry, atiyoga is non-gradual. one becomes aware of that at the very begining of practicing it.

most ChNN's followers are pretenders, so his teachings are for them. the context of his teaching is very important.

krodha wrote:
It is non-gradual because (i) it is the same continuum of vidyā from start to finish, and (ii) we are not producing anything new, only removing impediments.

Apart from those non-gradual aspects, there is a path. The dharmatā of the minds of sentient beings and Buddhas is identical in characteristic, but the former is burdened by avidyā while the latter is not. The process of eliminating avidyā is not immediate.

Take it from ya boy Dudjom Lingpa, he was not a DC pretender as you so arrogantly assert:
Having simply identified vidyā, some people, who lack even a trace of any meditation, claim they have experienced the extinction into dharmatā and there is nothing more to spiritual awakening than this. That is an enormous mistake! The qualities of realization mature through the power of gradual practice. This is how you must reach the state of liberation.

jet.urgyen said:
It is non gradual because your guru pointed at. That's tne non-gradual I'm taking about. It doesn't need much explanation.

krodha wrote:
There are concurrent contexts here that are important to understand. Something that may gradually occur in a non-gradual context. If we only fixate on the non-gradual side of things then we run the risk of missing some valuable nuances about the ati path.

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche describes this well in the following excerpt:
A seeming confusion obscures the recognition of the basis [gzhi]. Fortunately, this seeming delusion is temporary. This failure to recognize the basis is similar to dreaming. Dreaming is not primordial; it is temporary, it can be purified. Purification happens through training on the path. We have strayed from the basis and become sentient beings. To free the basis from what obscures it, we have to train. Right now, we are on the path and have not yet attained the result. When we are freed from obscuration, then the result - dharmakāya - appears. The liberated basis, path and result are all perfected in the realm of the single essence, the continuity of rig pa [vidyā].

In fact, there is no difference whatsoever between the basis and result. In the state of the basis the enlightened qualities are not acknowledged, but they are manifest at the time of the result. These are not new qualities that suddenly appear, but are like the qualities of a flower that are inherent in the seed. Within the seed are the characteristics of the flower itself. The seed holds the potential for the flower's color, smell, bud and leaves. However, can we say that the seed is the result of the flower? No, we cannot, because the flower has not fully bloomed. Like this analogy, the qualities of the result are contained in the state of the basis; yet, they are not evident or manifest.

That is the difference between the basis and the result. At the time of the path, if we do not apply effort, the result will not appear.
You are sort of choosing to focus on the part in bold, to the detriment of the rest of the points being made. The two gradual/nongradual aspects are not in contradiction. There's no reason to single one side out at the expense of the other. They are in harmony and balance if understood properly.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 25th, 2023 at 11:05 PM
Title: Re: ChNN and formal trekchö practice
Content:
jet.urgyen said:
i dare to say that trekcho ain't a practice. ain't an effort.

krodha wrote:
Effort is required at first. Starting out you have to "chase" the meditation, and then eventually it chases you, as Khenchen Palden Sherab Rinpoche and Khenpo Tsewang Dongyal Rinpoche put it. Trekchö initially takes a lot of effort and diligence.

People conflate the "effortless" mechanics of the so-called practice with the process being entirely effortless. If you don't apply any effort at all you'll end up doing nothing. I'm sure a lot of people do nothing and sit around and think they're practicing trekchö somehow. Idiots.

The aspect of effort is related to the habitual inclinations to become distracted and grasp. Those habits are very strong, and so diligent and persistent effort in the "effortless" mechanics of the discipline are needed.

This is what Chögyal Namkhai Norbu was referring to when he used the analogy of learning to drive a car. Lots of effort in the beginning, but eventually it becomes second nature and it is very easy and generally effortless.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 25th, 2023 at 3:10 PM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
madhusudan said:
Here is a new clip of BAW addressing this issue for those who want to hear it from the horse's mouth, so to speak:

TLDR: He claims that there are extremely rare genius-level practitioners who might not need to "achieve" shamatha, but for everyone else it is necessary. This, he says, is what he was taught by GR from multiple texts as well as from other Lamas, though he also mentions one without naming names who did not include shamatha in his Dzogchen.

dharmafootsteps said:
He mentions “realizing emptiness” a few times, and mentions doing so before beginning trekcho. I don’t know how he defines realizing emptiness, but as I understand it this would be a much bigger deal than the insistence on achieving śamatha. It would make Dzogchen the practice of āryas only.

krodha wrote:
The equipoise of an ārya that occurs upon realizing emptiness is the “state of trekchö,” so you’re right, his comment does not make sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 25th, 2023 at 12:05 PM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
If this is going to continue, can we define “achieve shamatha” precisely?

Malcolm said:
It means a state of equipoise characterized by four or five distinct mental,factors.

krodha wrote:
Does this mean the first dhyāna is “achieving śamatha?”

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 25th, 2023 at 9:03 AM
Title: Re: The Role of Shamatha/Vipaysana in Dzogchen
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
If this is going to continue, can we define “achieve shamatha” precisely?

krodha wrote:
The definition seems like a shifting landscape.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 25th, 2023 at 4:44 AM
Title: Re: Western Philosophy and emptiness
Content:
stong gzugs said:
It's also worth noting here that even these early stages aren't about the inherent emptiness of x (svabhāvaśūnyatā), but about the extrinsic emptiness of x as being empty of y (parabhāvaśūnyatā).

natusake said:
Why would the two be mutually exclusive?

stong gzugs said:
I don't know about mutually exclusive, but they're different meditative practices, and this difference has to do roughly with debates on affirming vs. non-affirming negations. The followers of Cāndrakirti primarily practice svabhāvaśūnyatā, where you take an object and realize its emptiness through analysis, and then that's it. The object dissolves and so does its emptiness, there's nothing left to work with. The problem is that you can spend all day dissolving chariots and tables, sprouts and seeds, and it won't necessarily get you deeper than the superficial objects of conventional appearance because that's your starting point and your ending point. In contrast, with parabhāvaśūnyatā, you dissolve an object, but in doing so, realize a deeper level into which the object dissolved. In this way, you can pursue emptiness in progressively deeper levels, far beyond chariots and tables, until you get to the end-point into which all things dissolve, the ālāya-jñāna. The objects dissolve into a basic wisdom awareness that is itself empty of these objects, as described in the gzhanstong literature, and which this early sutta points towards. Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso's Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness does a nice job of explaining this process.

PadmaVonSamba said:
It’s like if a Buddha sits and perceives himself and everything directly and clearly as the vast space between atoms. There’s still emptiness built upon something. if there were nothing, what could one dwell in?

stong gzugs said:
I think the above point kind of distinguishes between different ways that emptiness can be built upon something. This Sūtra below also knocks it out of the park in terms of explanation.

Aṅgulimālīya Sūtra said:
Childish beings may think of hailstones as being gems and take them home, but then they see them melt and think, "Oh, they are empty." Likewise, through reflecting and meditating on utter emptiness, you, Mañjuśrī, see all phenomena dissolve. You even think that liberation, which is not empty, is empty. Just as some people may meditate on gems as being empty due to their mistaking hailstones for gems and seeing those hailstones melt away, you even think of nonempty phenomena as being empty. Seeing phenomena as empty, you also destroy nonempty phenomena as being empty. However, empty phenomena are different from nonempty phenomena. Just like hailstones, the billions of afflictions are empty. Just like hailstones, nonvirtuous phenomena swiftly perish. But the Buddha and liberation are permanent, like a beryl. As for space, buddhas have form, while all śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas lack form. The liberation of a buddha is also form, while the liberations of śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas lack form, so how can you say that the characteristic of liberation is to be empty? Do not entertain this notion of there being no [such] divisions.

If there are no people in a house, it is empty. If there is no water in a vase, it is empty. If no water flows in a river, it is empty. The house is not empty in all respects—it is called "empty" because there are no people in it. The vase is not empty in all respects—it is

called "empty" because there is no water in it.The river is not empty in all respects—it is called "empty" because no water flows in it. Likewise, liberation is not empty in all respects—it is called "empty" because it is free from all flaws. The Buddha is not empty either—he is called empty because he is free from all flaws and lacks any human or divine existence entailing billions of afflictions. Alas, Mañjuśrī, you behave like a mosquito, not understanding the precise meaning of empty and nonempty. The Nirgranthas also meditate on everything's being empty, so you Nirgrantha mosquito, say no more!

Malcolm said:
No, you abide in the presence of the objects of the six āyatanas and the body, all they are empty of is affliction, desire for rebirth, and [afflictive] ignorance.

stong gzugs said:
Not quite. I've studied Bhikkhu Bodhi and particularly Bhikkhu Ānālayo on this practice, and the full realization of emptiness is accomplished in the stage of recognizing even the emptiness of signlessness, which ends all grasping even onto the experience of emptiness. The next statement about the six sense bases is saying that what remains after fully realizing emptiness in meditation is the continuity of our lives as embodied beings, just now without any influxes. Nirvana with remainder.

Malcolm said:
Amazing, so you are declaring a "first turning sūtra" to be definitive.

stong gzugs said:
Only the sūtras and tantras of the Kṛtayuga Dharma identified by the Omniscient Dölpopa are definitive. You should know that by now

But, for real, given the huge emphasis on anāpānasati and mindfulness in the (first turning) Buddhist world today, it's surprising how underappreciated this emptiness practice is, particularly as the Buddha said it was basically the definitive practice for Tathāgatas.

Cūḷasuññatasutta said:
Ānanda, whatever Tathāgatas, free from attachment and completely awakened, there have been in the past, they all truly dwelled in this emptiness, without distortion, namely in the eradication of the influxes, the influx-free and unconditioned liberation of the mind.

Ānanda, whatever Tathāgatas, free from attachment and completely awakened, there will be in the future, they will all truly dwell in this emptiness, without distortion, namely in the eradication of the influxes, the influx-free and unconditioned liberation of the mind.

Ānanda, I, who am the Tathāgata now, free from attachment and completely awakened,

I also truly dwell in this emptiness, without distortion, namely in the eradication of the influxes, the influx-free and unconditioned liberation of the mind.

Ānanda, you should train yourself like this: ‘I shall also truly dwell in this emptiness, without distortion, namely in the eradication of the influxes, the influx-free and unconditioned liberation of the mind.’ Ānanda, you should train yourself like this.

krodha wrote:
This svabhāvaśūnyatā vs parabhāvaśūnyatā dichotomy with the former being misrepresented is nonsense.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 24th, 2023 at 6:27 AM
Title: Re: Current science on COVID 19
Content:

krodha wrote:
They’re parroting a conspiracy theory that circulates the Internet that covid 19 is just the flu rebranded.

heart said:
I agree, a lot of people I know was tested positive for covid. It takes quite a long time to recover from covid because it goes for your lungs. I am still not fully ok. Not like a flue at all.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Minus long COVID or co occurring conditions, it is actually becoming comparable to seasonal flu. That’s not a conspiracy, just how the virus has changed and how much vaccinations have done.

Of course, that does not make it harmless now, only to say that for a large chunk of people catching COVID has become somewhat comparable to catching a seasonal flu.

Denying that it exists, denying its infectiousness, denying that it is more harmful to a certain percentage of people or certain populations is another story of course, and -is- simply conspiracy theory.

https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2803749

https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/31/health/covid-omicron-lung-cells.html

Also, afaik Omicron and subsequent variants by and large effect the lungs less, barring specific vulnerabilities, long COVID, etc.

Don’t remember reading a comparison of chronic lung problems from influenza vs

COVID with the current variants, but I'm guessing results would be more equivalent than people think, and I'd love to see such a study if anyone knows of one.

krodha wrote:
It is slowly becoming comparable to the flu because as the human immune system becomes more familiar with the virus, we are seeing less and less of the systemic overreaction in the body that leads to severe cases.

The initial covid variants caused people's adaptive immune systems to go haywire and overcompensate, which caused the body to attack itself in the process of attacking the infection. As the virus mutated it became more manageable for the body. This historically happens with most novel viruses.

Very different than the conspiracy theory that covid 19 is just wholesale rebranded influenza.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 24th, 2023 at 12:44 AM
Title: Current science on COVID 19
Content:

Malcolm said:
I don't know what Yeshe thought. I do know that the Merigar retreat was a covid spreading event. I doubt my friend was the only person who got covid there. He had remained covid free throughout the pandemic. Covid has an R factor of 6 if no one is taking precautions. It also takes two days to know you are ill, during which time you are the most infectious. my guess is that 25 percent of the in-person audience were infected, mostly people sitting inside, I imagine. Maybe it was brought from Lerab Ling.

ject said:
Getting a runny nose can be caused by anything - dust, hippy perfumes, pollen (got a lot of that flying around right now) and so on.
It used to be called a "flu season" for a reason. Temperatures can drop from nice 22C to nasty 13C just by walking around the corner. Getting a common cold in this time of the year is really easy. Speedy recovery is all, one can wish.

dharmafootsteps said:
Wondering what your point is.

krodha wrote:
They're parroting a conspiracy theory that circulates the Internet that covid 19 is just the flu rebranded.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 14th, 2023 at 8:56 AM
Title: Re: Christians Struggling to “understand” Buddhism
Content:
KeithA said:
Anyway, back to the Christian bashing!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 10th, 2023 at 6:17 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
natusake said:
I do not think we have seen anything in this thread or elsewhere that qualifies as immoral.

krodha wrote:
Being immoral isn’t the issue. I’m sure you’ve been in a social situation involving someone who is very polite while simultaneously exuding the vibe that they do not like you or someone you’re with.

Communication is also expressed in what isn’t said. In person this is much easier to detect, body language, subtle facial expressions, vocal tone or inflection, backhanded remarks, or just the overall energy. Harder to detect online, but same principle applies.

That is all I am pointing out.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 10th, 2023 at 5:08 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
Könchok Thrinley said:
Not to mention that Treehuggingoctopus was still very nice.

krodha wrote:
A polite aggression.

Lingpupa said:
Or a calm, reasonable disagreement.

krodha wrote:
The vibe is overt, as much as you two are attempting to conceal it with “calm, reasonable disagreement.” But whatever you want to tell yourself.

You and treehuggingoctopus come off like you’re white knuckling it through the politest external display of an internal “frak you” you’re capable of conjuring.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 10th, 2023 at 5:02 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
Könchok Thrinley said:
Not to mention that Treehuggingoctopus was still very nice.

krodha wrote:
A polite aggression.

Könchok Thrinley said:
Lets call it bluntness. Malcom can be blunt and he is a teacher so he should have morals in check, no? Or are morals just concepts andcwe shouldn't expect teachers to follow them?

krodha wrote:
It is definitely a different than bluntness.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 10th, 2023 at 3:50 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
Könchok Thrinley said:
Not to mention that Treehuggingoctopus was still very nice.

krodha wrote:
A polite aggression.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 10th, 2023 at 2:51 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:

Malcolm said:
I am not shutting down gzhan stong pas. They are free to say whatever they like. I have no power to control them, so stop acting like I do.

treehuggingoctopus said:
This is a complete misunderstanding of the whole situation. You do not need to literally mute someone to ensure that they no longer feel like talking. Of course you are silencing them, by asserting that they cannot defend it here, are unable to do so, and

that their position is risible. I mean, cannot you really see that such adversarial stance is a massive put off to most people? You have a great (and very well-deserved) authority here. You do not even have to speak, people will consider what you will say or think of what they will say before you even open your mouth. If you do speak, and speak in as agonistic fashion as you have in this thread, guess what will happen to your interlocutors. Extremely few people enjoy direct confrontations like this with someone whose expertise and position is vastly superior to theirs.

This should really be patently obvious to all of us here, should have been for years.

stoneinfocus said:
Damn, do y'all talk to any other Dharma teachers this way?

I know Malcolm is somewhat unique in terms of how available he is and how blunt he can be, but the way some people talk to him is pretty wild to me.

krodha wrote:
Indeed. Palpable aggression in this thread.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 6th, 2023 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
ThreeVows said:
FWIW, I think proper discernment of the third turning is identical to the realization of the path of seeing. The second turning sort of includes this, but it can also be understood in an intellectual manner without this discernment.

Kai lord said:
Instead of equating correct analysis of philosophical tenets from third/second turning with the path of seeing, Its more accurate to go Haribhadra on this; The direct perception of the first five emptinesses (out of eighteen) = realization of the first bhumi.

Given that both turnings teach eighteen emptinesses, Haribhadra's approach will also satisfy adherents from each of the four schools over which turning is superior.

ThreeVows said:
To be clear, my general position or view is that there is an essential progression of understanding that can be presented in a progressive manner.

To one with proper merit, this isn’t necessary to do in some extensive way.

To someone with proper merit, one phrase, or even perhaps a glance, may be sufficient to point out the nature of mind. This, in an essential sense, I would say is the discernment of the innermost intent of the third turning. Even if it is discerned from, say, a phrase found in the Pali Suttas.

The general progression is that, put briefly, initially we have a conceptual understanding of the dharma, of samsara and nirvana, etc.

Then we conceptually work with understanding the emptiness of all dharmas, while simultaneously balancing that with compassion for all beings and phenomena.

Then, we discern that which is beyond the scope of worldly beings, the so called union of emptiness and luminosity, the deathless nectar of the very heart essence of the dharma. This is absolutely beyond the scope of characterization in the minds of ordinary beings, but one may nonetheless use many words to point at it. Fundamentally, however, it must be discerned, not understood.

Generally, the essence of the third turning, I would say, is essentially pointing out the nature of mind properly.

The general scriptural support of this focuses on tathagatagarbha.

The general scriptural support of the second turning focuses on both the emptiness of all dharmas and the fullness of the bodhisattva path.

The general scriptural support of the first turning is basically the agamas/nikayas.

But essentially, the progression is what matters. If someone discerns suchness properly by reading ... the ye dharma hetu verse, or from some prajnaparamita sutra, or whatever, then in terms of the essence, they have discerned the meaning of the third turning. But, there are certain deviations that can occur - with the first turning alone, there can be a dualist, sort of pseudo realist understanding.

With the second turning, there can be a sort of obsession with characterizing dharmas as empty. This is a subtle movement or fabrication of the mind.

The third turning proper is unassailable because it is precisely the realization of suchness.

But, some are more concerned with words.

Anyway, I will not respond more on this thread, so others can play as they like.

krodha wrote:
The second and third “turnings” as contemporaneously presented are the prajñāpāramitā and tathāgatagarbha, often along with their ancillary systems. That said, historically there were times when these “turnings” were inverted, tathāgatagarbha being held as provisional to systems like Madhyamaka and the prajñāpāramitā teachings.

This can be seen in texts like the Hevajra which urge aspirants to first investigate the tathāgatagarbha and then follow up with Madhyamaka and so on to clean up any misconceptions that may have arisen from the tathāgatagarbha.

The entire “turning” schema is based on nothing pretty much. I find the model to often be a hindrance to people’s understanding rather than an asset.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 5th, 2023 at 7:11 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
ThreeVows said:
The third turning proper is unsurpassed as it is the discernment of suchness.

krodha wrote:
Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra:

Suchness empty of suchness is the emptiness of suchness. Whatever is emptiness, that is suchness. There is no emptiness apart from suchness. Suchness is emptiness, emptiness is suchness.

natusake said:
Seems to be well outside of any sort of idea of a blank void that we often see Mahayana accused of, even in Dzogchen texts.

krodha wrote:
Yeah the occasional accusations of śūnyatā being an inert void really just amount to polemical puffery at the end of the day.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 5th, 2023 at 5:07 AM
Title: Re: Clarification on Nyingma view of emptiness
Content:
ThreeVows said:
The third turning proper is unsurpassed as it is the discernment of suchness.

krodha wrote:
Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra:

Suchness empty of suchness is the emptiness of suchness. Whatever is emptiness, that is suchness. There is no emptiness apart from suchness. Suchness is emptiness, emptiness is suchness.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 2nd, 2023 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
yagmort said:
i thought Gambopa's four yogas of mahamudra is basically the rebranded dzogchen semde anyway, so the seeming differences are just nominal?

krodha wrote:
The primary difference is the four yogas are a gradual, consecutive process. The four tingdzins are attributes that are to be ideally recognized immediately and simultaneously.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 2nd, 2023 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Malcolm said:
He is the tall poppy around here...

Dawa Ösel said:
Some statments here at least shows, what "qualities" a Dzogchen master should not have, at least non i would follow

Malcolm said:
Have a look at r/Dzogchen on reddit. This is all pretty mild.

krodha wrote:
It’s been pretty tame lately. Just added Joe as a mod too. Sane minds will prevail!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 1st, 2023 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Jules 09 said:
There is no real difference between Dzogchen and Mahamudra.
The words may differ, but the meaning is the same.

Malcolm said:
If you mean only that the ultimate realization of both is the same, we agree, but there there is no ultimate difference in buddhahood by any path.

Otherwise, we disagree.

Jules 09 said:
Once it is seen that all is already accomplished,
then what need is there for disagreement?

krodha wrote:
The Mahāmudra path does not utilize the direct perception of vidyā in its methodology, is the point being made. That is a special feature of atiyoga.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 1st, 2023 at 6:11 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Jules 09 said:
The way that you are using the term "rig pa" here is not at all what I would call rig pa, within the context of the Dzogchen teachings. And in the 27 years since I first encountered these teachings, I have never heard any Dzogchen teacher say that rig pa, as pointed out by the guru, is "insufficient".

Malcolm said:
Since the citation comes from one of the authoritative commentaries on the seventeen tantras, you might want to stop being a frog in a well and widen your perspective.
Perhaps this is what you mean by "the introduction to the direct perception of dharmatā".
Or as Tsele Natsok Rangdrol puts it: "seeing the nature of your mind".
Not the same thing. If it were the same thing, there would be no difference between Dzogchen, Lamdre, Mahāmudra, and so on. But the fact is that the direct perception of dharmatā is unique to Dzogchen teachings, as are such teachings as four or six bardos, the six liberations, and so on.
Not the same thing. If it were the same thing, there would be no difference between Dzogchen, Lamdre, Mahāmudra,

Jules 09 said:
There is no real difference between Dzogchen and Mahamudra.
The words may differ, but the meaning is the same.

As Adeu Rinpoche explains:
There are four stages of development in Dzogchen.

The first stage comes with recognizing rigpa, which is sometimes called manifest dharmata, or innate nature—the natural state seen as it actually is.

As you progress and your experience deepens, the second stage is called increased meditative experience. The third stage is awareness reaching fullness while the fourth is the exhaustion of all concepts and dualistic phenomena.
This last stage is equivalent to the stage of nonmeditation in Mahamudra.

As mentioned above, the ultimate state of enlightenment is being re-enlightened in the pre-enlightened original ground. The great Dzogchen master Paltrül Rinpoche often told his disciples, “You should leave room for progress. You should not think that you are already there and that there is nothing more to attain. Even though it is the state of rigpa, leave room for progress. Don’t be satisfied, it’s too early. There is still room for improvement in your practice.”

What is pointed out according to the Mahamudra approach is the true state of original wakefulness as your ordinary mind. Once this has been pointed out to you, it is called mind-essence. The instruction is: “Look into mind-essence. Sustain mind-essence. This is the way.”

According to Dzogchen instructions, what is pointed out is called rigpa, which is the intrinsic original wakefulness that is present within you. Once it is pointed out you recognize rigpa and sustain it. There is no real difference between these two teachings.

Of course, there are some extra instructions in the two systems. It is like approaching Bodhgaya from the south or the north—both roads lead to the same destination. The pointing-out instruction is the same as showing the unmistaken way that leads straight to Bodhgaya.

If one truly recognizes the way one needs to train to be enlightened, and if one follows this exactly, there is no doubt that this is the unmistaken path. However, one must still follow the path. How swiftly you reach the goal is entirely up to you and your diligence…

Whether you progress according to Dzogchen or Mahamudra, please understand that ultimately there is no real difference. There is not one awakened state called Mahamudra and a separate one known as Dzogchen. It is all of one taste within the expanse of dharmakaya.

What these two words actually refer to is the basic nature of things. Since all phenomena, all that appears and exists within samsara and nirvana have the stamp of great bliss, it is called the “Great Seal,” which is the literal meaning of Mahamudra. Similarly, since all phenomena are perfected in the expanse of self-existing awareness, it is called the “Great Perfection,” or Dzogchen.

Fruition, or the final result of the path, is described as awakening to true enlightenment within the expanse of the three kayas, or bodies of enlightenment. This is explained to be the empty essence that is realized as dharmakaya, the cognizant nature that is realized as sambhogakaya, and the ever-present capacity that is realized as nirmanakaya. These three kayas are also realized to be indivisible within the single

sphere of original wakefulness. This holds true whether we call that state of fruition Mahamudra or Dzogchen.
Source: https://www.lionsroar.com/two-great-paths/

krodha wrote:
The state of Mahāmudra and the state of Dzogchen are the same, but the paths are different.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 29th, 2023 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Really?

So, are you saying that practicing the instructions that one personally receives from a guru that holds the unbroken oral/aural lineage of transmission, that can be traced back to Garab Dorje, or Saraha, or Tilopa; is "not enough" ?

Malcolm said:
I said that rig pa, or a guru, etc., is not enough. As Vimalmitra observes:

Similarly, though there is buddhahood in nondual dharmatā, it does not exist in one's vidyā alone, which is insufficient. Likewise, a guru alone is insufficient. Also, one's cultivation is insufficient. When these three things meet [vidyā, guru, and cultivation], buddhahood is a certainty.

Not only this, but also there can be flaws in the guru's instruction, even if they have a proper lineage:

The Tantra Without Syllables, the root tantra of the veiw, states:

Therefore, it is said there are no errors in the scriptures,
but errors can arise in the intimate instructions.
pg. 148

Vimalamitra simply notes:

However, since the explanation of the instructions of the guru can be explained with or without error, it seems that errors can arise.
pg. 148

Therefore, it is incumbent upon the student to make sure the instructions they are

receiving are consistent with the Dzogchen tantras and commentaries. Even upadeśas are ultimately deceptive. The only thing that counts in Dzogchen is direct perception, as Vimalamitra states:

The intimate instruction that approaches the critical points proper to direct perception does not exist [in the common upadeśas]. Since there is no buddhahood via intimate instructions, which induce a fabricated realization, all intimate instructions also do not exist. If it is asked why, it is because intimate instructions depend on words. Vidyā is free from all words. pg. 167

One needs the intimate instruction of direct perception, and that cannot rely on words:

Likewise, since the experience will arise in one's continuum through the intimate instructions of the guru, there is liberation without needing to rely on words.
pg. 175

Without this, one simply won't be able to understand the meaning of the Great Perfection. This is one reason it is recommended one seek out a few teachers when one is beginner.

Personally, I have seen many mistaken explanations, particularly, explanations made by Western teachers.

krodha wrote:
Not to hate on western teachers, I applaud their intentions, but I've never encountered one apart from you who made this point clear. And given that everything hinges on this point, it is somewhat concerning they aren't making this connection.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 18th, 2023 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
Actually, rigpa is never more or less obscured.It is always just right there. It is all about recognising or not recognising. We have a lot of habits and grasping that might seem impossible to cut through, but rigpa is right there, right now. We need to relax a bit, that is all.

That said, it isn't always easy.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā may not be "obscured" but it is definitely confused regarding its own appearances and is fully caught up in the ignorance that comes with being associated with the

karmavāyus. This is why it is expressed as the mind in sentient beings.

The emptiness of mind and phenomena is what is obscured.

heart said:
The vidya that recognise the basis is not obscured, it is just not recognised.

krodha wrote:
Right, I said it “may not be obscured, but…”

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 18th, 2023 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
However I still feel there is no need to mature and ripen anything. No need to change or improve anything in the rigpa that recognise the basis.

Pema Rigdzin said:
In a real sense, you’re quite right. But from the standpoint of the path, there is a continuum of going from not recognizing rigpa at all to recognizing it—with the karmavayus and the attendant clinging and habit patterns and obscurations being dominant—and being in rigpa 24/7, when all such karmavayus, etc having completely been exhausted and no longer obscuring rigpa at all. Rigpa itself never goes from being weak to strong, but how obscured rigpa is does. Surely you’ve noticed how when you were a beginner and had only just recognized your rigpa it was still easy for attachment, or anger, or whatever to surge forth and bury it, and that over time your ability to maintain or quickly regain rigpa in these circumstances has improved. Maybe it makes sense to speak more in terms of discursive mind and its habits weakening than of rigpa maturing, but honestly it’s all semantics given mind and rigpa are not, in their essence, two things.

If we compare rigpa to water, then it’s just like how impurities don’t actually contaminate water itself—the actually hydrogen and oxygen bound together. When we purify water, we’re not improving the bound hydrogen and oxygen we know as water; we’re just doing away with what is accompanying it and having the effect of seemingly contaminating it.

heart said:
Actually, rigpa is never more or less obscured.It is always just right there. It is all about recognising or not recognising. We have a lot of habits and grasping that might seem impossible to cut through, but rigpa is right there, right now. We need to relax a bit, that is all.

That said, it isn't always easy.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā may not be “obscured” but it is definitely confused regarding its own appearances and is fully caught up in the ignorance that comes with being associated with the karmavāyus. This is why it is expressed as the mind in sentient beings.

The emptiness of mind and phenomena is what is obscured.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 16th, 2023 at 12:59 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ok thanks. This is then referring to thögal because otherwise realized prajñā is only accessible to āryas, yes?

Malcolm said:
It's referring to both trekcho and thogal, since the key point of both is nakedly exposing rig pa. That is where the path of Dzogchen actually begins.

krodha wrote:
For non-ati practitioners of the common vehicles realized prajñā only manifests with the vipaśyanā that realizes emptiness though is the distinction I’m making.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 16th, 2023 at 12:41 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Malcolm said:
Correct, there is no need to ripen or change anything, unripened rig pa is a term for rig pa which has not been pointed out.

krodha wrote:
Although Longchenpa does at the very least say vidyā is “matured” along the path.

Tshig don mdzod:

de yang gzhi nas ’phags pa’i rig pa sa bon lta bu grol ’khrul gang byed ma nges pas ma smin pa’i rig pa zhes bya ste/ /sangs rgyas su smin par byed pa ni rtogs pa’i shes rab kyis byas te

Furthermore, since the vidyā [rig pa] that arises from the basis is like a seed, uncertain to produce either liberation or delusion, it is called “unripened vidyā”: that which will

mature it into full buddhahood is the prajñā of realization.

Khenpo Jikphun commentary by way of Jean-Luc Achard:

Therefore this state of vidyā [rig pa] is styled as “unripened” [ma smin pa] because it has not yet been “brought to maturity” through the prajñā or sublime knowledge that realises its very nature.

Seems to suggest there is a process of maturation or “ripening” that is occurring from (i) the time that we merely identify a moment of unfabricated consciousness, to (ii) realizing emptiness at third vision where the prajñā of realization is first encountered, to (iii) finally buddhahood at the time of the result. For example.

Malcolm said:
This prajña of realization is not the third vision. It occurs when rigpa is nakedly exposed. Otherwise, the path would not work. Here, in this context Longchenpa is discussing rig pa at the time of the arising of the basis, in the section on the liberation of Samantabhadra and the delusion of sentient beings.

The context that Vimalamitra cites the term in the context of a sentient being who is still subject to transmigration, but we know that anyone who nakedly exposes rig pa in a direct perception will no longer continue in samsara and will achieve realization in this life, the time of death, the bardo, or in a buddhafield.

krodha wrote:
Ok thanks. This is then referring to thögal because otherwise realized prajñā is only accessible to āryas, yes?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 10:28 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
Interesting end to this discussion for me. I went to sleep and dreamed that I was spending a lot of time with ChNNR. He was living in the very north of my country and was very available. We where eating together and but I only remember discussing things like "panini" and that Rinpoche wanted one. When I woke up this morning from that dream I had clear understanding what khroda and Malcolm was trying to say in my mind. That all the different modalities of rigpa are the same rigpa and so on makes perfect sense. However I still feel there is no need to mature and ripen anything. No need to change or improve anything in the rigpa that recognise the basis.

Malcolm said:
Correct, there is no need to ripen or change anything, unripened rig pa is a term for rig pa which has not been pointed out.

krodha wrote:
Although Longchenpa does at the very least say vidyā is “matured” along the path.

Tshig don mdzod:

de yang gzhi nas ’phags pa’i rig pa sa bon lta bu grol ’khrul gang byed ma nges pas ma smin pa’i rig pa zhes bya ste/ /sangs rgyas su smin par byed pa ni rtogs pa’i shes rab kyis byas te

Furthermore, since the vidyā [rig pa] that arises from the basis is like a seed, uncertain to produce either liberation or delusion, it is called “unripened vidyā”: that which will mature it into full buddhahood is the prajñā of realization.

Khenpo Jikphun commentary by way of Jean-Luc Achard:

Therefore this state of vidyā [rig pa] is styled as “unripened” [ma smin pa] because it has not yet been “brought to maturity” through the prajñā or sublime knowledge that realises its very nature.

Seems to suggest there is a process of maturation or “ripening” that is occurring from (i) the time that we merely identify a moment of unfabricated consciousness, to (ii) realizing emptiness at third vision where the prajñā of realization is first encountered, to (iii) finally buddhahood at the time of the result. For example.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 5:05 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
Well if sentient beings had the vidya that recognised the basis they would all be Kuntuzangpo. So what you say might be correct on a very intellectual level but it have very little bearing on our practice.

krodha wrote:
I feel it has monumental bearings on our practice because it means simply recognizing the mere vidyā that is just the knowing capacity of the mind is enough to serve as a foundation for practice.

My heart goes out to people who are confused and think they need to have some sort of extraordinary transcendent insight to practice atiyoga.

heart said:
Ok, so lets stop this back and forth on this your lovely and compassionate note. Truly all

sentient beings have the capacity.

krodha wrote:
I think it’s a friendly discussion/debate. You and I had the opportunity to spend time together in meat space. I consider you a friend and I am not interpreting this interaction as an argument or even as being antagonistic in any way.

Plus discussions like this bring a nice energy to the forum, at least for me because I like to talk about dharma. Good to continue if you want to and the more people that join in the merrier.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 4:52 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
As both you and Malcolm mentioned many times there are multiple ways to use the word vidya. In all descriptions I read on how samsara appears it is said that in the basis from the beginning there was neither vidya nor avidya. When Kuntuzangpo recognised the appearance rising from the basis that was vidya, when sentient beings didn't recognise it become mind, avidya. So sentient beings never had that vidya that Kuntuzangpo had. Alas you are talking about an other form of vidya.

krodha wrote:
All forms of vidyā are just different modalities of one’s single vidyā.

Vimalamitra concludes that excerpt describing the different types of vidyā by making sure to clarify that they are all just subsets of a single vidyā.

heart said:
Well if sentient beings had the vidya that recognised the basis they would all be Kuntuzangpo. So what you say might be correct on a very intellectual level but it have very little bearing on our practice.

krodha wrote:
I feel it has monumental bearing on our practice because it means simply recognizing the mere vidyā that is just the knowing capacity of the mind is enough to serve as a foundation for practice.

My heart goes out to people who are confused and think they need to have some sort of extraordinary transcendent insight to practice atiyoga.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 4:23 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
That vidya couldn't possibly be the vidya we are talking about here.

krodha wrote:
When the rtsal of vidyā gets mixed with the karmavāyu it becomes deluded and takes on the appearance of the mind. The “mind” is just this habitual pattern of non-recognition and ignorance.

heart said:
As both you and Malcolm mentioned many times there are multiple ways to use the word vidya. In all descriptions I read on how samsara appears it is said that in the basis from the beginning there was neither vidya nor avidya. When Kuntuzangpo recognised the appearance rising from the basis that was vidya, when sentient beings didn't recognise it become mind, avidya. So sentient beings never had that vidya that Kuntuzangpo had. Alas you are talking about an other form of vidya.

krodha wrote:
All forms of vidyā are just different modalities of one’s single vidyā.

Vimalamitra concludes that excerpt describing the different types of vidyā by making sure to clarify that they are all just subsets of a single vidyā.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
How could vidya become mind? Mind is avidya.

krodha wrote:
Vimalamitra:

As such, knowledge (vidyā, rig pa) itself becomes ignorance (ma rig pa, āvidyā) and nondelusion becomes delusion.

heart said:

That vidya couldn't possibly be the vidya we are talking about here.

krodha wrote:
When the rtsal of vidyā gets mixed with the karmavāyu it becomes deluded and takes on the appearance of the mind. The “mind” is just this habitual pattern of non-recognition and ignorance.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
Of course vidya is not equivalent to the basis, who said that? Vidya is the knowing of the basis and it isn't subject to delusion but mind sure is. Vidya is beyond mind if it wasn't there would be no path and everything would be mind.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā becomes the mind. Vidyā becomes avidyā. It is just the same mindstream in an afflicted or unaffiicted state.

heart said:
How could vidya become mind? Mind is avidya.

krodha wrote:
Vimalamitra:

As such, knowledge (vidyā, rig pa) itself becomes ignorance (ma rig pa, āvidyā) and nondelusion becomes delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
My only comment is that this doesn't correspond with what I been taught. Also if someone said what you are saying here 10 years ago both you and Malcolm would have laughed out loud. So I stick with what my Guru told me and leave the gradual Dzogchen to you.

krodha wrote:
Even Norbu Rinpoche said vidyā is not equivalent to the basis. Vidyā is subject to delusion while the basis is not. I don’t have the excerpt on hand from ChNN but it has been posted here before.

And not to be too literal because I get that you’re just trying to make a point, but I was saying this same thing around 10 years ago.

heart said:
Of course vidya is not equivalent to the basis, who said that? Vidya is the knowing of the basis and it isn't subject to delusion but mind sure is. Vidya is beyond mind if it wasn't there would be no path and everything would be mind.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā becomes the mind. Vidyā becomes avidyā. It is just the same mindstream in an afflicted or unaffiicted state.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
I am sorry Malcolm but since I don't know the context of these teachings it is difficult to understand what Vimalamitra is talking about. I have just repeated what my teacher told me. He never said that vidya needed to be matured and ripened and the above quote don't mention that either. He very clearly said that only time was an factor. The quality of the basis is immaculate and don't need to be improved in any way.

krodha wrote:
Basis is immaculate and complete, but as atiyogins, our knowledge [vidyā] of the basis is what we refine.

That knowledge ranges from nonexistent in everyday sentient beings to complete in Buddhas.

heart said:
My only comment is that this doesn't correspond with what I been taught. Also if someone said what you are saying here 10 years ago both you and Malcolm would have laughed out loud. So I stick with what my Guru told me and leave the gradual Dzogchen to you.

krodha wrote:
Even Norbu Rinpoche said vidyā is not equivalent to the basis. Vidyā is subject to

delusion while the basis is not. I don't have the excerpt on hand from ChNN but it has been posted here before.

And not to be too literal because I get that you're just trying to make a point, but I was saying this same thing around 10 years ago.

Also I am not saying Dzogchen is gradual. An island of gold is not gradually or suddenly gold, it's always already been gold… but if you have a knowledge obscuration that prevents you from recognizing it is gold, then there may be a process of rectifying that issue.

Much like someone with jaundice that sees a white conch shell as yellow. The shell is always already white, but there is a cognitive obscuration that prevents that from being seen correctly.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 2:57 AM
Title: Re: H.E. Dzogchen Khenpo Choga Rinpoche
Content:
Sādhaka said:
Malcolm,

I figured someone would say something like that.

If you saw the progression of my posts in that other thread though, you'll see that towards the end I admitted that I was hasty in my judgement, and would owe a apology to the 14th Dalai Lama based on new information that had come out.

I feel like a jerk now; and at the same time, if anything, this only reinforces what I just posted in reply to Gelukman here.

Malcolm said:
I did see the progression. But your statement rather reminded me of Jamie Tartt complaining to Ted Lasso about Zava being a self-centered jerk.

krodha wrote:
I've only caught glimpses of this show but this saw this scene the other night while my folks were watching it.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 15th, 2023 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
I already answered this. Once you recognised vidya in direct introduction the path is to familiarise yourself with that vidya. Vidya isn't matured or ripened it is only prolonged. And also if you don't get a "fully qualified" experience of vidya during direct introduction then you didn't get it.

Malcolm said:
Vimalamitra states in the Lamp that Summarizes Vidyā in the Variegated Syllables section of the Vima Nyingthig:
3.1 The vidyā that apprehends characteristics [when one is a beginner], called “the vidyā that nominally designates generic and specific phenomena,” is merely one’s clear and nonconceptual consciousness known to oneself, contaminated with many cognitions.

3.2 The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis [226] generates all the consciousnesses when present in one’s body and abides as mere intrinsic clarity. This is called “unripened vidyā,”

3.3 The vidyā of the abiding basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three pristine consciousnesses. The vidyā which is not covered by partiality [endowed with the nature of the pristine consciousness of compassion] is present as the essence of omniscient pristine consciousness...

3.4 The vidyā of insight is those vivid appearances when the instruction is demonstrated. It is called “the self-appearance endowed with the essence of the bindu."...

3.5 The vidyā of thögal is [227] the absence of increase or decrease in experience, having reached the full measure of appearance...

Are those [five] vidyās different or not? They are not different because there is nothing more than a single essence.

heart said:
I am sorry Malcolm but since I don't know the context of these teachings it is difficult to understand what Vimalamitra is talking about. I have just repeated what my teacher told me. He never said that vidya needed to be matured and ripened and the above quote don't mention that either. He very clearly said that only time was an factor. The quality of the basis is immaculate and don't need to be improved in any way.

krodha wrote:
Basis is immaculate and complete, but as atiyogins, our knowledge [vidyā] of the basis is what we refine.

That knowledge ranges from nonexistent in everyday sentient beings to complete in Buddhas.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 11:53 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
It's true, never heard that....

Sādhaka said:
Ripening, realizing, until reaching the full-measure, many short-moments, familiarizing, etc.; like Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche having said that even shortly after D.I. (regarding most individuals anyway), most are like an baby abandoned on the battlefield etc.

And also like I'd said on the previous page or so of this thread; there are the Three Kayas of the respective Base, Path, & Result (that from the ultimate perspective, are not different from one another).

If we conflate these things, then we're taking Semde as not only the Base, but also as the Result, without considering the Path, yea?. Of course Semde is important regarding the View; however there's also a 'reason' why Semde isn't Pith.

I mean there are said to have been Cig Car Bas that have been rare; yet what's holding us back from being ones our 'selves'...? (don't take this as me trying to lay all this out as implying the Result as being so far away that we fall into nihilism as an result)

Kai lord said:
It seems to me that one arguing from the prospectives of Togal, where the first vision is often described as an initial glimpse followed by increase of experience in the second and full measure in the third, etc while another is arguing from the prospectives of Trekchod practices where holding the view 24/7 is the main objective rather than expanding one's vision.

Thats why it seems like they are talking pass each other.

krodha wrote:
Even in trekchö vidyā ripens because it gets increasingly sharp and strong, and then begins to break through into realizing emptiness, which involves samādhi infused with prajñā that increases in duration as kleśas are burned.

What vidyā is capable of knowing ripens as well, even in trekchö, going from cognizing conditioned objects like a normal person to vipaśyanā that knows nonarising.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm saying both are true and intertwined.

stong gzugs said:
Ah, helpful clarification, thank you! If I'm understanding you correctly, perhaps one problem people encounter on the path is when they mistake a shallow level of vidyā for the real thing and try to stretch it out horizontally before they go deep enough vertically? (Maybe mistaking the neutral basis for vidyā is an example of this?)

krodha wrote:
Skillfully cultivating the former will result in the latter. No way to access the latter first unless you're a rare practitioner.

The "shallow level" is the real thing, it just has to awaken, which it will if you skillfully integrate the view and the meditation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
It's true, never heard that....

Sādhaka said:
Ripening, realizing, until reaching the full-measure, many short-moments, familiarizing, etc.; like Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche having said that even shortly after D.I. (regarding most individuals anyway), most are like an baby abandoned on the battlefield etc.

And also like I'd said on the previous page or so of this thread; there are the Three Kayas of the respective Base, Path, & Result (that from the ultimate perspective, are not different from one another).

If we conflate these things, then we're taking Semde as not only the Base, but also as the Result, without considering the Path, yea?. Of course Semde is important regarding the View; however there's also a 'reason' why Semde isn't Pith.

I mean there are said to have been Cig Car Bas that have been rare; yet what's holding us back from being ones our 'selves'...? (don't take this as me trying to lay all this out as implying the Result as being so far away that we fall into nihilism as an result)

heart said:
Feel free to quote Tulku Ugyen saying that vidya need to be matured and ripened.

krodha wrote:
There are many passages where Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche is discussing the maturation of vidyā but he is not referring to it as that specifically.

He does make a distinction between (i) rigpa as gnas gyu shes pa or the mere knowing of the mind that notices the movement of thought and stillness, and (ii) rigpa as rangjung rigpa which is the definitive awakened expression of rigpa. Says they are very different.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
stong gzugs said:
Would it be fair to sum up the discussion as follows: krodha says there is a vertical dimension to vidyā and we can have shallower or deeper levels of it (based on its maturity/ripening), whereas heart is saying that there is only one level of vidyā (no need for ripening), but the horizontal dimension is what matters (based on how long we stretch this vidyā out to encompass our day)? If so, this is an interesting distinction.

krodha wrote:
I'm saying both are true and intertwined.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 6:15 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
I am sorry krodha but my master never said that you need to improve (ripen and mature) vidya you just need to be able to stay longer in vidya. Thats it.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā is matured and ripened by "staying longer in it." I'm admittedly surprised you've never heard of this principle of "ripening" vidyā.

heart said:
It's true, never heard that vidya need to be matured and ripened.

krodha wrote:
That is what the "path" is.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 5:38 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master

Content:

krodha wrote:
It is the same continuum of vidyā, but it is not yet the modality of vidyā as the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” as Vimalamitra says. Thus it is akin to an example jñāna.

Just like an example jñāna, as the mere clarity of mind, the vidyā of direct introduction is also just the mere clarity of mind that we fuse with the “view” in order to ripen that vidyā with the prajñā of realization so that it becomes the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā.”

heart said:
Sorry man, I don't buy that. Direct introduction gives a short experience of “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” but it doesn't last long. So when "deciding on one point" all aspect of samsara arise as experience of body, speech and mind but one keep returning to the “knowledge of the essence", thus deciding on that.

Tata1 said:
This is pretty standar dzogchen. You can also read this in Chnn commentary on his longsal trekchod

krodha wrote:
Standard sure, but gets fairly technical in Norbu Rinpoche’s presentation. The scope and depth of detail in Rinpoche’s knowledge of these tenets really shines in those writings. Truly one of the greatest and unmatched masters of recent times.

Specifically on page 111 of Longsal Vol. 5, Rinpoche discusses the “instant rigpa” and how its role as an immediate condition concomitant with mind serves to manifest the appearance of dualistic perceptions. He also discusses how rigpa itself appears as the mind.

Then on page 117 Rinpoche notes that the instant rigpa (which is referenced as a white light) is the dang of rigpa, symbol of the mind, and is "the rigpa that retains its characteristics" which is a reference to the species of rigpa Vimalamitra coins "the vidyā that apprehends characteristics" per Malcolm's translation.

I actually wrote about this on Vajracakra years ago (RIP to that forum), the following is from one of those old posts:

[Vimalamitra’s definition of “the vidyā that apprehends characteristics” unpacked further:] "Characteristic is called 'the vidyā which designates general phenomena and just its own names.' Its action is just-that-itself being a clear non-conceptual awareness, which is polluted by many cognitions." Granted [Norbu] Rinpoche does state that the instant rigpa becomes "the all-perceiving mental consciousness" when the instant

rigpa's rtsal is not recognized as self-display.

Rinpoche says that the instant rigpa expresses itself in this manner once the fourfold conditions arise that manifest obstacles to knowledge (and rigpa can possess knowledge obscurations, as Vimalamitra states per Malcolm: "Vidyā with knowledge obscurations is knowing and lucid."), he then states that the instant rigpa is the "immediate condition concomitant with the mind" which, as Malcolm has pointed out before, is the “the immediately simultaneous and antecedent condition” that is the combination of the causal, dominant and objective conditions.

This is just saying that when this instant rigpa does not recognize its self-display it becomes afflicted mind, but it is the same capacity (of rigpa) that becomes the mere clarity of mind, it is still 'rigpa', it is just confused about its appearances (hence; ma rig pa).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 5:22 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
heart said:
I am sorry krodha but my master never said that you need to improve (ripen and mature) vidya you just need to be able to stay longer in vidya. Thats it.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā is matured and ripened by “staying longer in it.” I’m admittedly surprised you’ve never heard of this principle of “ripening” vidyā.

I am not trying to keep this going to get the last word in or anything, we can simply agree to disagree on this point, but here are some citations that help to illustrate how and why vidyā is ripened or requires ripening.

I’ll preface this by saying I agree with you that the vidyā of direct introduction is the same vidyā (the same continuum of vidyā) as the vidyā of the third vision, but… the vidyā of direct introduction is not qualitatively equivalent in expression to the vidyā of the third vision. The latter is “ripened” whereas the former is not.

I do hope we at least agree that the qualitative expression of vidyā is transformed on the path. Dudjom Rinpoche uses the example of dawn, daybreak and midday to describe how vidyā develops:

Similarly: first, the rigpa [vidyā] of having had the introduction is like the first part of the early dawn; in the middle, the rigpa of having gained assurance, free from equipoise and post-attainment is like the daybreak; and finally the rigpa of having gained liberation from extremes is like the sun shining.

The single continuum of vidyā is “ripened” and refined along the path because it is

gradually divested of obscurations.

At the time of direct introduction, vidyā is essentially just one's dualistic consciousness [vijñāna]. The Sun that Illuminates the Meaning:

The vidyā of migrating beings itself appears as the mental consciousness [vijñāna] in terms of apprehending subjects and apprehended objects. When vidyā manifests its own primal nature, the mental consciousness manifests as self-originated pristine consciousness [jñāna], and then the pure basis of the mental consciousness (free from the root of an apprehending subject and apprehended objects) brings samsara to an end.

At the time of the third vision, emptiness is realized and vijñāna collapses so that jñāna manifests as the practitioner's prevailing modality of cognition, this is called "the full measure of vidyā." The span of the fourth vision is the process of cultivating that equipoise of an ārya until all afflictive obscurations are totally exhausted and the nature of mind—vidyā as dharmakāya—remains completely unobstructed.

Vidyā has to be matured and ripened by eliminating obscurations. As the path progresses, vidyā is "purified" of the afflictive factors that cause it to be enveloped in dualistic consciousness. Longchenpa:

That being so, it is very important to distinguish mind and wisdom because all meditation is just that: all methods of purifying vāyu and vidyā are that; and in the end at the time of liberation, vidyā is purified of all obscurations because it is purified of the mind.
The prajñā [shes rab] of realization [rtogs pa] is actually what "ripens" vidyā into the dharmakāya.

Longchenpa:

Furthermore, since the vidyā [rig pa] that arises from the basis is like a seed, uncertain to produce either liberation or delusion, it is called "unripened vidyā": that which will mature it into full buddhahood is the prajñā of realization.
From the dgongs pa zang thal explanatory tantra:

Since wisdom [prajñā] arose to vidyā, it naturally formed as dharmakāya.
.
heart said:
That is why it isn't a gradual path, in a gradual path there is indeed something to improve.

krodha wrote:
Vidyā is innately pure, but because it becomes negatively influenced by delusion, the qualitative expression of vidyā must be "improved." Not only that, but what vidyā effectively "knows" must be improved and refined. The vidyā of everyday persons is expressed as vijñāna - it can only know conditioned objects (unless we are discussing the visions). The vidyā of Buddhas is expressed as jñāna - it does not perceive

conditioned objects.

Atiyoga is a soteriological system that helps us get from one point to the other. Even though this all occurs within the “non-gradual” single bhūmi that is the unceasing continuum of vidyā, there is still a gradual refinement of vidyā on the path.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
Unripened just means not fully realised, it doesn't mean that that vidya wasn't fully experienced as you seem to say.

krodha wrote:
It is the same continuum of vidyā, but it is not yet the modality of vidyā as the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” as Vimalamitra says. Thus it is akin to an example jñāna.

Just like an example jñāna, as the mere clarity of mind, the vidyā of direct introduction is also just the mere clarity of mind that we fuse with the “view” in order to ripen that vidyā with the prajñā of realization so that it becomes the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā.”

heart said:
Sorry man, I don't buy that. Direct introduction gives a short experience of “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” but it doesn't last long.

krodha wrote:
If you’re very ripe, that may occur. The vast, vast majority does not have that degree of insight during direct introduction, and they don’t need to. All that is required is recognizing a moment of unfabricated consciousness [ma bcos pa'i shes pa skad cig ma]. Or vidyā in a direct perception, but both are just unripened vidyā.

heart said:
So when "deciding on one point" all aspect of samsara arise as experience of body, speech and mind but one keep returning to the “knowledge of the essence", thus deciding on that.

krodha wrote:
“Deciding on one point” just means you understand the continuum of vidyā is where buddhahood occurs, and nowhere else. All one has to do is to mature that unripened

vidyā and buddhahood is a guarantee. That is all “deciding on one point” means.

That is why Vimalamitra makes this statement:
Fire is produced through the meeting of two things: the meeting of a person’s hands with a spindle. The fire does not exist in the spindle, nor does it exist in the hands of the person. Fire arises when three things meet: the hand, the spindle, and the fireboard. Similarly, though there is buddhahood in nondual dharmatā, it does not exist in one’s vidyā alone, which is insufficient. Likewise, a guru alone is insufficient. Also, one’s cultivation is insufficient. When these three things meet [vidyā, guru, and cultivation], buddhahood is a certainty.
You must “cultivate” i.e., ripen and mature the vidyā that the guru introduces you to and then buddhahood is a certainty. But vidyā alone without cultivation is not enough, just like an example jñāna alone without cultivation is insufficient.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 1:45 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
I haven't read that book so I can't really comment on that but I never heard direct introduction compared with anything but the fourth empowerment and that is the "true wisdom".

krodha wrote:
It is compared to an example jñāna because it is the same continuum of vidyā from direct introduction to buddhahood, but vidyā at the time of direct introduction is “unripened” [ma smin pa].

heart said:
Unripened just means not fully realised, it doesn't mean that that vidya wasn't fully experienced as you seem to say.

krodha wrote:
It is the same continuum of vidyā, but it is not yet the modality of vidyā as the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” as Vimalamitra says. Thus it is akin to an example jñāna.

Just like an example jñāna, as the mere clarity of mind, the vidyā of direct introduction is also just the mere clarity of mind that we fuse with the “view” in order to ripen that vidyā with the prajñā of realization. Then it becomes the “knowledge of the essence [snying po] that permeates all which is free of avidyā” (actual jñāna).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 14th, 2023 at 12:14 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
When you talk about the dpe'i ye shes, that is according to rywiki: Symbolic wisdom. The wisdom which is the unity of bliss and emptiness of the third empowerment and which is used to introduce the 'true wisdom' of the fourth empowerment.

krodha wrote:
Right, Patrul Rinpoche is saying that the vidyā we are introduced to at the time of direct introduction is essentially like an example jñāna.

florin said:
Right. What is "example jnanna" and did your late teacher CNNr gave direct introduction to an example ?

If he did, did he say that ?

krodha wrote:
Norbu Rinpoche taught that “instant rigpa” is equivalent to “the vidyā that apprehends characteristics” as coined by Vimalamitra. This means he is acknowledging that the vidyā we recognize during direct introduction is unripened.

I honestly don’t understand why this is controversial, we don’t start off with an awakened form of vidyā. Awakening does not occur until the third vision when vidyā reaches its “full measure.”

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
When you talk about the dpe'i ye shes, that is according to rywiki: Symbolic wisdom. The wisdom which is the unity of bliss and emptiness of the third empowerment and which is used to introduce the 'true wisdom' of the fourth empowerment.

krodha wrote:
Right, Patrul Rinpoche is saying that the vidyā we are introduced to at the time of direct introduction is essentially like an example jñāna.

heart said:
I haven't read that book so I can't really comment on that but I never heard direct introduction compared with anything but the fourth empowerment and that is the "true wisdom".

krodha wrote:
It is compared to an example jñāna because it is the same continuum of vidyā from direct introduction to buddhahood, but vidyā at the time of direct introduction is “unripened” [ma smin pa].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 10:54 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
Direct introduction is not the third empowerment.

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the third empowerment, he is referring to what is encountered in direct introduction, in the context of atiyoga.

heart said:
When you talk about the dpe'i ye shes, that is according to rywiki: Symbolic wisdom. The wisdom which is the unity of bliss and emptiness of the third empowerment and which is used to introduce the 'true wisdom' of the fourth empowerment.

krodha wrote:
Right, Patrul Rinpoche is saying that the vidyā we are introduced to at the time of direct introduction is essentially like an example jñāna.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 8:55 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
That is Tantra, not Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:

Curious how you came to that conclusion.

This is from Patrul Rinpoche's text on advice titled gzhan yang zhal shes 'thor bu which accompanies his exposition titled theg mchog a ti' i man ngag gnas lugs gsal ston or "Clear Elucidation of True Nature: An Esoteric (Intimate) Instruction on the Sublime Approach of Ati"

There is a difference between the vidyā of direct introduction and the vidyā of āryas, this is why Vimalamitra names numerous modalities of vidyā.

Mind and the jñāna of the dharmakāya are not simultaneously present as prevailing modalities of cognition. Dharmakāya is the nature of the mind, but mind and mental factors have to cease for dharmakāya to manifest, this does not mean merely stopping thought for a moment in hedewa.

heart said:
Dharmakāya is the nature of the mind, but mind and mental factors have to cease for dharmakāya to manifest, this does not mean merely stopping thought for a moment in hedewa.

Jules 09 said:
That is why the direct mind transmission (blessings / jin lap), of an authentic lineage holder is necessary:
According to the common approach of Secret Mantrayāna, by means of the wisdom of example in the third empowerment, one is introduced to the real, ultimate wisdom in the fourth empowerment.

Here, according to the special approach of the great masters of the practice lineage, the nature of mind, the face of rigpa, is introduced in and upon the very dissolution of conceptual mind.
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

Hence:
Homage to the masters that have the capacity to point out the Dharmakaya nature of mind, rigpa;
because that alone is most important.

krodha wrote:
Depends on how the "dissolution of conceptual mind" is understood. Some are asserting it is just stopping thought for a moment.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 5:59 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
That is Tantra, not Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Curious how you came to that conclusion.

This is from Patrul Rinpoche's text on advice titled gzhan yang zhal shes 'thor bu which accompanies his exposition titled theg mchog a ti' i man ngag gnas lugs gsal ston or "Clear Elucidation of True Nature: An Esoteric (Intimate) Instruction on the Sublime Approach of Ati"

heart said:
Direct introduction is not the third empowerment.

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the third empowerment, he is referring to what is encountered in direct introduction, in the context of atiyoga.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 5:49 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

heart said:
To tell you the truth krodha I really don't think you are right here. Mundane vidya is just the intelligence of our ordinary mind and that is not what is introduced at the moment of direct introduction. If you where correct Dzogchen would be a very very gradual path but it isn't. Dharmakaya can be directly introduced and that is the first word of Garab Dorje. Strangely enough I feel Jules is correct this once.

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche:
Moreover, the phrase "to see the essence of mind" refers to merely the general seeing of symbolic pristine wisdom [dpe'i ye she's] that is skillfully introduced. Other than that, the authentic essence of totally nonconceptual pristine wisdom of natural intrinsic awareness is realized only by those who have attained the level of noble ones [āryas].

heart said:
That is Tantra, not Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:

Curious how you came to that conclusion.

This is from Patrul Rinpoche's text on advice titled gzhan yang zhal shes 'thor bu which accompanies his exposition titled theg mchog a ti' i man ngag gnas lugs gsal ston or "Clear Elucidation of True Nature: An Esoteric (Intimate) Instruction on the Sublime Approach of Ati"

There is a difference between the vidyā of direct introduction and the vidyā of āryas, this is why Vimalamitra names numerous modalities of vidyā.

Mind and the jñāna of the dharmakāya are not simultaneously present as prevailing modalities of cognition. Dharmakāya is the nature of the mind, but mind and mental factors have to cease for dharmakāya to manifest, this does not mean merely stopping thought for a moment in hedewa.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Jules 09 said:
So, you believe that The Three Vital Points of Garab Dorje are mere rhetoric ?

krodha wrote:
Verbiage such as "liberation" and "dharmakāya" that is used during direct introduction is not literal.

Is dharmakāya found apart from the vidyā identified during direct introduction? No.

Is vidyā ultimately the dharmakāya? Yes.

But is that mundane vidyā expressed as dharmakāya currently at the time of direct introduction? No.

heart said:
To tell you the truth krodha I really don't think you are right here. Mundane vidya is just the intelligence of our ordinary mind and that is not what is introduced at the moment of direct introduction. If you where correct Dzogchen would be a very very gradual path but it isn't. Dharmakaya can be directly introduced and that is the first word of Garab Dorje. Strangely enough I feel Jules is correct this once.

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche:
Moreover, the phrase "to see the essence of mind" refers to merely the general seeing of

symbolic pristine wisdom [dpe'i ye she's] that is skillfully introduced. Other than that, the authentic essence of totally nonconceptual pristine wisdom of natural intrinsic awareness is realized only by those who have attained the level of noble ones [āryas].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 3:34 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Really?

https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

krodha wrote:
Like I said, lofty rhetoric, but not literal.

The actual dharmakāya is not known until later in the path, third and fourth visions. Liberation certainly does not occur until the time of the result.

Jules 09 said:
So, you believe that The Three Vital Points of Garab Dorje are mere rhetoric ?

krodha wrote:
Verbiage such as “liberation” and “dharmakāya” that is used during direct introduction is not literal.

Is dharmakāya found apart from the vidyā identified during direct introduction? No.

Is vidyā ultimately the dharmakāya? Yes.

But is that mundane vidyā expressed as dharmakāya currently at the time of direct introduction? No.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 2:37 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master

Content:

Kai lord said:
We simply call it "Lamdre"

krodha wrote:
Sure, but the meaning really pertains to the activity of generating the yidam and mandala. The path is the meditation on the so-called “impure” yidam which signifies the result, that is taking the “result as the path.” Then, you actualize the pure yidam, total realization of the nature of mind.

Which is just to say Jules response does not really make sense in a Dzogchen context. Even though Vairocana says vidyā is the yidam of atiyogins.

Kai lord said:
Actually thats rather simplistic to describe Lamdre. What taking "result as the path" really means, is that the practitioner upon receiving the "example gnosis" given or introduce during the third empowerment and after reinforce by the fourth, use that view as a basis and practices in a way that unite both Kyerim and Dzogrim.

Subsequently upon dissolving the four pulsations, etc, one experiences the union of great Bliss and emptiness and Buddhahood or the resultant Mahamudra is thereby achieved.

On the side note, fortunate students can even realize the actual gnosis and attain the path of seeing in the third/fourth empowerment.

You are right that this is

krodha wrote:
All well and good. As long as it’s clear it doesn’t mean what our friend was suggesting it means.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Kai lord said:
We simply call it "Lamdre"

krodha wrote:

Sure, but the meaning really pertains to the activity of generating the yidam and mandala. The path is the meditation on the so-called “impure” yidam which signifies the result, that is taking the “result as the path.” Then, you actualize the pure yidam, total realization of the nature of mind.

Which is just to say Jules response does not really make sense in a Dzogchen context. Even though Vairocana says vidyā is the yidam of atiyogins.

Kai lord said:
Which is just to say Jules response does not really make sense in a Dzogchen context.

Jules 09 said:
Really?
Since it is vital to cut through the flow of arising thoughts, and destroy meditation made by the mind, the sound ‘phaṭ!’ should be fierce, forceful and abrupt: “Fierce, forceful, and abrupt. How amazing (emaho)!”

At this moment, you are free from all fixed notions of what mind might be, and liberation itself is actualized: “There is nothing there: transfixed in wonder,”

In that state of dharmakāya, devoid of any reference or reliance whatsoever, all-penetrating, naked awareness dwells, just as it is, as the wisdom that transcends the mind, and so: “Struck by wonder (hedawa), and yet all is transparently clear (zang tal lé)”.
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

krodha wrote:
Like I said, lofty rhetoric, but not literal.

The actual dharmakāya is not known until later in the path, third and fourth visions. Liberation certainly does not occur until the time of the result.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
Taking the “result as the path” is anuttarayogatantra,

Kai lord said:
We simply call it "Lamdre"

krodha wrote:
Sure, but the meaning really pertains to the activity of generating the yidam and

mandala. The path is the meditation on the so-called “impure” yidam which signifies the result, that is taking the “result as the path.” Then, you actualize the pure yidam, total realization of the nature of mind.

Which is just to say Jules response does not really make sense in a Dzogchen context. Even though Vairocana says vidyā is the yidam of atiyogins.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 1:41 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:

Jules 09 said:
I would suggest that he is referring to the actual dharmakaya: " recognize this and this alone".

krodha wrote:
He is referring to vidyā as an example jñāna [dpe'i ye she's], called "the dharmakāya of the basis." The entire passage you've cited above is strictly concerned with utilizing he de ba to help aspirants recognize that form of mundane vidyā that is used as a foundation for practice. The rhetoric is lofty per usual but is not literal in the sense that you are actualizing the definitive form of dharmakāya during direct introduction. That would be nice, but very unrealistic. Only cig car bas are capable of that. We are mostly rim gyis pas and thod rgal bas, and predominantly the former.

Jules 09 said:
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

Otherwise, Dzogchen becomes a kind of gradual path...

krodha wrote:
Well, it is gradual from the standpoint of the "mode of appearances" [snang tshul]. The path of atiyoga, thögal, for example, is very gradual, but in a different context it is not gradual at all. Context is king here, and it is impossible to make blanketed statements in that regard.

Jules 09 said:
Which brings us back to the original topic of this thread.

As Old Bob wrote:

Homage to the masters that have the capacity to point out the Dharmakaya nature of mind, rigpa;
because that alone is most important.

krodha wrote:
Just as long as the basis isn't being mistaken for the result.

Jules 09 said:
Take the result as the path and you'll do fine.

Otherwise..,
The difference between this and the approach of the natural Dzogpachenpo is greater than that between earth and sky, as it does not possess the essential point—the unceasing flow of clear light, which is non-meditation.
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

krodha wrote:
Taking the “result as the path” is anuttarayogatantra, mahāyoga specifically. It means using a yidam deity in generation stage.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Jules 09 said:
It can be recognized in that gap.
As Old Bob mentions above, this is one of the skillful means employed when giving direct introduction

https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the actual dharmakāya, per Ju Mipham:
From the perspective of the mode of appearance, the basis itself never ripens as the result, and since that non-ripening is not the actual dharmakāya, since this present basis is not the buddhahood that manifest the ten powers from the mere cause of the dharmakāya, it may be considered that “dharmakāya of the basis” is not "the actual one.”
Dharmakāya cannot be encountered between thoughts. Norbu Rinpoche was critical of the misconception that there was any benefit to investigating the alleged gap between thoughts at all. Even Zen masters like Huineng reject the idea of a gap between thoughts.

Jules 09 said:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the actual dharmakāya
I would suggest that he is referring to the actual dharmakaya: " recognize this and this alone".

krodha wrote:
He is referring to vidyā as an example jñāna [dpe'i ye she's], called the "dharmakāya of the basis." The entire passage you've cited above is strictly concerned with utilizing he de ba to help aspirants recognize that form of mundane vidyā that is used as a foundation for practice. The rhetoric is lofty per usual but is not literal in the sense that you are actualizing the definitive form of dharmakāya during direct introduction. That would be nice, but very unrealistic. Only cig car bas are capable of that. We are mostly rim gyis pas and thod rgal bas, and predominantly the former.

Jules 09 said:
The crucial point here is that rigpa [vidya], which abides as the ground of dharmakāya, is the primordial purity of the path of the yogins, the absolute view of freedom from all elaboration. Until you recognize this one point, then whatever meditation or practice you do, you can never get beyond a fabricated mind-made view and meditation.

The difference between this and the approach of the natural Dzogpachenpo is greater than that between earth and sky, as it does not possess the essential point—the unceasing flow of clear light, which is non-meditation. So it is most important, first of all, to recognize this and this alone, and: “Recognize this as the pure awareness of dharmakāya”
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

Otherwise, Dzogchen becomes a kind of gradual path...

krodha wrote:
Well, it is gradual from the standpoint of the "mode of appearances" [snang tshul]. The path of atiyoga, thögal, for example, is very gradual, but in a different context it is not gradual at all. Context is king here, and it is impossible to make blanketed statements in that regard.

Jules 09 said:
Which brings us back to the original topic of this thread.

As Old Bob wrote:
So the key point is that the person(s) who Introduces you to Direct Introduction, Instant Presence, is your Dzogchen Teacher.

This is the key quality that a Dzogchen Master must have. All the other qualities are nice to have.
Homage to the masters that have the capacity to point out the Dharmakaya nature of

mind, rigpa;
because that alone is most important.

krodha wrote:
Just as long as the basis isn't being mistaken for the result.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 13th, 2023 at 12:32 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
In ati teachings we cannot access luminosity [prabhāsvara] in between thoughts. The ālaya is technically in between thoughts while we practice trekchö below the path of seeing. During that time we work with thought arising [shar grol] and self-liberating [rang grol] within the scope of the aforementioned mundane modality of vidyā.

stong gzugs said:
What happens when your guru shouts phat during a DI? (Or you do the phat semdzin on your own)? You have a space between thoughts and you glimpse vidyā, no?

krodha wrote:
It is unnecessary to glimpse vidyā between thoughts, but some people might need to.

stong gzugs said:
Then once you've glimpsed it in that space between thoughts, you can allow for thoughts to return and recognize them from within the context of vidyā so they self-liberate.

krodha wrote:
If that is necessary.

stong gzugs said:
I don't see why there is anything fundamentally different about using the naturally occurring gap as some in the Thai Forest tradition suggest.

krodha wrote:
I’m not sure. I can’t say I’m really interested or concerned what Thai forest practitioners have to say about this topic.
If a practitioner truly actualizes prabhāsvara then thought does not arise, and is known to have never arisen in the first place [ye grol]. This nullifies even the notion of a gap between thoughts.

stong gzugs said:
I think the Thai Forest masters say something similar about what happens when citta itself stops. I don't know their practices as well as I'd like, but oftentimes when I read something from the Theravadins that I really resonate with, and look up the teacher,

they are from the Thai Forest tradition.

krodha wrote:
My experience with Thai forest is that it is not a monolith and you tend to get a variety of views that reflect a variety of levels of realization amongst their ajahns. There are a small handful who are the real deal, and many, even high profile, who just have a modest degree of insight. Overall none of it is really on my radar.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 12th, 2023 at 1:17 PM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
The person I replied to earlier was emphasizing the gaps between thought, which would be cultivating gnas pa or stillness, rendering the meditation just traditional śamatha. If they instead advocated for incorporating the movement [gyu ba] of thought, then the meditation would begin to approach the "view" that we apply in practicing ati as trekchö below the path of seeing.

stong gzugs said:
Like Kai Lord mentioned earlier when mentioning the controversies around bhavanga, some Theravadins practice roughly what you describe as the view of trekchö, as they incorporate an underlying stillness with movement of thought and relate this to liberating knowledge. Certain commentaries on the https://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an01/an01.049.than.html describe how the luminosity of mind is experienced between thoughts in the bhavanga state. Resting in this bhavanga state, according to Ajahn Lee (of the Thai Forest tradition), still allows for thoughts to arise and self-liberate on their own. It's not exactly the same thing as trekchö, but it's respectably close IMO.

Here's Thanissaro Bhikkhu's explanation: The importance of becoming is evident from the role it plays in the four noble truths, particularly in the second: Suffering and stress are caused by any form of craving that leads to becoming. Thus the end of suffering must involve the end of becoming. The central paradox of becoming is also evident in the second noble truth, where one of the three forms of craving leading to becoming is craving for non-becoming—the ending of what has come to be. This poses a practical challenge for any attempt to put an end to becoming. Many writers have tried to resolve this paradox by defining non-becoming in such a way that the desire for Unbinding (nibbana) would not fall into that category. However, the Buddha himself taught a strategic resolution to this paradox, in which the four noble truth—the path to the end of suffering—involves creating a type of becoming where the mind is so steady and alert that it can simply allow what has come into being to pass away of its own accord, thus avoiding the twin dangers of craving for becoming or for non-becoming.
And here's the instruction of Ajahn Lee that Thanissaro was explaining.
Ajahn Lee said:
ONCE I HAD MADE UP MY MIND to stay, the Somdet asked me to come and teach him

meditation every day. I had him practice anapanasati—keeping the breath in mind. We talked about a number of things while he sat in meditation.

One day he said, 'I never dreamed that sitting in samadhi would be so beneficial, but there's one thing that has me bothered. To make the mind still and bring it down to its basic resting level (bhavanga): Isn't this the essence of becoming and birth?'

'That's what samadhi is,' I told him, 'becoming and birth.'

'But the Dhamma we're taught to practice is for the sake of doing away with becoming and birth. So what are we doing giving rise to more becoming and birth?'

'If you don't make the mind take on becoming, it won't give rise to knowledge, because knowledge has to come from becoming if it's going to do away with becoming. This is becoming on a small scale—uppatika bhava—which lasts for a single mental moment. The same holds true with birth. To make the mind still so that samadhi arises for a long mental moment is birth. Say we sit in concentration for a long time until the mind gives rise to the five factors of jhana: That's birth. If you don't do this with your mind, it won't give rise to any knowledge of its own. And when knowledge can't arise, how will you be able to let go of ignorance? It'd be very hard.

'As I see it,' I went on, 'most students of the Dhamma really misconstrue things. Whatever comes springing up, they try to cut it down and wipe it out. To me, this seems wrong. It's like people who eat eggs. Some people don't know what a chicken is like: This is ignorance. As soon as they get hold of an egg, they crack it open and eat it. But say they know how to incubate eggs. They get ten eggs, eat five of them, and incubate the rest. While the eggs are incubating, that's "becoming." When the baby chicks come out of their shells, that's "birth." If all five chicks survive, then as the years pass it seems to me that the person who once had to buy eggs will start benefiting from his chickens. He'll have eggs to eat without having to pay for them. And if he has more than he can eat, he can set himself up in business, selling them. In the end he'll be able to release himself from poverty.

'So it is with practicing samadhi: If you're going to release yourself from becoming, you first have to go live in becoming. If you're going to release yourself from birth, you'll have to know all about your own birth.'

krodha wrote:
Perhaps it is similar, I cannot tell. The chicken and egg talk is somewhat cryptic, but to each their own.

In ati teachings we cannot access luminosity [prabhāsvara] in between thoughts. The ālaya is technically in between thoughts while we practice trekchö below the path of seeing. During that time we work with thought arising [shar grol] and self-liberating [rang grol] within the scope of the aforementioned mundane modality of vidyā.

If a practitioner truly actualizes prabhāsvara then thought does not arise, and is known

to have never arisen in the first place [ye grol]. This nullifies even the notion of a gap between thoughts.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 12th, 2023 at 8:58 AM
Title: Re: Dalai Lama kisses boy on his lips and asks him to suck his tongue
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Seeming more and more like a media hit job to me, Idk.

krodha wrote:
No doubt. Someone on reddit familiar with propaganda tactics said that the torrent of media coverage and the ubiquitous format of slander all sharing the same talking points (that were coming from new accounts) were telltale hallmarks of an orchestrated smear campaign.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 12th, 2023 at 6:46 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Have you read the previous posts in this thread?

krodha wrote:
Yes.
Jules 09 said:
If yes, are you categorizing The First Vital Point of Garab Dorje as "just śamatha"?

krodha wrote:
One would not categorize the first "vital point" as śamatha. The first vital point is identifying vidyā. That being said, whether the particular practitioner in question's practice involves (or resembles) śamatha, after vidyā has been identified, will then be contingent on the ability of that practitioner.

Typically most ati practitioners are introduced to a modality of vidyā that is essentially like an example jñāna [dpe'i ye she's], and the trekchö that is performed using that example jñāna is really just a glorified or advanced form of śamatha that deviates from traditional śamatha in the sense that it cultivates the inseparability of stillness, movement and vidyā, as opposed to traditional śamatha, which only cultivates stillness [gnas pa].

The person I replied to earlier was emphasizing the gaps between thought, which would be cultivating gnas pa or stillness, rendering the meditation just traditional śamatha. If they instead advocated for incorporating the movement [gyu ba] of thought, then the meditation would begin to approach the "view" that we apply in practicing ati as trekchö

below the path of seeing.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 11th, 2023 at 2:51 AM
Title: Re: Dalai Lama kisses boy on his lips and asks him to suck his tongue
Content:
krodha wrote:
Chinese propagandists are astroturfing and shilling the living hell out of these posts on other forums, Reddit especially. Comes off as very intentional and perhaps even deliberate.

They surely wanted an emotional reaction from the West, and they’re getting it.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 9th, 2023 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Lingpupa said:
But in THAT sense, I think it is not unreasonable to talk about trying to rest in or recognize the gap between two thoughts, as I have heard at least one of my main teachers say. Those thoughts may not be the same as theoretically posited "mind moments", of course, but I think I (or we?) are convinced that such mind moments do not deserve much attention.

Malcolm said:
If you identify a gap, your meditation has a conceptual reference, and you will be further from the dharmakaya than heaven is from earth,

Lingpupa said:
It's not a technique I use, but in any case I'm not talking about such rarefied ideas as the dharmakaya. It's just an everyday meditation technique, described in everyday language.

krodha wrote:
It’s just śamatha.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 7th, 2023 at 10:37 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the actual dharmakāya, per Ju Mipham:
From the perspective of the mode of appearance, the basis itself never ripens as the result, and since that non-ripening is not the actual dharmakāya, since this present basis is not the buddhahood that manifest the ten powers from the mere cause of the

dharmakāya, it may be considered that “dharmakāya of the basis” is not "the actual one.”
Dharmakāya cannot be encountered between thoughts. Norbu Rinpoche was critical of the misconception that there was any benefit to investigating the alleged gap between thoughts at all. Even Zen masters like Huineng reject the idea of a gap between thoughts.

nyamlae said:
That's a great quote, thanks for sharing. What text is it from?

krodha wrote:
I’m not sure. It is Malcolm’s translation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 7th, 2023 at 4:50 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Jules 09 said:
It can be recognized in that gap.
As Old Bob mentions above, this is one of the skillful means employed when giving direct introduction
To free yourself from the ‘cocoon’ of attachment-to-experience, lay bare the all-penetrating rigpa and reveal explicitly its true state, “Suddenly let out a mind-shattering phaṭ!”,

Since it is vital to cut through the flow of arising thoughts, and destroy meditation made by the mind, the sound ‘phaṭ!’ should be fierce, forceful and abrupt: “Fierce, forceful, and abrupt. How amazing (emaho)!”

At this moment, you are free from all fixed notions of what mind might be, and liberation itself is actualized: “There is nothing there: transfixed in wonder,”

In that state of dharmakāya, devoid of any reference or reliance whatsoever, all-penetrating, naked awareness dwells, just as it is, as the wisdom that transcends the mind, and so:
“Struck by wonder (hedawa), and yet all is transparently clear (zang tal lé)”.

This all-penetrating, unimpeded awareness is the key point of inexpressible and naturally inherent wisdom, beyond all extremes such as rising and ceasing, existing and non-existing, and so beyond words and out of reach of mental enquiry. “Fresh, pure and sudden, so beyond description:”

The crucial point here is that rigpa, which abides as the ground of dharmakāya, is the primordial purity of the path of the yogins, the absolute view of freedom from all elaboration. Until you recognize this one point, then whatever meditation or practice you do, you can never get beyond a fabricated mind-made view and meditation.

The difference between this and the approach of the natural Dzogpachenpo is greater than that between earth and sky, as it does not possess the essential point—the unceasing flow of clear light, which is non-meditation. So it is most important, first of all, to recognize this and this alone, and: “Recognize this as the pure awareness of dharmakāya”.
https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/tsik-sum-nedek-commentary

krodha wrote:
Patrul Rinpoche is not referring to the actual dharmakāya, per Ju Mipham:
From the perspective of the mode of appearance, the basis itself never ripens as the result, and since that non-ripening is not the actual dharmakāya, since this present basis is not the buddhahood that manifest the ten powers from the mere cause of the dharmakāya, it may be considered that “dharmakāya of the basis” is not "the actual one.”
Dharmakāya cannot be encountered between thoughts. Norbu Rinpoche was critical of the misconception that there was any benefit to investigating the alleged gap between thoughts at all. Even Zen masters like Huineng reject the idea of a gap between thoughts.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 6th, 2023 at 4:32 AM
Title: Re: Qualifications of a Dzogchen Master
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Yes, the hetawa moment of shock breaks the continuous linking of one thought to the next, thus creating a gap in which one's intrinsic nature, the sugatagharba, re-cognizes itself.

krodha wrote:
If you are lucky. Typically one just recognizes a mundane form of vidyā that is then utilized as a foundation for practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2023 at 5:46 AM
Title: Re: In Madhyamaka is everything empty, without exception? Or is there something that exists?
Content:
Dgj said:
For example, I have read that suchness exists, despite everything else being empty.

krodha wrote:
“Suchness” is a fancy way of describing “seeing the way things really are,” or “the actual way of things.” It is just a synonym for emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2023 at 6:50 AM
Title: Re: Advaita Vedanta and Dzogchen
Content:
stong gzugs said:
Thanks, fckw. Yeah, that was in line with what I was thinking, and I've definitely seen that set of symptoms. A group of researchers including Willoughby Britton are exploring it and other dangers of serious meditation now. There's a fine line between realizing non-self and depersonalization.

krodha wrote:
Realizing anātman and depersonalization are worlds apart. Really the furthest from a “fine line.”

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 8th, 2023 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and the individual state
Content:
James Sealy said:
All in all we never can, with Madyamika emptiness, have a correct understanding of Dzogchen .
Dzogchen is based on an awareness and Madyamika on dualistic reasoning based on a non self and non here and there, which can go into absurdness, or misunderstood, can easily end into nihilism

krodha wrote:
This really is not true at all. Dzogchen and Madhyamaka are divergent in method, but their fundamental view and the import of that view are essentially identical.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2023 at 7:26 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and the individual state
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
All Lopon appears to be saying is pointing out what has been pointed out many times on DW, that is that if Buddha Nature was shared, one being attaining Buddhahood would make all beings obtain it, but of course it does not work that way.

I’ve also heard more than one Bönpo teacher express admiration for Madhymaka in different contexts, so the idea that this statement is somehow anti-Madhymaka, advocating Shentong specifically or something seems to have little basis in its content.

krodha wrote:
Agreed. Also, Jean-Luc Achard said on his forum many years ago that Lopön Tenzin Namdak is a proponent of Prasangika Madhyamaka. He would be the one to know.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2023 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and the individual state
Content:
James Sealy said:
Recently there was a discussion about that boring "self" and seen by myself, as more an identity than a "self".

Well I want to explain that further, for a better understanding.
That is possible because the Bön Yongdzin Rinpoche gives here a very clear explanation.
This explanation stems from the Dringpo Sorzhag / The pith instructions of the Zhang Zhung Nyam Gyud Masters.

==========

Question:
The question is about the fact that you said this morning that everyone's Natural State is exactly the same, that the quality is exactly the same, yet each one of us still has their own individual State. It seems that we are keeping some kind of individuality, and so there is a trace of Ignorance which remains because there is something distinct which seems to remain even after realization. So could you clarify this point?

The Bön Yongdzin Rinpoche
Answer:
Yes. The Teachings themselves very often say Thigle Nyagchig, Single Point or Unique Nature: Clarity (and) Unification are not separate; it is always saying things like that.

That means the each individual being has individual mind. Nature is very deeply connected wherever there is mind - the mind is like water and Nature is like wetness. Or the mind is like fire and Nature is like heat; we cannot separate them.

Therefore when we are explaining Nature we are explaining the Nature of Mind. Mind is completely individual, we believe that even insects, fish and chickens are all beings. Nobody has given them to us as food, they are not the same as vegetables; fish and flowers are not the same at all. Flowers are not beings but fish are definitely beings. Wherever there is mind there is Nature, and the Dzogchen View explains about Nature, Dzogchen Nature.

Nature cannot be created or changed; it is naturally pure, clear, unified and inseparable. As I explained this morning, it doesn't matter whether you realize Nature or not, Nature is always the same.

When Dharmakaya or someone has achieved Buddhahood, his Nature didn't change at

all; he didn't change anything. It is just that the practitioner or whoever realized Nature and then became more and more deeply familiar with it and stable. That can purify all defilements and obscuration, everything.

As you go deeper and deeper you realize that no substance can remain, no traces can be kept. That is why it is possible to purify all defilements and negative actions. It is very clear that if one person practises and achieves Buddhahood, it is only for himself, not for the rest of the sentient beings; it is not that way at all. That shows us.

Usually, the Teachings give a general explanation but if a particular person practises and realizes, it is he himself who achieves (Buddhahood), no-one else.

Thousands of Buddhas exist. Maybe you can make a mistake. One Buddha emanated thousands of Buddhas, but that is just one Buddha; their Nature is one. Each individual Buddha has only one Nature and, they are separate emanations; there are many, many thousands of different ones, some of them are Peaceful while some of them are Wrathful according to what is needed, according to the time and circumstances. So don't be mistaken.

Buddha can mean general or private (individual) - like humans, like us, you see. We can generally explain that a human has one head, two eyes, two ears, a nose, two legs, hands and so on, and this is all general. Then privately, someone has a beard, someone has a long beard, someone has no beard - sa it is similar. There are thousands of Buddhas and that can mean the thousands of emanations of one Buddha or thousands of separate Buddhas. There are a lot of separate Buddhas and also one Buddha with one Nature can emanate thousands of Buddhas and (they can show you) whatever you want to know or question. If you want to know the real Buddha, we are explaining Basic Buddha which each individual here has.

Everybody has this Base of Buddha, and if you try and practise it purifies all defilements and obscuration so you yourself can achieve Buddhahood.

That is one Buddha. Then you can emanate thousands or millions of Buddhas if it is necessary, and they are all your Buddhas, not different separate Buddhas. We explain that there are many Buddhas - sometimes (they manifest) one, sometimes more, it depends on the context, on what you want to know.

krodha wrote:
Lopön Tenzin Namdak is just explaining that the nature of mind is a generic characteristic [samanyalakṣana]. This is not really related to selves or identities beyond acknowledging that persons, places and things have conventional selfhoods and identities.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 26th, 2022 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: Yeshi’s back

Content:
jet.urgyen said:
c'mon guys, cheer up a bit.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps you aren't aware of much of what's been going on behind the scenes for the DC the past few years.

Simply cheering up might not cut it. Time will tell.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2022 at 2:51 PM
Title: Re: Yeshi's back
Content:
laowhining said:
I'm very excited to see what comes of this.

As an aside, does anyone else find the capitalizing of pronouns very bizarre?

krodha wrote:
Culty for sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2022 at 4:19 AM
Title: Re: Advaita Vedanta and Dzogchen
Content:
Kai lord said:
A lot of misunderstanding could have been avoided if this thread is renamed to "Advaita Vedanta and Bon Dzogchen "

Since Buddhist Dzogchen is nowhere compatible to Advaita Vedanta and someone says that his knowledge of Bon Dzogchen shows otherwise. Then good..... as it can be easily deduced from there that Bon Dzogchen is not the same as Buddhist Dzogchen and should be treated separately and given different treatment Instead of having groups of people talking pass each other because they think both Dzogchen is the same deal.

PeterC said:
It isn't different. There are areas where one tradition oe the other has more or less detailed explanations, but they're not fundamentally different.

James Sealy said:
I can fully agree to that.

Bön Dzogchen is not different from Nyingma Dzogchen, because Samantabhdra = Kuntu Zangpo.

The difference is made by persons who do not understand, some very difficult to understand topics in Dzogchen.
That is understandable and here no blame or excuse needed , because Dzogchen is not easy to understand, with the mind of karma.

So we have Longde, Semsde and Mengagde, and accordingly Dzogchenpas can understand Dzogchen better.
For me personal counts the practice more than the theoretical understanding about Bön Dzogchen.
But i do not deny, that a certain foundation of knowing, with the karma mind or consciousness mind, is also needed.

It is then, that dwelling in the Trekchöd state together with the self-emergent visions of Thodgal, there is no self as seen or studied with the consciousness mind of karma.

Well if we emancipate this state then that is the target of "knowing" Dzogchen as such.
That state is known in Bön Dzogchen as the Dharmakaya aspect, but performed with a body of illusion.
It means this body has some features , with which we can get into that certain Dharmakaya state, and these entities are inherent present and do not come from outside. So this body is the foundation to get emancipated, and the best in the 6 realms of illusion.

That is then still seen on the more karmic side of the body / mind, and partly pure and not.
The absolute state, if we would abide for 24/7 in that state then this is like it is explained by the Masters.

So it is difficult to approach Dzogchen with reasoning about it is this and that, done with the karma mind.

Therefore, i fully agree with the ultimate state or the Dzogpa chenpo state, which is never based on a self, eternal non-duality, an identity and more of that dualistic stuff.

But in Bön Dzogchen we also know that in the base is Samsara and Nirvana present.
So we are teached not to follow visions as the remedy of the never ending "movie" stemming out of the base.
Well not following, Bönpo´s practice then when we abide in the "temporal" Dharmakaya status, during Dzogchen "meditation".

Here one can see that according "our"practice , Dzogchen can be easier explained , then when we do it pure academical.
But text and practice are important, no doubt about it.

All in all, Samantabhadra and Kuntu Zangpo, the Natural State, Trekchöd and Thodgal, the indivisible Tri Kaya´s, Longde, Semsde and Mengagde, Rainbow Body, the shrunken Body, the Chikai Bardo , the inherent dwelling entity in this karma body with the kati

channel and energy etc etc.that all is known in Bön Dzogchen as well Nyingma Dzogchen.

BUT some persons have a certain approach to Dzogchen , because Longde , Semsde and Mengagde.
Bön has no Longde but is more Mengagde.

Bön has 4 unbroken Dzogchen lineages, so Bön has a rich Dzogchen history.

As a last my interpretations are always based on the teachings from the most senior Bön Yongdzin Rinpoche. Lopon la, is the head Master of all teachers and lama´s in Bön.

To understand my contributions, means to know the complete related Bön Dzogchen teachings, and here we also will meet easy, the misunderstandings, like we have seen.

krodha wrote:
Are you just underhandedly attempting to assert the Bön posits some sort of über self in a very verbose way? Can't tell what you're trying to get at.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2022 at 7:40 AM
Title: Re: Advaita Vedanta and Dzogchen
Content:
fckw said:
Actually, if you study what Gautama Buddha said, there are some passages where he did not explicitly reject the idea of a self, but rather the question whether there is or is not a self based on the argument that the whole discussion around the topic is simply not helpful.

It is fascinating how many Buddhists heavily make use of the argument of no-self to demonstrate that they are "completely different" from Vedantins, hence ignoring those passages.

This article is quite interesting regarding the debate:
https://tricycle.org/magazine/there-no-self/

krodha wrote:
This is a novel view of Thanissaro Bikkhu. He is the only person who promulgates it, and then Theravadins love to parrot him. It's nonsense.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2022 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Sems thinks. Rigpa doesn't think.
Is it clear ?

krodha wrote:
Rigpa is present even in sems. It is called gnas gyu shes pa, the knower of stillness and movement.

You have an excessively narrow definition of rigpa. I'm not even sure how one can practice Dzogchen with such a narrow definition.

For you, rigpa is strictly the prajñā of an ārya... but there are stages below the path of seeing, and you're completely neglecting how rigpa expresses itself in those contexts.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2022 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Teacher's response: "Those are thoughts!" Whack !!

krodha wrote:
Time to find a new teacher.

Jules 09 said:
Dzogchen is about stepping out of the box.

krodha wrote:
Not sure who told you this but, not the best advice if you think that means you are exempt from requiring proper instructions or clarification on your understanding (which is in dire need of clarification).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2022 at 3:14 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:
Jules 09 said:
If I were to go to my teacher and say that there is conceptual thinking during authentic rigpa, and that is how to train, I would get a verbal slap in the face with a slipper. I know

that because it has happened many times already.

krodha wrote:
This would be falsely misrepresenting people’s advice in this thread.

Instead you would ask your teacher if in the context of the view, is self-liberation applied to thoughts and phenomena so that the practitioner can recognize rigpa in its “authentic” expression as so so rang gyi rig pa'i ye shes.

They would confirm that is indeed the case.

Jules 09 said:
is self-liberation applied to thoughts and phenomena so that the practitioner can recognize rigpa in its “authentic” expression as so so rang gyi rig pa'i ye shes.
Teacher's response: "Those are thoughts!" Whack !!

krodha wrote:
Time to find a new teacher.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2022 at 12:53 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:
Jules 09 said:
If I were to go to my teacher and say that there is conceptual thinking during authentic rigpa, and that is how to train, I would get a verbal slap in the face with a slipper. I know that because it has happened many times already.

krodha wrote:
This would be falsely misrepresenting people’s advice in this thread.

Instead you would ask your teacher if in the context of the view, is self-liberation applied to thoughts and phenomena so that the practitioner can recognize rigpa in its “authentic” expression as so so rang gyi rig pa'i ye shes.

They would confirm that is indeed the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2022 at 7:42 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:

Jules 09 said:

It is not possible to rest in rigpa and watch or "allow" thoughts to liberate themselves.
Thoughts arise in marigpa, not rigpa.
In rigpa, there is no experience of an agent who would "allow" or not allow a thought to liberate itself.

krodha wrote:
Rigpa is not a one-size-fits-all type of thing. It is more like a spectrum.

There are different modalities of rigpa. From preliminary and coarse, to the advanced and most refined.

In the beginning, if you don't apply self-liberation with respect to thoughts and so on while resting in that preliminary modality of rigpa, then your rigpa will not be refined so to speak, so that you begin to encounter the other modalities you are posting quotes about (rigpa equivalent to sherab and so on. You need to walk before you run).

Jules 09 said:
Rigpa, Buddha-nature, tries to recognize itself in a manner that accords with the different needs of individual sentient beings.
I guess we can agree on that.

krodha wrote:
For all sentient beings, their rigpa is expressed as marigpa. You always start there, unless you're the rarest of rare chigcharwa.

Rigpa is not necessarily tathāgatagarbha or buddha nature. Rigpa can have knowledge of tathāgatagarbha, or lack that knowledge. Rigpa is like a crystal ball, it will appear in different ways according with conditions.

For example, the rigpa of sentient beings is the vijñāna skandha. We all begin there. You have to train your rigpa by familiarizing with the view, which many people here have attempted to communicate in this thread. You aren't immune or exempt from this.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2022 at 5:06 AM
Title: Re: Rtog pa - subtle cognition?
Content:

Jules 09 said:
It is not possible to rest in rigpa and watch or "allow" thoughts to liberate themselves.
Thoughts arise in marigpa, not rigpa.
In rigpa, there is no experience of an agent who would "allow" or not allow a thought to liberate itself.

krodha wrote:
Rigpa is not a one-size-fits-all type of thing. It is more like a spectrum.

There are different modalities of rigpa. From preliminary and coarse, to the advanced and most refined.

In the beginning, if you don't apply self-liberation with respect to thoughts and so on while resting in that preliminary modality of rigpa, then your rigpa will not be refined so to speak, so that you begin to encounter the other modalities you are posting quotes about (rigpa equivalent to sherab and so on. You need to walk before you run).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 22nd, 2022 at 6:53 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

muni said:
Thank you all for yours conversation. Then there is no trace of division.
Since no thing/being is out of emptiness, the base. All inclusive all embracing, by the grace of emptiness all is possible.

"The view is like the bright sky:
Free from all that is high or low, divided or partial,
Neither wide nor narrow, it is beyond attempts to verbalize it—
Apply the tool of insightful understanding straight away." Longchenpa.

"Dodurupchen says that all phenomena/beings are quite definitely such that they arise as rigpa energy or rigpa display. From the point of view of the new schools of tantra (sarma), everything that appears arises as the display of great bliss, and the display of emptiness. In the terminology of Dzogchen whatever manifests arises as the display of rigpa, and that is certain. So the agent responsible for all of this as well as the space and ground for it all, is the single state of Clear Light. Everything, in fact , is the display or array of Clear Light." Dalai Lama

As gratitude for clarification of Dharmata and Dharmadhatu*!

Malcolm said:
That luminosity is a unique, individual continuum. It's not transpersonal.

muni said:
That is dharmata.
There is the dharmadatu as the quote and there is dharmata. As I made it not clear, it is written in the post by Jules., a teaching by Namkai Norbu Rinpoche.

krodha wrote:
Dharmadhātu is essentially just a term for the emptiness of all phenomena.

Whereas in common Mahāyāna, dharmatā is the emptiness of a specific entity. This is the only difference.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 14th, 2022 at 8:44 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

stong gzugs said:
Non-arising is realized even through analytical meditation a la Nagarjuna. It certainly isn't the kind of unification experience that ChNN is describing in the above quote.

krodha wrote:
Non-arising is the key realization in all of these teachings, Dzogchen is no exception.

The Rig pa rang shar:

When the nonarising nature of phenomena is realized, that is buddhahood and nothing else. All phenomena are delusions of the mind. The mind is the one gathering all traces. Phenomena are free from all clinging traces. [139a] Through confidence that there is no buddhahood in the mind, that person who has seen the view for themselves is said to have been ultimately liberated without going anywhere.

Further, on this topic of vijñāna and jñāna, non-arising [anutpāda] is again, a key factor as explained in the Ārya-akṣayamati-nirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra which dedicates a section to comparing and contrasting vijñāna and jñāna, concluding with the following:

Furthermore, abiding in arising and perishing is vijñāna [rnam shes]. Abiding in nonarising and non-perishing is jñāna [ye shes]. This is "relying on jñāna and not relying on vijñāna" [which is the fourth of the "four reliances"].

Natan said:
But this will not be a non arising by way if Madhyamaka analysis.

krodha wrote:
Never asserted it was.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2022 at 6:31 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

stong gzugs said:
Non-arising is realized even through analytical meditation a la Nagarjuna. It certainly isn't the kind of unification experience that ChNN is describing in the above quote.

krodha wrote:
Non-arising is the key realization in all of these teachings, Dzogchen is no exception.

The Rig pa rang shar:

When the nonarising nature of phenomena is realized, that is buddhahood and nothing else. All phenomena are delusions of the mind. The mind is the one gathering all traces. Phenomena are free from all clinging traces. [139a] Through confidence that there is no buddhahood in the mind, that person who has seen the view for themselves is said to have been ultimately liberated without going anywhere.

Further, on this topic of vijñāna and jñāna, non-arising [anutpāda] is again, a key factor as explained in the Ārya-akṣayamati-nirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra which dedicates a section to comparing and contrasting vijñāna and jñāna, concluding with the following:

Furthermore, abiding in arising and perishing is vijñāna [rnam shes]. Abiding in nonarising and non-perishing is jñāna [ye shes]. This is "relying on jñāna and not relying on vijñāna" [which is the fourth of the "four reliances"].

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2022 at 3:49 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Matt J said:
That is not so difficult--- based on what ChNNR is stating, it is just a matter of an individual reaching an expanded state of consciousness. Since this can include other mindstreams, in theory a Buddha that achieves some sort of universal omniscience would be a sentient being who achieved a very expanded state of knowledge.

stong gzugs said:
Are you using consciousness in an everyday or technical way here? If it's the latter, I don't think that a person's consciousness (shes pa/vijñāna) can expand out to encompass others. It's usually wisdom (ye she/jnana) that is tied to the Buddhas omniscience.

And this doesn't really answer the question, which is that if you think that each individual has their own separate basis, what is the matrix/space within which an individual is "expanding" to reach other individuals? It has to be the matrix of buddha-nature which would, again, imply a transpersonal matrix that connects and unifies all reality, and which is fractally or holographically reflected in the heart of all sentient

beings (like how Tenzin Wangyal interprets sugatagarbha/dharmakaya), such that this matrix provides a way for individuals to expand beyond their individual confines to reach others.

krodha wrote:
They don't "expand," they simply realize non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 12th, 2022 at 12:49 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
Nope. That's not how it works. Aí ai

krodha wrote:
I clarified that "analysis" simply means a yogi's scrutiny of samsara in whatever form. For example, nirvana being defined as "analytical cessation" [pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha] this does not mean nirvana results from literal scientific style analysis.

That is how it works.

Otherwise, regarding the cellular topic, if you're some sort of physicalist who is asserting that cells can withstand scrutiny, that would be an interesting deviation from the entire history of these teachings. I'm not sure how novel Guru Natan is planning on getting.

Natan said:
Here's what your master says, "We don't reject outer objects in Dzogchen, which, if you were more studied in the subject, you would understand already. "

krodha wrote:
Outer objects are not rejected conventionally, but the conventional cannot withstand scrutiny, the same goes for Dzogchen. Objects are not actually real.

Natan said:
Dzogchen has nothing to do with analysis, really.

krodha wrote:
No one asserted it does. You're being too literal.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2022 at 11:05 PM
Title: Re: Rigpa is conditioned?

Content:
Luren said:
Hello everyone.

I realized that Dzogchen is the best choice for me and best suits the way of western life. I want to experience life fully, not to renounce it as is the case with some other forms of spirituality.

However, I was a bit concerned about an interview I came across recently - in this interview, Delson Armstrong, very advanced meditation practitioner, claims that Rigpa is a conditioned state and not the pinnacle of human spiritual abilities.

At the same time, it seems to me that he makes the Dzogchen teachings a little shallower.

What is your opinion on this?

The passage in question is: 12:50 - 15:11

krodha wrote:
Rigpa has conditioned and unconditioned modalities, but this guy is just making stuff up in terms of asserting that rigpa in total is subordinate to whatever he's promoting as superior.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2022 at 12:28 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
You think ignorance is removed by analysis of when we are naming things and awakening is no longer using names?

krodha wrote:
Never said that at any point in this discussion.

Natan said:
Like before we knew there were cells in the body there were no cells and they arose because we stupidly saw them with a microscope and named them cells? But then if we analyze what a cell is it ceases to exist? It's so silly...

krodha wrote:
Not sure what you're talking about.

“Analysis” in this context refers to using whatever means to realize that dharmas are non-arisen.

If a cell was the subject of that insight, then indeed bhavanirodha or the cessation of existence would certainly be known through that realization. But we don’t have to use phenomena on a cellular level, there is no need. The macroscopic level of everyday persons, places and things works just fine.

Natan said:
Nope. That's not how it works. Aí ai

krodha wrote:
I clarified that “analysis” simply means a yogi’s scrutiny of samsara in whatever form. For example, nirvana being defined as “analytical cessation” [pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha] this does not mean nirvana results from literal scientific style analysis.

That is how it works.

Otherwise, regarding the cellular topic, if you’re some sort of physicalist who is asserting that cells can withstand scrutiny, that would be an interesting deviation from the entire history of these teachings. I’m not sure how novel Guru Natan is planning on getting.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 11th, 2022 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
All these quotes stand for is that when anything is analysed nothing fundamental is ever found.

krodha wrote:
Yes, a dharma only appears to be real if it is not investigated. If scrutinized, no dharma can withstand scrutiny because the basis of designation does not contain or produce the entity that is imputed onto it, and therefore the entity is nothing more than an imputation. A nominal inference.

Natan said:
But this is about Dzogchen tantras and how the universe and it's Buddha's, gods and men arose from nothing.

krodha wrote:
These dharmas only appear to arise because of ignorance and delusion. Remove

ignorance and delusion and you see that nothing ever arose to begin with. Meaning all dharmas are merely nominal in nature.

Natan said:
Then, we could have been Buddhas if raised by wolves? So before you know what a word is, like when you're a wolf, what name are you giving the connate ignorance? And why are there even wolves?

And don't you feel it's counterintuitive and asinine to believe the universe and all of life was caused by a word? The word for connate ignorance? Who their right mind would make such an idiotic claim with a straight face? Could it be names are really a result of millions of years of evolution? And no intelligent yogi would ever assume the universe is made.of words?

krodha wrote:
The connate ignorance is the failure to recognize that appearances are your own display, and then the imputing ignorance is where the ālaya forms and all of the deluded conventional diversity we experience is concretized.

The universe only appears real because of our delusion.

Natan said:
You think ignorance is removed by analysis of when we are naming things and awakening is no longer using names?

krodha wrote:
Never said that at any point in this discussion.

Natan said:
Like before we knew there were cells in the body there were no cells and they arose because we stupidly saw them with a microscope and named them cells? But then if we analyze what a cell is it ceases to exist? It's so silly...

krodha wrote:
Not sure what you're talking about.

"Analysis" in this context refers to using whatever means to realize that dharmas are non-arisen.

If a cell was the subject of that insight, then indeed bhavanirodha or the cessation of existence would certainly be known through that realization. But we don't have to use phenomena on a cellular level, there is no need. The macroscopic level of everyday persons, places and things works just fine.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2022 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Natan said:
There's a trend that appears in your writings in which everything in Dharma... all dharmas, dharmas of samsara and dharmas of the path all boil down to seeing them as merely nominal. It is as if one can just give up names and be a nirmanakaya. Children raised by packs of wild animals come to mind. Your take strikes me as nihilistic.

krodha wrote:
I realize you directed this question at Malcolm, but it is an interesting topic. If dharmas were anything more than nominal in nature they would be able to withstand keen scrutiny.

Ju Mipham:

Conventional truth is not ultimately real [bden par grub pa] because it is not able to withstand reasoned analysis.

Longchenpa:

If one analyses, what does not bear analysis is relative.

Rongzom states that convention:

is satisfactory when not investigated; but if investigated cannot bear the weight of reasoning.

Dharmas are only inferred via imputation, which means they are completely nominal in nature. A mere designation that infers the existence of something that isn't really there. Obviously the connate ignorance underlies this process, but these levels of ignorance and delusion reify one another.

.

Natan said:
All these quotes stand for is that when anything is analysed nothing fundamental is ever found.

krodha wrote:
Yes, a dharma only appears to be real if it is not investigated. If scrutinized, no dharma can withstand scrutiny because the basis of designation does not contain or produce the entity that is imputed onto it, and therefore the entity is nothing more than an imputation. A nominal inference.

Natan said:
But this is about Dzogchen tantras and how the universe and it's Buddha's, gods and

men arose from nothing.

krodha wrote:
These dharmas only appear to arise because of ignorance and delusion. Remove ignorance and delusion and you see that nothing ever arose to begin with. Meaning all dharmas are merely nominal in nature.

Natan said:
Then, we could have been Buddhas if raised by wolves? So before you know what a word is, like when you're a wolf, what name are you giving the connate ignorance? And why are there even wolves?

And don't you feel it's counterintuitive and asinine to believe the universe and all of life was caused by a word? The word for connate ignorance? Who their right mind would make such an idiotic claim with a straight face? Could it be names are really a result of millions of years of evolution? And no intelligent yogi would ever assume the universe is made.of words?

krodha wrote:
The connate ignorance is the failure to recognize that appearances are your own display, and then the imputing ignorance is where the ālaya forms and all of the deluded conventional diversity we experience is concretized.

The universe only appears real because of our delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 10th, 2022 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Natan said:
There's a trend that appears in your writings in which everything in Dharma... all dharmas, dharmas of samsara and dharmas of the path all boil down to seeing them as merely nominal. It is as if one can just give up names and be a nirmanakaya. Children raised by packs of wild animals come to mind. Your take strikes me as nihilistic.

krodha wrote:
I realize you directed this question at Malcolm, but it is an interesting topic. If dharmas were anything more than nominal in nature they would be able to withstand keen scrutiny.

Ju Mipham:

Conventional truth is not ultimately real [bden par grub pa] because it is not able to withstand reasoned analysis.

Longchenpa:

If one analyses, what does not bear analysis is relative.

Rongzom states that convention:

is satisfactory when not investigated; but if investigated cannot bear the weight of reasoning.

Dharmas are only inferred via imputation, which means they are completely nominal in nature. A mere designation that infers the existence of something that isn't really there. Obviously the connate ignorance underlies this process, but these levels of ignorance and delusion reify one another.

.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2022 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Sharp said:
One thread had this quote from "The Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two":

The eleventh root downfall is to subject the ineffable, ultimate nature to logical assessment. That to which the word "dharmadhatu" refers is beyond name, example, and indication; it is beyond all conventional labeling. And even though the discursive intellect can, in its ratiocinations, understand ultimate reality as being "emptiness" and "lack of self," in fact this "no-self" of phenomena is exclusively the field of self-cognizing primordial wisdom. It stands in clean contradiction to the conventional, dualistic mind. The sharp, investigating intellect may indeed point to what is a lesser kind of emptiness of phenomena, such as the aggregates, and say that it is ultimate reality, thereby claiming a superior view. But to evaluate the unborn nature, namely, inconceivable ultimate reality, according to the criteria of ordinary thought, constitutes the eleventh downfall.

krodha wrote:
Seems pretty straightforward and obvious.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 9th, 2022 at 12:17 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
krodha wrote:
The "basis" is just the essence, nature and compassion of one's vidyā.

stong gzugs said:
The basis exists regardless of whether one has vidyā or not. It therefore seems strange to define the basis by vidyā. I think it's more linguistically accurate to say that vidyā is recognition of the basis. But this seems like pointless word play?

krodha wrote:
Garab Dorje:

The fundamental basis is the trio of essence, nature and compassion of each individual's vidyā.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2022 at 11:12 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Sharp said:
You are arguing against conventions being arbitrary. I didn't say they were. You then write an essay about how rigpa is individual. I never said it wasn't. Rigpa is personal. The basis is neither personal, transpersonal etc. Since these two (rigpa and the basis) are neither the same nor different, there is no contradiction.

krodha wrote:
You don’t have to say things like “the basis is neither personal, transpersonal, etc.” this is incorrect and unnecessary.

Transpersonal natures or universals [pādārthas] are not accepted even conventionally. Discrete, personal entities, mindstreams etc., are allowed a conventional status. And then entities are ultimately empty. This covers all aspects of the issue.

Sharp said:
What I actually said was that no convention for the ultimate is accurate. The definition of accurate is "correct in all details; exact." This is exactly right.

krodha wrote:
Sorry, but this is neither right or “exactly right.”

Why would there not be a convention accurate for ultimate truth? This is a nonsensical assertion. The Dzogchen luminaries spent massive amounts of time writing about so-called ultimate truth and defining it precisely and carefully. Their writings are accurate.

"
Sharp said:
The basis is personal" is one such view, not "correct in all details", not "exact". Hence "inaccurate". “The basis is transpersonal” is another. Avoiding both extremes, the Tathagata “taught his Dhamma via the middle.”

krodha wrote:
This is not how this logic is applied.

Sharp said:
Of all of them, primordial purity is the least wrong, but still wrong, still a convention. And this being a convention "is itself the middle way".

krodha wrote:
It seems that you are trying to separate enumerated and unenumerated ultimate truth and are then asserting that only the unenumerated ultimate truth is right. But why? This is completely unnecessary.

Sharp said:
appreciate the translations, I'm sorry they were unnecessary. Here is a quote from Norbu Rinpoche instead:

The Base, or Zhi in Tibetan, is the term used to denote the fundamental ground of existence both at the Universal level and at the level of the individual, the two being essentially the same; to realize the one is to realize the other. If you realize yourself, you realize the nature of the Universe. [...] However, the Base should not be objectified and considered as a self-existing entity; it is the insubstantial State or condition which serves as the basis of all entities and individuals
I will never be able to articulate my position with more clarity than how it is expressed here.

krodha wrote:
This just means if you realize the nature of mind you realize the nature of phenomena.

I
Sharp said:
f you read this and think it means that "the basis is personal" or "the basis is transpersonal", then we simply have a different understanding of the meaning and that's okay. Either way I have never attempted to say anything other than what these words convey according to my own limitations.

krodha wrote:
You’re fixating on this personal versus transpersonal thing, and are sort of treating both as equal, but this isn’t the case. One is conventionally valid while the other is not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2022 at 12:12 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Sharp said:
a dharmata or a mere experience...
The phrase "a dharmata" here is a typo but I am unable to edit my post. It should be

disregarded, just like conventions.

krodha wrote:
Oh, I see. Well still you successfully demonstrated how a wrong convention is possible, and you even identified it yourself after telling me such a thing isn't possible. This is palpable irony, Sharp!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 8th, 2022 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Jules 09 said:
Remember the quote from the Mahaparinirvana sutra that I offered you earlier in this thread?

"All the fully enlightened Buddhas praised the meaning of the Buddha-Essence (Buddhanature) as inconceivable, immeasurable, and endless."

- It is just as Wangdor Rinpoche used to say: "Whatever it is, it's not what you think it is."

krodha wrote:
These statements just mean that the experience these conventions are applied to is ineffable. But that is true for anything. "Red ball" cannot capture the direct perception of a red ball. Just as "sweet" does not capture the experience of tasting sugar.

Direct perceptions are nonconceptual, this is well established in Buddhist pramana. People think being "beyond words" is profound, but everything is beyond words. It isn't necessarily all that exciting once you figure that out.

Nevertheless, within the context of convention, there is accurate and inaccurate convention. Like describing the taste of sugar as "salty" would be inaccurate conventionally. This is all we do here on dharmawheel, discuss accurate and inaccurate convention.

Sharp said:
Rigpa is not like the qualia of something, such as the redness of an apple.

krodha wrote:
No one claimed it was. Regardless however, we can have a direct perception of an apple and a direct perception of vidyā and both pratyaksas are nonconceptual. The only difference is the former is karmic in nature.

Sharp said:

The difference is rigpa is decisive, precise, clear. It is diamond-like. The ineffability of redness is none of these things.

krodha wrote:
This is a little pedantic and out in left field. As long as the individual understands the principle of ineffability, then that is all that matters. You're sort of going after a straw man here.

Sharp said:
As Mipham
states when distinguishing rigpa from the all ground:

[it]lacks decisiveness, since you are completely unable to describe it in any way. Rigpa, on the other hand, is essentially indescribable. Yet at the same time it has a decisive quality, which cuts through any doubt about what is indescribable. There is thus a huge difference between these two kinds of indescribability, as great as the difference between blindness and perfect vision. This is also a crucial point in distinguishing between the ground-of-all and the dharmakāya. Therefore, terms such as [...] inexpressible and so on are used in two different ways, only one of which is authentic.

krodha wrote:
Nice, but off topic.

Sharp said:
In short, the inexpressibility of reality and the inexpressibility of a dharmata or a mere experience are not at all the same;

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what you mean by dharmatā being a "mere experience" that contrasts "reality," (whatever that is). This is not how these principles are defined.

Sharp said:
they are the very difference between ignorance (the ground-of-all) and wisdom (dharmakaya). It is only like sugar because once you've tasted it you know that taste for yourself and can recognise it anywhere. Not because it is an arbitrary quality or characteristic of some "thing", like the redness of an apple.

krodha wrote:
Still very pedantic and missing the point, but since you just misdefined dharmatā, in addition to the pedantism, there's now another layer of uncertainty in terms of your point.

Sharp said:
Therefore, it is also incorrect to say that one convention is more accurate than another when describing something intrinsically beyond expression, outside of terms that refer to this exact point such as "intrinsically beyond expression". Jules09 is correct - an accurate convention is not possible.

krodha wrote:
Yes, and no. Depends on context. In the context I was discussing there are indeed accurate and inaccurate conventions, just as you demonstrated with your definition of “dharmatā.”

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 7th, 2022 at 9:21 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Engaging in affirmation and rejection of concepts about buddhanature is not the path of the natural Great Perfection.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Then get out of here? Seriously, what do you think you've been doing this whole time?

Jules 09 said:
Remember the quote from the Mahaparinirvana sutra that I offered you earlier in this thread?

"All the fully enlightened Buddhas praised the meaning of the Buddha-Essence (Buddhanature) as inconceivable, immeasurable, and endless."

- It is just as Wangdor Rinpoche used to say: "Whatever it is, it's not what you think it is."

krodha wrote:
These statements just mean that the experience these conventions are applied to is ineffable. But that is true for anything. “Red ball” cannot capture the direct perception of a red ball. Just as “sweet” does not capture the experience of tasting sugar.

Direct perceptions are nonconceptual, this is well established in Buddhist pramana. People think being “beyond words” is profound, but everything is beyond words. It isn’t necessarily all that exciting once you figure that out.

Nevertheless, within the context of convention, there is accurate and inaccurate convention. Like describing the taste of sugar as “salty” would be inaccurate conventionally. This is all we do here on dharmawheel, discuss accurate and inaccurate convention.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 7th, 2022 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Jules 09 said:

Are you saying that Dzogchen teachings reify personal identity?

Malcolm said:
Dzogchen teachings accept the limitations of language in discourse. For example, the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra begins: "Children of good families, listen faithfully without distraction! My explanation of the great meaning to each of you will remove the concepts in your minds."

So here we have the pronouns my, you, and your.

Further:

For sentient beings without realization,
each word must be understood with each meaning.
Therefore, connect the meanings with the words
and illustrate the great meaning with words.
Therefore, investigate the connection between the words and
meanings.
Though the illustrative words and letters
may not exist in utter purity itself,
because they remove mental doubts,
one should always be acquainted with the words.

And:

The transcendent state of all buddhas
is not words and syllables,
but appears like words and syllables.
Nevertheless, the great meaning is unravelled with words.

So, fortunately, even though the meaning of the great perfection is beyond verbal reifications such as self, other, and so on, Nāgarjuna's dictum remains in force in Dzogchen teachings:

Without relying on the conventional, the ultimate will not be understood;
without realizing the ultimate, nirvana will not be attained.

Jules 09 said:
That's all well and good. But it doesn't mean that buddhanature is something that belongs to the misconception that is given the name 'sentient being'.

krodha wrote:
It does mean that. The deceptively appearing bodies of sentient beings harbor the sugatagarbha inside of those bodies.

Longchenpa:

General delusion is caused by the stain of vidyā not recognizing the manifest basis, through which vidyā itself becomes polluted with delusion. Though vidyā itself is without the stains of cognition, it becomes endowed with stains, and through its becoming enveloped in the seal of mind, the vidyā of the ever pure essence is polluted by conceptualization. Chained by the sixfold manas, it is covered with the net of the body of partless atoms, and the luminosity becomes latent.

Thus, because vidyā fails to recognize these appearances to be its own movements, its pure dynamism is externalized and this causes the appearances to concretize like water turning into ice. Vidyā then recedes into the that deceptive appearance of a body like a cocoon of delusion and it then remains in a latent state that expresses itself in a limited and diminished fashion.

We can reverse this process through applying the ati teachings, but, for now, yes, you are stuck with this seemingly corporeal body comprised of the five elements and your vidyā dwells inside of that deceptive body… which is subject to all sorts of karmic action.

These elements that we experience as the body and our environment are fully formed cognitive errors that you've been entrenched in for lifetimes and lifetimes. While it is true that it is a misconception, you can't just sit there and propose that it is a "misconception," to explain it away if you have not conquered that delusion. For you it is very real. This isn't a game.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 7th, 2022 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ju Mipham's "Investigation of the Essential Identity: Neither One Nor Many" from the Four Great Logical Arguments of the Middle Way is also quite good on this topic. He clarifies that so-called "ultimate natures" are really just species of absences.

To begin with, there is an analysis of the essential identity of all conditioned and unconditioned phenomena to determine whether or not there is true singularity. In the case of those conditioned phenomena of the five aggregates possessing physical form, there is a division into above, below, the cardinal and intermediate directions and the centre. Through this, it can be seen that, for something such as a vase, singularity is simply a conceptual notion applied to the various features that are the basis for such an imputation. True singularity is not established, and the same applies in the case of its component parts. The body and the limbs are also divided into parts in the same way.

In short, all that possesses physical form and is composed of material particles may be broken down to its basis, which is the infinitely small particle. And, according to the logic explained before, for that most subtle particle to be surrounded by particles in the various directions, it must have sides, which means it must have parts, and so on, in an infinite regression. If not, then however many subtle particles are gathered together,

they could never grow any larger. Thus, all phenomena with material form lack true singularity.

In addition, the eight or the six collections of consciousness can not be established as truly singular since they consist of various cognitive acts and mental states, take various features as their focus, and arise in different forms from the gathering of the four conditions, and then cease.

By analyzing everything that has the nature of arising and ceasing deriving from its own causes, even the subtlemost indivisible moment can not be established, and so all phenomena included within mind and matter lack any true singularity. As for non-concurrent formations, they are simply imputations made upon the 'occasion' of mind and matter, and so they lack any essential identity. Unconditioned phenomena are imputations made with regard to the eliminated aspects of objects of negation, and are also lacking in any essential identity.

In short, all conditioned and unconditioned phenomena can not be shown to have any true singularity, and since this is not established, plurality that is made up of what is singular must also remain unestablished. And so, since there is no mode of true existence aside from being truly singular or plural, it must follow that individuals and phenomena are proven to be without inherent identity, just as it is explained more elaborately in The Ornament of the Middle Way.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2022 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Sharp said:
As others have said, linguistic conventions are useful as a pedagogical tool, but are naturally going to be limited by dualistic language.

krodha wrote:
This statement does not really make sense. Persons, places, things, etc., are only conventions. It is perfectly okay in these teachings for conventions to be dualistic, it doesn't matter, because they are inferential imputations.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2022 at 2:40 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Jules 09 said:
You seem to be saying that you think you possess your own buddhanature. Is this the case?

krodha wrote:
Yes, a conventional individual possess their own individual tathāgatagarbha. In Dzogchen teachings for example, that sugatagarbha even has a physical location in the body.

Jules 09 said:
Are you saying that Dzogchen teachings reify personal identity?

krodha wrote:
In addition to Johnny's answer, these teachings also allow for a conventional identity. That identity appears solid and concrete for deluded sentient beings. Buddha's on the other hand know that all identities are just useful inferences that reference nothing substantial.

In either case we can utilize identity as a tool for navigating our lives. That is the meaning of convention. We aren't like Neo-Advaitains who have to sit around using scare quotes around "I" and "me."

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2022 at 6:18 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Natan said:
There's not one cite that says or implies Buddhanature is individual and specific to each person.

Malcolm said:
In fact, the Lankāvtāra Sūtra states that tathāgatagarbha is just a name for the ālayavijñāna. How is the ālayavijñāna not personal and individual?

Asanga states in the Uttaratantra commentary that the name for the dharmakāya encased in afflictions is "tathāgatagarbha." How can personal afflictions encase a transpersonal entity? He later states in the same that the name for suchness, tathāta, encased in afflictions is tathāgatagarbha. The same question applies. He later describes sentient beings as "tathāgarbhins", possessors of tathāgatagarbha. In the same way consciousness pervades all sentient beings, it is stated that tathāgatagarbha pervades all sentient beings. However, no one thinks the phrase "consciousness pervades all sentient beings" means there is one unitary consciousness that pervades all sentient beings. It is the same with the basis, tathāgatagarbha. Finally, Asanga concludes his treatises by pointing out that the gnosis of tathāgatagarbha is just the tathāgata's gnosis of emptiness. He says:

"Without the gnosis of ultimate emptiness, it is impossible to realize and actualize the dhātu of pure nonconceptuality. Having stated this, the gnosis of tathāgatagarbha is the Tathāgata's gnosis of emptiness. Further, it is said extensively that the tathāgatagarbha has not been seen or realized by all śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas. However tathāgatagarbha is, the dharmakāyagarbha is just like that, and it is not within the domain of those who fall into a view of personality (satkāyadṛṣṭi), because the dharmadhātu is the antidote to views."

So how is the dharmadhātu defined in this text? Again "The so-called dharmadhātu is the tathāgatagabha that is no different than the nature of one's dharmatā."

So here you have a very precise description of tathāgatagarbha being described as individual and specific to each sentient being. Since the spyi gzhi is just a term for tathāgatagarbha in Dzogchen teachings, we can understand the meaning to be the same here, especially since in the discussion of how the basis exists in the body in the third topic of the Tshig don mdzod, Longchenpa mainly cites from the Uttaratantra.

In the same way that we talk about the vijñānadhātu or the sattvadhātu as aggregates of consciousness and sentient beings, we talk about the dharmadhātu as an an aggregate of dharmatās. Without individual dharmatās that belong to dharmins, we cannot talk about dharmatās at all, just as we cannot talk about the emptiness of nonexistents like the children of barren women, etc.

And of course in Vajrayāna teachings, we go a step further and site the location of sugatagarbha in the bodies of sentient beings. However, the idea the sugatagarbha sited in the bodies of all sentient beings refers to one transpersonal entity has been rejected by the Buddha very clearly as an incorrect view of atman. For example, the Nirvana Sūtra (Chinese recension) explicitly rejects it: "Child of a good family, some tīrthikas advocate a permanent "self," other advocate an annhilationist "not-self." The Tathagata is not like that. Because he teaches self and not-self, it is called "the middle." Now, whoever teaches the Buddha's middle way can say that the nature of buddhahood exists in all sentient beings, but it is not known and not seen because it is obscured by afflictions. Therefore, be diligent in the method of eliminating afflictions." The Indian recension of the Nirvana sutra states, "The buddhadhātu exists in all sentient beings, held in each one's body. After sentient beings exhaust afflictions, they become buddhas."

I could go on, but we are getting into TL;DR territory

Natan said:
Alayavijnana is one's personal mistake. Buddhanature is not. I don't need to assert there is something called transpersonal. You need to assert apparently that there's not. The only thing apparent in meditation is a nonconceptual experience.

krodha wrote:
There are different types of nonconceptual experience and different types of nonconceptual realization. Even relatively this is true. The taste of sugar and the taste of

salt are both direct, nonconceptual, ineffable experiences, but are both radically different in characteristic.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 6th, 2022 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Jules 09 said:
And no, "there isn't a unified Buddhanature pervading all sentient beings" because the Basis, Buddhanature has never been fragmented, so cannot be said to be "unified". And neither is it the case that each sentient being has 'their own' Buddhanature.

Malcolm said:
The basis is just a generic set of attributes, this is why Dzogchen texts refer to it as the "spyi gzhi," "the generic basis."

All fires are hot. Not all fires are the same. The same heat does not permeate all fires. "heat" is a "spyi mtshan nyid," a generic characteristic (samanyalakṣana), known in western philosophy as a universal. Dzogchen is a Buddhist system, and like all the other ones, is nominalist in orientation.

The general example in Dzogchen for buddhanature is the oil in sesame seeds. The Vajrasattva Mind Mirror:

Tathāgatagarbha exists intrinsically in all sentient beings. That exists just as sesame seeds are permeated with oil. Its basis — it is based on the material aggregate.

When you press one seed, it produces its own oil, not the oil of all seeds. When you "press" one sentient being with the path, that being produces their own buddhahood, not the buddhahood of all beings. So you are incorrect, every sentient beings possesses their own buddhanature just as every sesame seed possesses its own oil.

The reason why the basis is beyond one or many is that the basis is a generic set of attributes, just as heat, the generic attribute of fire, is beyond one or many. Since generic characteristics are unreal, they cannot be quantified as being "one" or "many." Why are they unreal? Because they are abstractions.
every sentient beings possesses their own buddhanature just as every sesame seed possesses its own oil.

Jules 09 said:
You seem to be saying that you think you possess your own buddhanature. Is this the case?

krodha wrote:
Yes, a conventional individual possess their own individual tathāgatagarbha. In Dzogchen teachings for example, that sugatagarbha even has a physical location in the

body.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 5th, 2022 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
stong gzugs said:
No lineage that I'm aware of thinks of vidyā/rigpa as collective. The question here is about the basis.

krodha wrote:
The “basis” is just the essence, nature and compassion of one’s vidyā.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 4th, 2022 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Jules 09 said:
He appears be dividing and differentiating his unceasing flow of spontaneous presence into "Equipoise" and "post equipoise".

krodha wrote:
This indicates you really don’t understand how the path of Dzogchen works.

Jules 09 said:
That and citing the same forum post from JLA about the importance of conceptual understanding in Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
It is beneficial for people, and is applicable to everyone. It is also good for those such as yourself who mistakenly think they possess some sort of “unceasing flow of spontaneous presence” and clearly insert the result into the basis like some nihilist.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 4th, 2022 at 6:25 AM
Title: Re: Jean-Luc Achard on the Role and Importance of Study and Conceptual Understanding in one’s Relationship with Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is never enough reading. All the main masters of the past and recent times that one venerates from Longchenpa to Jigme Lingpa, from Dru Gyelwa to Kundrol Rinpoche, from Khyentse Wangpo to Shardza, from Khenpo Gangshar to Sakya Tridzin, from HH the Dalai Lama to Yongdzin Rinpoche (too many names to list), all of them have spent a gazillion sessions of their practice in formal study. I don't think this has caused them

any obscurations. I don't buy a single minute the legends of brainless yogis reaching Rainbow Body as a paradigm to follow for westerners without a proper buddhist/bon complete education. The Dharma is one of the three Jewels, it does not cause obscurations. I would add to this that ignorance comes from not recognizing one's state but it is maintained, developed and intensified by the absence of study. It is only among lay people in the West that there is this fancy that one will reach anywhere on the path of Dharma while despising texts and teachings.

There are other forums where people are proud of their ignorance. I am not. I am ashamed of it when I compare it to the knowledge of my masters. I try every single day to spend my time 50/50 in between practice and study. Study never let me down. I can tell you, for having met people who reject study in the past 35 years, that not a single of them has a clue about what Rigpa is. You can spend a gazillion years on your cushion, if the correct understanding is not there, you simply waste your time. You never waste your time reading the teachings the masters so kindly composed for the past 2,000 years. So reading texts after texts is a correct way to chase ignorance away. I don't think anybody here claims to be a great vidyadhara. However, I have met countless people with a dramatically superficial "knowledge" of the teachings who claim to be advanced on the path and who actually ignore the stages of that path. Lopon [Tenzin Namdak] said this once:

"I prefer someone who has clearly understood the state of Dzogchen, even intellectually, as opposed to a brainless yogi able to stand upside-down on the tip of a grass with one single finger. I know which of the two can have a chance at recognizing the state in the Bardo."

Throwing the books [marginalizing study] is throwing one of the 3 Jewels in the river. This is a totally nihilistic approach which has nothing whatsoever to do with Dzogchen. When Shakyamuni was there, we were in a period associated with his Body (i.e. the Buddha was there physically), then he passed away and we were still more or less in a period associated with his Body through those who had met him personally and received his teachings. Then when these died, we entered a period associated with his Speech only, because that was all was left of him: his teachings transmitted as best as masters could do at the time. Then when things started to be written down, we entered a period associated with his Mind, i.e. a period where all that was left of him was what he had taught according to his realization and this was now in written form for us. We should consider ourselves as lucky to even have access to that because these are teachings of an enlightened being, not an ordinary one, not nihilism. And Shakyamuni’s basic message beside the 4 Noble Truths is: stay away from the two extremes, nihilism and eternalism. Enter the middle Path. Dzogchen is in perfect accord with this view.

Again, nobody said that what we read IS rigpa. This is stupid to even think of it. However, words are pointers, they are indicators of a deeper meaning and they have symbolic semantic fields which help understand a key-idea of Dzogchen in the proper terms of Dzogchen. And again, we were not, at least I was not, discussing how to enter Rigpa but what Rigpa is. Contrary to what you think, Rigpa can be enunciated in words. This is what all the Tantras of Dzogchen do. It is not because the state is beyond words and

speech that speech and words cannot convey a deeper meaning at a subtler level than they are outwardly. Denying this is denying the function of the Sambhogakaya in us.

To make things clear for the forum — this may be my mistake because I haven't been very active on it in the past months: we believe in study and practice. We don't welcome opinions negating the value of study to promote a so-called practice which may be flawed because of a lack of understanding (resulting from an absence of study). This is in particular true with the dramatic proliferations that are affecting so many Nyingma students in the West about Rigpa. Understanding Rigpa is simpler than they think but these people are fantasizing about a magical state, etc. Rigpa is knowledge. It is not difficult to experience it.

This is important because, when one says Rigpa is beyond consciousness and thoughts, some people identify it with non-discursiveness. This is wrong: Rigpa can be with or without thoughts. But when it is with thoughts, these are only altruistic ones that one uses for the "activities of the wise" (mkhas pa'i bya ba), namely explanations, debates and compositions. Now, to enter these activities and take part in the Dharma, one needs the selfless knoweldge of the Buddha which is acquired through studies, otherwise one risks to spread one's own deluded "dharma" which will certainly be a cause to lower rebirths. This is where canonicity enters the game: it is very important if one intends to teach that the teachings are within the confines of canonicity. There have for instance been heterodox Dzogchen systems in the past in Tibet, propounded by unrealized masters such as the Dzogchen De'uma system. I think this is one of the main reasons so few westerners are actually authorized to teach from texts, but are rather authorized to discourse a little on Dzogchen, as introductory lectures.

Traditionally, Lamas would train you in both study and practice because they both enrich each other. Studies help you understand the subtleties of your mind, and practice helps you understand what’s written in texts by enlightened masters, an understanding which in turn helps you realizing what “occurs” or not in your contemplation, and so on endlessly.

If I have something personal to say here it would be to repeat (it has become my personal opinion since years, so i share this one as a treasure for me) what Lopon [Tenzin Namdak] Rinpoche told me:

Study and practice. Practice and Study. You studies will clear out what you experience in practice. Your experience in practice will make you understand the teachings of the Buddhas that you read. Then what you read will totally clarify what you meditate on."
It's the Wheel of Wisdom. All is there.

climb-up said:
Wonderful!
Is that a quote from something or was that written specifically to be posted here?

krodha wrote:
It is a synthesis of a few posts of Jean-Luc’s on this topic from his own forum, dating

back 6 or 7 years ago. I think he was periodically encountering a theme of anti-intellectualism and felt it was necessary to make some clarifications.

climb-up said:
What is the heterodox “Dzogchen de’uma” system? Obviously I’m not interested in learning a deviation of the teachings, but has it’s history been written about in English?

krodha wrote:
I’m not sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 4th, 2022 at 4:53 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Jules 09 said:
The citation from DJKR was made in the discussion I was having with Kyle. Going by some of the things that he has said in this thread, it may be relevant to where he is at.

krodha wrote:
I didn’t realize the intention of your citation was to address somewhere “I’m at.” Everything I’ve said in this thread is applicable to everyone here. Unless you are a Buddha you are not beyond this subject matter. Even āryas on the bhūmis are subject to it.

Nurture and guard your vidyā, don’t overvalue “where you’re at.”

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:
Idk, I can see it mattering. Particularly if a Dzogchen or Vajrayana practitioner decides that they can just bliss out because their mind stream is somehow joined to the Big Dharmakaya. It’s mistaken category, as mentioned before like believing we all share the same fireplace because all our fires are hot.

Additionally, universally (sutra, Tantra, Dzogchen, whatever) the path begins with deep, naked examination of the relative state, points of view which implicitly direct people away from that process in favor of the above could certainly be deviations. ChNN talked often about understanding the real condition of the individual, there’s layers to that, but I can see this mattering.

This kind of belief often goes hand in hand with the standard cop out “it’s all emptiness dude” and has to do with perception of individual agency, so I am not sure it is so unimportant .

krodha wrote:
Agreed, seems important, especially if the tantras state it multiple times.

Some other examples just for the thread:

The Self-Arisen Vidyā:

The transcendent state of perfect buddhas exists in the forms of kāyas and pristine consciousness [ye shes] in the personal continuums of all sentient beings.
And from the sgra thal ‘gyur commentary:

In Ati, the pristine consciousness [ye shes]—subsumed by the consciousness which apprehends primordial liberation and the abiding basis as ultimate—is inseparable in all buddhas and sentient beings as a mere consciousness. Since the ultimate pervades them without any nature at all, it is contained within each individual consciousness.

Natan said:
At least I won't mock you and say you don't understand this subtle point that only the few can get.

krodha wrote:
That is fair, I apologize for going off a little earlier. Four years ago left a bad taste in my mouth, but I don’t want bad blood between us.

Natan said:
But this is talking about how it is prior to any realization of the path. It's true for all of Mahayana and Vajrayana. There's nothing unique to Dzogchen in this.

krodha wrote:
It can be both, that is the beauty of nominal conventions.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 7:41 AM
Title: Jean-Luc Achard on the Role and Importance of Study and Conceptual Understanding in one’s Relationship with Dzogchen
Content:
Unknown said:
There is never enough reading. All the main masters of the past and recent times that one venerates from Longchenpa to Jigme Lingpa, from Dru Gyelwa to Kundrol Rinpoche, from Khyentse Wangpo to Shardza, from Khenpo Gangshar to Sakya Tridzin, from HH the Dalai Lama to Yongdzin Rinpoche (too many names to list), all of them have spent a gazillion sessions of their practice in formal study. I don't think this has caused them

any obscurations. I don't buy a single minute the legends of brainless yogis reaching Rainbow Body as a paradigm to follow for westerners without a proper buddhist/bon complete education. The Dharma is one of the three Jewels, it does not cause obscurations. I would add to this that ignorance comes from not recognizing one's state but it is maintained, developed and intensified by the absence of study. It is only among lay people in the West that there is this fancy that one will reach anywhere on the path of Dharma while despising texts and teachings.

There are other forums where people are proud of their ignorance. I am not. I am ashamed of it when I compare it to the knowledge of my masters. I try every single day to spend my time 50/50 in between practice and study. Study never let me down. I can tell you, for having met people who reject study in the past 35 years, that not a single of them has a clue about what Rigpa is. You can spend a gazillion years on your cushion, if the correct understanding is not there, you simply waste your time. You never waste your time reading the teachings the masters so kindly composed for the past 2,000 years. So reading texts after texts is a correct way to chase ignorance away. I don't think anybody here claims to be a great vidyadhara. However, I have met countless people with a dramatically superficial "knowledge" of the teachings who claim to be advanced on the path and who actually ignore the stages of that path. Lopon [Tenzin Namdak] said this once:

"I prefer someone who has clearly understood the state of Dzogchen, even intellectually, as opposed to a brainless yogi able to stand upside-down on the tip of a grass with one single finger. I know which of the two can have a chance at recognizing the state in the Bardo."

Throwing the books [marginalizing study] is throwing one of the 3 Jewels in the river. This is a totally nihilistic approach which has nothing whatsoever to do with Dzogchen. When Shakyamuni was there, we were in a period associated with his Body (i.e. the Buddha was there physically), then he passed away and we were still more or less in a period associated with his Body through those who had met him personally and received his teachings. Then when these died, we entered a period associated with his Speech only, because that was all was left of him: his teachings transmitted as best as masters could do at the time. Then when things started to be written down, we entered a period associated with his Mind, i.e. a period where all that was left of him was what he had taught according to his realization and this was now in written form for us. We should consider ourselves as lucky to even have access to that because these are teachings of an enlightened being, not an ordinary one, not nihilism. And Shakyamuni’s basic message beside the 4 Noble Truths is: stay away from the two extremes, nihilism and eternalism. Enter the middle Path. Dzogchen is in perfect accord with this view.

Again, nobody said that what we read IS rigpa. This is stupid to even think of it. However, words are pointers, they are indicators of a deeper meaning and they have symbolic semantic fields which help understand a key-idea of Dzogchen in the proper terms of Dzogchen. And again, we were not, at least I was not, discussing how to enter Rigpa but what Rigpa is. Contrary to what you think, Rigpa can be enunciated in words. This is what all the Tantras of Dzogchen do. It is not because the state is beyond words and

speech that speech and words cannot convey a deeper meaning at a subtler level than they are outwardly. Denying this is denying the function of the Sambhogakaya in us.

To make things clear for the forum — this may be my mistake because I haven't been very active on it in the past months: we believe in study and practice. We don't welcome opinions negating the value of study to promote a so-called practice which may be flawed because of a lack of understanding (resulting from an absence of study). This is in particular true with the dramatic proliferations that are affecting so many Nyingma students in the West about Rigpa. Understanding Rigpa is simpler than they think but these people are fantasizing about a magical state, etc. Rigpa is knowledge. It is not difficult to experience it.

This is important because, when one says Rigpa is beyond consciousness and thoughts, some people identify it with non-discursiveness. This is wrong: Rigpa can be with or without thoughts. But when it is with thoughts, these are only altruistic ones that one uses for the "activities of the wise" (mkhas pa'i bya ba), namely explanations, debates and compositions. Now, to enter these activities and take part in the Dharma, one needs the selfless knoweldge of the Buddha which is acquired through studies, otherwise one risks to spread one's own deluded "dharma" which will certainly be a cause to lower rebirths. This is where canonicity enters the game: it is very important if one intends to teach that the teachings are within the confines of canonicity. There have for instance been heterodox Dzogchen systems in the past in Tibet, propounded by unrealized masters such as the Dzogchen De'uma system. I think this is one of the main reasons so few westerners are actually authorized to teach from texts, but are rather authorized to discourse a little on Dzogchen, as introductory lectures.

Traditionally, Lamas would train you in both study and practice because they both enrich each other. Studies help you understand the subtleties of your mind, and practice helps you understand what’s written in texts by enlightened masters, an understanding which in turn helps you realizing what “occurs” or not in your contemplation, and so on endlessly.

If I have something personal to say here it would be to repeat (it has become my personal opinion since years, so i share this one as a treasure for me) what Lopon [Tenzin Namdak] Rinpoche told me:

Study and practice. Practice and Study. You studies will clear out what you experience in practice. Your experience in practice will make you understand the teachings of the Buddhas that you read. Then what you read will totally clarify what you meditate on." It's the Wheel of Wisdom. All is there.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 6:39 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Jules 09 said:
It could also be said that the result is impossible whilst that referent still remains.

krodha wrote:
There is an aspect of cognition, the svasaṃvitti, if that is mistaken as a passive background, subjective “knower” of objective “known” objects then it manifests as dualistic consciousness, vijñāna.

Buddhas have conquered this misconception of that svasaṃvitti being an independent subject. And their cognition then expresses itself as nondual jñāna free of that subjective substrate that a self is imputed onto.

But again we as Buddhists accomplish this without an overarching, monolithic and established ultimate nature like tirthika systems. And in addition, we do not negate the conventional continuum of mind that vijñāna and jñāna are modalities of. There’s no need to negate conventions because they are only nominal in nature, they aren’t real.

Jules 09 said:
There’s no need to negate conventions because they are only nominal in nature, they aren’t real.
The result is for an individual mind,
Yes, as Tsele Natsok Rangdrol said in The Heart of the Matter:

" The moment you recognize the falsity of
delusion is called the view."

(Heart Lamp, p.108.)

krodha wrote:
Indeed. It is all false. Delusion is the influencing factor that causes phenomena, including the self, to seem concrete and substantial. Complete knowledge of the false nature of dharmas is dharmakāya, which is inversely, simply the total elimination of delusion.

The Saddharmapundarika Sūtra states:

If no phenomena are perceived at all,
that is the great wisdom that perceives
the whole dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
Sure. That's what the dhyanas aka jhanas are, incomplete realizations. But if Vimalamitra wanted to say you must understand the result is an individual consciousness in contrast to the way it is described in the Guhyagarbha Tantra chapter 1 he most certainly would have. Also the goal is nothing to do with individual consciousness. It's beyond one and many and so forth.

Malcolm said:
The result is for an individual mind, because not everyone attains buddhahood at the same time.
The result is for an individual mind,

Jules 09 said:
It could also be said that the result is impossible whilst that referent still remains.

krodha wrote:
There is an aspect of cognition, the svasaṃvitti, if that is mistaken as a passive background, subjective “knower” of objective “known” objects then it manifests as dualistic consciousness, vijñāna. That reference point becomes an active characteristic of cognition due to the influence of afflictive causal factors such as ignorance and grasping, but in sentient beings it is the prevailing modality of cognition and is the basis for selfhood and samsara in general.

Buddhas have conquered this misconception of that svasaṃvitti being an independent subject. And their cognition then expresses itself as nondual jñāna free of that subjective substrate that a self is imputed onto.

But again we as Buddhists accomplish this without an overarching, monolithic and established ultimate nature like tirthika systems. And in addition, we do not negate the conventional continuum of mind that vijñāna and jñāna are modalities of. There’s no need to negate conventions because they are only nominal in nature, they aren’t real.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 4:30 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
He could have said individual consciousness. Anyway, you think so, then it's ok. I don't think it matters really what one believes about this going into it. All these ideas don't

really make a difference in the end if one is practicing the method.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Idk, I can see it mattering. Particularly if a Dzogchen or Vajrayana practitioner decides that they can just bliss out because their mind stream is somehow joined to the Big Dharmakaya. It's mistaken category, as mentioned before like believing we all share the same fireplace because all our fires are hot.

Additionally, universally (sutra, Tantra, Dzogchen, whatever) the path begins with deep, naked examination of the relative state, points of view which implicitly direct people away from that process in favor of the above could certainly be deviations. ChNN talked often about understanding the real condition of the individual, there's layers to that, but I can see this mattering.

This kind of belief often goes hand in hand with the standard cop out "it's all emptiness dude" and has to do with perception of individual agency, so I am not sure it is so unimportant .

Natan said:
It.dont think the passages are about avoiding deviations. It seems more about explaining the body mind situation that makes it work. Why one would need think this is my individual mind or not my individual mind to work the system doesn't make sense, because in tregcho and togal one is not thinking. One is just looking.

krodha wrote:
There are relative nyams and relative nondual states that can seem very profound. Oceanic, cosmic consciousness where all appearances seem like the universe as a single entity undulating and expressing itself, to itself, in a state of total oneness. That is a legitimate state. But not the goal in these teachings, and if one does not know any better they can mistake that for jñāna. Errors like that happen.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 4:19 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Malcolm said:
If course it supports the point...an individual consciousness.

Natan said:
He could have said individual consciousness. Anyway, you think so, then it's ok. I don't think it matters really what one believes about this going into it. All these ideas don't really make a difference in the end if one is practicing the method.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Idk, I can see it mattering. Particularly if a Dzogchen or Vajrayana practitioner decides that they can just bliss out because their mind stream is somehow joined to the Big Dharmakaya. It's mistaken category, as mentioned before like believing we all share the same fireplace because all our fires are hot.

Additionally, universally (sutra, Tantra, Dzogchen, whatever) the path begins with deep, naked examination of the relative state, points of view which implicitly direct people away from that process in favor of the above could certainly be deviations. ChNN talked often about understanding the real condition of the individual, there's layers to that, but I can see this mattering.

This kind of belief often goes hand in hand with the standard cop out "it's all emptiness dude" and has to do with perception of individual agency, so I am not sure it is so unimportant .

krodha wrote:
Agreed, seems important, especially if the tantras state it multiple times.

Some other examples just for the thread:

The Self-Arisen Vidyā:

The transcendent state of perfect buddhas exists in the forms of kāyas and pristine consciousness [ye shes] in the personal continuums of all sentient beings.
And from the sgra thal 'gyur commentary:

In Ati, the pristine consciousness [ye shes]—subsumed by the consciousness which apprehends primordial liberation and the abiding basis as ultimate—is inseparable in all buddhas and sentient beings as a mere consciousness. Since the ultimate pervades them without any nature at all, it is contained within each individual consciousness.
I think people object to this because they do not really understand how ultimate truth and the unconditioned in general are species of absences in buddhadharma. In this case, the absence of an essential nature in the alleged conventional entity called "mind."

If people understood how convention worked in this sense they would see how this ends up being far more profound than merely opting for some Brahman like ultimate. It actually goes further than these tirthika systems do. Brahman or some sort of ultimate nature like that ends up being a half measure.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: Will I gain Buddhist merit as a Hindu?
Content:

krodha wrote:
The Theravada scholar Thanissaro Bikkhu is most responsible for misusing this sutta with Vacchagotta. He makes the same conclusion you do. Bikkhu Bodhi and Bhante Sujato object to Thanissaro's interpretation.

Bhante Sujato says this idea that the Buddha refused to answer is false and that Thanissaro's assertion to that end is flawed or incomplete. Sujato cites Bikkhu Bodhi for clarification, and explains that the silence in that one particular instance was to keep Vacchagotta from adopting a view of annihilationism where a self currently exists and then ceases to exist. The Buddha's silence was not intended as some sort of endorsement for a neutral or indeterminate view with regard to the status of a self. The Buddha routinely states "sabbe dhamma anatta" all phenomena both conditioned and unconditioned are devoid of self. Incidentally, Thanissaro offers a butchered interpretation of "sabbe dhamma anatta" as well. You see many Theravadins and even some Mahāyānis confused by such misconceptions.

laic said:
Hello krodha,

Thanks. Maybe a relevant verse or two can be found in the Sutta Nipata.....

Seeing misery in views and opinions, without adopting any, I found inner peace and freedom. One who is free does not hold to views or dispute opinions. For a sage there is no higher, lower, nor equal, no places in which the mind can stick. But those who grasp after views and opinions only wander about the world annoying people.

Well, I'm no sage but I get the gist of it, even if I have annoyed a few people in my time.

All the best.

krodha wrote:
An absence of views for Buddhas is related to the realization of emptiness. If we, as mere sentient beings relinquish relative views, including right view in its various expressions, then we are in error.

Like using more water to flush out water trapped in an ear, we must use views skillfully on the path. Abandoning views and opinions without realizing the definitive meaning of "an absence of views" is really a fool's errand.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 3:08 AM
Title: Re: Will I gain Buddhist merit as a Hindu?
Content:

Malcolm said:
This is an error... Etc etc

Since there is no person designated on anything other than the five aggregates, the Buddha definitely taught that there is no self.

laic said:
Then we disagree, which is fine.

This all relates to the Buddha's dealings with Vacchagotta, as recorded the Theravada texts:-

Note that Buddha neither said “there is a self” or “there is not a self.” But among many Buddhists there appears to be a kind of dogmatism that says “there is not a self” instead of taking the true middle. Also Buddha replied by silence because he considered the condition of the questioner and the effect of a dogmatic reply on him. Buddha did not say “there is no self” to prevent the bewilderment of Vacchagotta. “For he would have said: ‘Formerly indeed I had a self but now I have not one any more.’”

It was Buddha’s aim not to give a “final” speculative answer but to be free from all theories and to know, by experience, “the nature of form and how form arises and how form perishes.” He wanted “not a third position lying between two extremes but a no-position that supersedes them both.” This is the Middle Way.

(The musings of Thomas Merton while mid-pacific on his way to Asia, reading Murti's book "The Central.Philosophy of Buddhism)

All the best

krodha wrote:
The Theravada scholar Thanissaro Bikkhu is most responsible for misusing this sutta with Vacchagotta. He makes the same conclusion you do. Bikkhu Bodhi and Bhante Sujato object to Thanissaro’s interpretation.

Bhante Sujato says this idea that the Buddha refused to answer is false and that Thanissaro’s assertion to that end is flawed or incomplete. Sujato cites Bikkhu Bodhi for clarification, and explains that the silence in that one particular instance was to keep Vacchagotta from adopting a view of annihilationism where a self currently exists and then ceases to exist. The Buddha’s silence was not intended as some sort of endorsement for a neutral or indeterminate view with regard to the status of a self. The Buddha routinely states “sabbe dhamma anatta” all phenomena both conditioned and unconditioned are devoid of self. Incidentally, Thanissaro offers a butchered interpretation of “sabbe dhamma anatta” as well. You see many Theravadins and even some Mahāyānis confused by such misconceptions.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 3rd, 2022 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
But here Norbu Rinpoche has his to say... (A FB buddy sent me this, thanks buddy... I won't say his name bc I didn't ask)

https://archive.org/details/the_supreme_source/page/n147

Hard to copy from this format, but paraphrasing the Q&A whether there can be infinite Samantabhadras if there are infinite sentient beings, Rinpoche answers this is a misleading question because it posits an impossible limitation on Samantabhadra which is beyond "individual being."

krodha wrote:
Again, guru Natan, we are able to accomplish going beyond "individual being" without falling headlong into some sort of brahman type view. This is a subtle point, not understood well by many so I don't fault you.

Natan said:
Kyle, your definition of this dry dharmakaya is not how it is taught as essence, nature and compassion in Dzogchen. Dharmakaya is complete with qualities, wisdoms and activities of body, speech and mind. That is just Dzogchen 101. That sort of sutra level analysis is useful for orientation into Buddhist phenomenalogy, but a yogi on the path of tantras gets a few lessons on lists of views and then is introduced to three primordial wisdoms directly.

krodha wrote:
I never said it wasn't. Spare me the straw man argument guru Natan.

Natan said:
Dharmakaya is definitely not just a generic quality in Vajrayana.

krodha wrote:
The two aren't mutually exclusive.

Natan said:
The samaya would also be broken by conceptualizing any views, Buddhist ones, too.

krodha wrote:
This is simply false.

Natan said:
That's what Tilopa said to Naropa. "The conceptual keeping of Samaya violates the ultimate Samaya." And "Proponents of the secret mantra and the pāramitā vehicles, the vinaya, and the other scriptural authorities will not reveal the luminosity of mahāmudrā by expounding on their texts and philosophical traditions"

krodha wrote:
Yet we see prolific scholars in all these traditions who were accomplished yogis and buddhas. These two are not mutually exclusive either.

Natan said:
You say you understand something, but what? Did some lama say you understand something?

krodha wrote:
We can't all be like you, Nate, and have a high lama tell us we are a full fledged Buddha.

Natan said:
Or did you appoint that to yourself? Brahman is just a word that means many different things to different people, some of those definitions are very very close to Buddhanature as described in tantras.

krodha wrote:
In certain contexts, not in others.

Natan said:
This is sharply distinguished in sutra, but not in tantra. It's not easy to receive complete instructions in Vajrayana so I don't fault you.

krodha wrote:
I do not lack complete instructions and empowerments in Vajrayana, but I appreciate your concern.

Natan said:
I know what no grasping means.

krodha wrote:
Do you?

Natan said:
But what you are doing is not nongrasping. It's another attachment to your view.

krodha wrote:
More context conflation. Equipoise and post-equipoise are two different things. It has never been said at any time, anywhere, that a practitioner cannot read, study, debate or discuss views as post-equipoise activities, and it does not detract from the individual's path one iota. Of course, you who has attained the dgongs pa beyond equipoise and

post-equipoise, I mean, obviously none of that applies to you, and we all bow to you tathagata, shower us all with your compassionate blessings.

Natan said:
There's no mystery to it if that's what you're referring to. I wouldn't want to create a straw man based on your own word choices.. Dharma is actually really easy to understand.

krodha wrote:
Oh yeah, really easy. Its almost like being a totally awakened buddha is exactly like being a normal afflicted sentient being, its just so simple.

Natan said:
It just gets complicated by pseudo intellectuals. It's good to follow lamas btw. You should try it.

krodha wrote:
I do, buddy. But again, appreciate the concern.

Natan said:
Reading on the internet only gets you so far.

krodha wrote:
The "you're just an intellectual" tactic.

Natan said:
The accomplished scholars typically have to put the books away for their years in retreat. And practicing in earnest clarifies everything by itself. That's what Tilopa said you become a torch of the teaching.

krodha wrote:
Guru Nate, the torch.

Natan said:
The methods are mutually exclusive. You cannot contemplate the nonconceptual while conceptualizing constantly. That's why Tilopa instructs to give up all activities and rest the mind. If one were serious about scholarship one would probably want to go to school for it.

krodha wrote:
The methods are not mutually exclusive, at all. Equipoise, non-conceptual. Post-equipoise, a certain degree of conceptuality accords perfectly with sharpening the prajna of reflection and again, many accomplished yogis and key luminaries spent (and still spend) a great deal of time reading, studying and so on. This warped idea that practitioners need to fixate on the non-conceptual at all times is a totally false western trope.

Now, is the view of Vajrayana and Dzogchen non-conceptual? Of course. Is realization

non-conceptual? Of course. No on is claiming otherwise. But spare me this first year zen student nonsense.

Natan said:
The fact is our traditions do have a lot in common. Much more in common than differences.

krodha wrote:
Our tradition(s)?

Natan said:
And you can slide your underhanded snipe at me for using Guru Natan, but it wasn't something I wanted to do. I have sponsors who are pushing me out to teach, because they benefitted from the methods (which are 100% lineage word for word) and they want me to put myself out there so others may benefit.

krodha wrote:
I don't have to be underhanded. You aren't a buddha. And you did not realize the fourth vision.

Natan said:
At that time you didn't even have a lama and maybe saw ChNN once.

krodha wrote:
Norbu Rinpoche was my lama for ten years. I did meet him once. I didn't need to meet him any more than that. He was very generous and gave remote teachings regularly and I received everything I needed to receive from him.

Natan said:
You remember when I gave you all my dharma gear and took off from the country? That was over 4 years ago now.

krodha wrote:
Yes, I remember when you gave me much of your stuff, and then tried to have me pawn some of it for you. And then you asked me to mail some of it back to you, I gladly obliged. And then you asked me for money when I had none, and when I couldn't produce that for you, when you couldn't use me for something, you said we were no longer friends and we haven't spoken since.

I do hope you are doing better than you were back then, I truly do not have any ill feelings towards you apart from a distaste for how that period of time played out.

Natan said:
I've been in strict isolation in practice in foreign countries for much of that time. Why? Because that's what sutras and tantras say to do. Now I'm in semi isolation. I put my money where my mouth is, Kyle.

krodha wrote:
Your mouth does write a lot of checks.

Natan said:
Right livelihood is pretty important for a would be scholar of dharma, something someone in your line of work might want to think about.

krodha wrote:
I have zero interest in being a scholar of the dharma. And have moved on to other livelihoods. Not that you would know, good friend.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2022 at 11:15 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Sharp said:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche is not saying there is multiple Dharmakayas.

Rinpoche is saying that the clarity of a given mind, the Samboghakaya, is individual, like the Sun; however, the Dharmakaya is universal and common to all beings, like the sky. Many suns, one sky.

Rinpoche uses and elaborates on the same metaphor in The Crystal and the Way of Light (note that the sky/essence has been explicitly equated with Dharmakaya earlier in the same chapter):

Elsewhere, Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche also unambiguously clarifies this point:

Hope this is helpful.

krodha wrote:
Whether one says dharmakāya is individual or not ultimately does not matter. Dharmakāya is a generic characteristic, the dharmatā of a mind. Mindstreams are distinct and individual in a conventional sense, and so each mind has a dharmatā. That dharmatā, which is the individual prakrti of that mind, is dharmakāya, which is the emptiness of that mind.

In the same way, the dharmatā of objects, meaning the emptiness of objects, does not need to be “individual,” but again, conventionally, each discrete conventional object

has a prakrti, a dharmatā, and that dharmatā is emptiness [śūnyatā].

Emptiness is the same in each discrete, conventional object, but emptiness also renders objects as unfindable. This is how emptiness is non-reductive in nature, it cancels itself out. Like Nāgārjuna says, since there is nothing that is not empty, what is there to be empty? The value of emptiness is the epistemic knowledge of it, that is the soteriological factor in this equation. Dharmakāya is an individual's totally unobstructed and complete knowledge of emptiness, the total realization of emptiness at the time of buddhahood.

Thus there are contexts at play here. Dharmakāya can be an individual's realization, yet that realization also is the elimination of the afflictive and cognitive obscurations which cause the ignorance which perceives discrete selves and objects to manifest. As such, individuality is also unfindable and unreal for an awakened person in equipoise. A Buddha knows objects, sentient beings, selves, all dualities are fallacies. Yet again, this is due to a collective absence of characteristics, not a Brahman type singular, ontological nature.

Moreover, Norbu Rinpoche was very consistent in clarifying that everything is not "one" but rather the same in principle or characteristic.

He states in the Song of the Vajra text:

There is a saying of Guru Padmasambhava: "All enlightened beings in that real state are of the same principle; in wisdom all enlightened beings are the same." This does not mean that all beings become one, but they are one in being of the same principle, the same knowledge, the same condition.

I don't know how much clearer this can be.

Further, you have teachers like Lopön Tenzin Namdak who literally state you are breaking your samaya by adopting the type of view that some are promulgating in this thread.

He states:

If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly.

He clarifies that it is the samaya of the basis called gcig pu, which is actually supposed to be unbreakable, which is violated by asserting that dharmakāya is "one" in the tirthika

manner adopted by some here.

In any case, some things to consider.

Natan said:
But here Norbu Rinpoche has his to say... (A FB buddy sent me this, thanks buddy... I won't say his name bc I didn't ask)

https://archive.org/details/the_supreme_source/page/n147

Hard to copy from this format, but paraphrasing the Q&A whether there can be infinite Samantabhadras if there are infinite sentient beings, Rinpoche answers this is a misleading question because it posits an impossible limitation on Samantabhadra which is beyond "individual being."

krodha wrote:
Again, guru Natan, we are able to accomplish going beyond "individual being" without falling headlong into some sort of brahman type view. This is a subtle point, not understood well by many so I don't fault you.

Natan said:
Kyle, your definition of this dry dharmakaya is not how it is taught as essence, nature and compassion in Dzogchen. Dharmakaya is complete with qualities, wisdoms and activities of body, speech and mind. That is just Dzogchen 101. That sort of sutra level analysis is useful for orientation into Buddhist phenomenalogy, but a yogi on the path of tantras gets a few lessons on lists of views and then is introduced to three primordial wisdoms directly.

krodha wrote:
I never said it wasn't. Spare me the straw man argument guru Natan.

Natan said:
Dharmakaya is definitely not just a generic quality in Vajrayana.

krodha wrote:
The two aren't mutually exclusive.

Natan said:
The samaya would also be broken by conceptualizing any views, Buddhist ones, too.

krodha wrote:
This is simply false.

Natan said:
That's what Tilopa said to Naropa. "The conceptual keeping of Samaya violates the ultimate Samaya." And "Proponents of the secret mantra and the pāramitā vehicles, the vinaya, and the other scriptural authorities will not reveal the luminosity of mahāmudrā

by expounding on their texts and philosophical traditions"

krodha wrote:
Yet we see prolific scholars in all these traditions who were accomplished yogis and buddhas. These two are not mutually exclusive either.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2022 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
krodha wrote:
Whether one says dharmakāya is individual or not ultimately does not matter. Dharmakāya is a generic characteristic...

Sharp said:
There are ten trees in a field. Where are the trees?

One answer is: "each tree possesses the generic characteristic of field-ness."

Another is: "in the field."

Tomatoes, to-mah-toes.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what you are talking about, and if I'm being honest, I don't think you know either.

Sharp said:
Further, you have teachers like Lopön Tenzin Namdak who literally state you are breaking your samaya by adopting the type of view that some are promulgating in this thread.

He states:

If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly.
It is worth clarifying that Lopon is talking about "Nature", the clarity aspect (gsal-cha), or awareness aspect (rig-cha), which is always particular in the sense of being individual (sems-nyid gcig-pu).

krodha wrote:
No, he is referring to people who hold wrong views like the one you are supporting. This section was quoted by Jean-Luc Achard to address someone making the same error you are, probably Jax or someone.

Sharp said:
Dharmakaya, though, refers to "Essence", the spacious aspect (dbyings-cha), or emptiness aspect (stong-cha), which is always universal in the sense of being all-encompassing (khyab bdal chen-po) and the dimension of all existence (bon-nyid bdings).

This is why Lopon describes the Dharmakaya as “one” which “pervades everywhere” in Bonpo Dzogchen Teachings:

Lopön Tenzin Namdak said:
"Just as there exists the boundless infinity of space that pervades everywhere and, at the same time, there is the space found inside an earthen jar, which takes thereby a specific and particular shape, so it is with the Dharmakaya and the individual sentient being. The one is permanent and the other is imperma-nent and conditioned, temporarily confined by the clay walls of the jar. When the jar is broken, they are only one space."

krodha wrote:
Again, this is just describing the nature of that realization once the absence of characteristics is known. It has nothing to do with some sort of non-buddhist brahman view.
He clarifies that it is the samaya of the basis called gcig pu, which is actually supposed to be unbreakable, which is violated by asserting that dharmakāya is “one” in the tirthika manner adopted by some here.

Sharp said:
Yes, very much agreed, all “Tirthika” views are explicitly refuted in Dzogchen. For example, Dvaita, which holds that each mind is distinct and separate.

krodha wrote:
Right, if you understood convention, then you'd understand how individuality works in this context. But, you probably don't, 99% of people who hold these erroneous views simply do not understand how convention works in buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2022 at 9:17 AM
Title: Re: Ghosts
Content:
Nicholas2727 said:
I know from Buddhist cosmology, hungry ghosts is certainly a realm and real, but the discussion came up at work today if we believe in ghosts. What is the Buddhist/your

view on this? For some background the conversation was about a house getting sold that was reportedly haunted and then we had some discussion on if we believe in ghosts and it got me curious.

krodha wrote:
Ghosts are called bhūtas or bhoots in India.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2022 at 6:59 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Kai lord said:
Actually the debate about one or multiple mindsteams is nothing new in Buddhism. There was a position called Vijñānādvaitavāda (non dual consciousness or mind) existed as a branch of Yogacara.

Ratnakirti, student of Jñanasrimitra (Gate-scholar of Vikramasila like Naropa), argued about since all of us can only inferred the existence of citta-santāna of others instead of direct perception, mindstreams of others can only be validated empirically in a relative sense.

krodha wrote:
This is true for most Mahāyāna systems. Still, we acknowledge and honor the conventional status of other mindstreams, just as we accept trees, rocks and anything else in a conventional sense.

Kai lord said:
So its a form of relative truth and in the ultimate sense, there can only be ekacitta (one single mindstream).

krodha wrote:
This conclusion is a generous leap, and is ultimately unnecessary even in the face of ultimately negating other mindstreams.

Kai lord said:
He went on in his work, Santānāntaradūṣaṇa, to establish the impossibility for the existence of other external mindstreams and removing boundaries between minds from the perspective of ultimate truth.

krodha wrote:
Again, most Mahāyāna systems conclude this, but that negation doesn’t usually translate to some sort of single mindstream.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 1st, 2022 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Anders said:
Am I reading this correctly or misunderstanding what is meant by basis - is Namkhai Norbu saying that the Dharmakaya is individual to each sentient being? That there is a multiplicity of dharmakayas?

Sharp said:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche is not saying there is multiple Dharmakayas.

Rinpoche is saying that the clarity of a given mind, the Samboghakaya, is individual, like the Sun; however, the Dharmakaya is universal and common to all beings, like the sky. Many suns, one sky.

Rinpoche uses and elaborates on the same metaphor in The Crystal and the Way of Light (note that the sky/essence has been explicitly equated with Dharmakaya earlier in the same chapter):
The sky is not a definable place, has no shape or colour, and no-one can say where it starts or finishes. It is something universal, as is the primordial state of the individual, the void. The base, at the level of the individual, is like the space inside a clay vase, which, even though it is temporarily limited by the shape of the vase, is not different from the space outside. The void condition, which is like empty space, is called essence, and it is beyond all concepts. But in it there is a continuous clarity that manifests in the individual's thoughts and the various aspects of energy; this clarity is the state of presence, which is like a sun arising in the sky.

The light of the sun is the manifestation of the clarity of the sky; and the sky is the basic condition necessary for the manifestation of the sun's light. So, too, in the sky two, three, four, or any number of suns could arise; but the sky always remains indivisibly one sky. Similarly, every individual's state of presence is unique and distinct, but the void nature of the individual is universal, and common to all beings.
Elsewhere, Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche also unambiguously clarifies this point:
Dharmakaya is all-pervasive and totally infinite, beyond any confines or limitations. This is so for the dharmakaya of all buddhas. There is no individual dharmakaya for each buddha, as there is no individual space for each country. You cannot say there is more than one space, can you? It is all-pervasive and wide open. It's the same with the dharmakaya level of all buddhas.
Hope this is helpful.

krodha wrote:
Whether one says dharmakāya is individual or not ultimately does not matter. Dharmakāya is a generic characteristic, the dharmatā of a mind. Mindstreams are distinct and individual in a conventional sense, and so each mind has a dharmatā. That dharmatā, which is the individual prakrti of that mind, is dharmakāya, which is the emptiness of that mind.

In the same way, the dharmatā of objects, meaning the emptiness of objects, does not

need to be “individual,” but again, conventionally, each discrete conventional object has a prakrti, a dharmatā, and that dharmatā is emptiness [śūnyatā].

Emptiness is the same in each discrete, conventional object, but emptiness also renders objects as unfindable. This is how emptiness is non-reductive in nature, it cancels itself out. Like Nāgārjuna says, since there is nothing that is not empty, what is there to be empty? The value of emptiness is the epistemic knowledge of it, that is the soteriological factor in this equation. Dharmakāya is an individual’s totally unobstructed and complete knowledge of emptiness, the total realization of emptiness at the time of buddhahood.

Thus there are contexts at play here. Dharmakāya can be an individual’s realization, yet that realization also is the elimination of the afflictive and cognitive obscurations which cause the ignorance which perceives discrete selves and objects to manifest. As such, individuality is also unfindable and unreal for an awakened person in equipoise. A Buddha knows objects, sentient beings, selves, all dualities are fallacies. Yet again, this is due to a collective absence of characteristics, not a Brahman type singular, ontological nature.

Moreover, Norbu Rinpoche was very consistent in clarifying that everything is not “one” but rather the same in principle or characteristic.

He states in the Song of the Vajra text:

There is a saying of Guru Padmasambhava: “All enlightened beings in that real state are of the same principle; in wisdom all enlightened beings are the same.” This does not mean that all beings become one, but they are one in being of the same principle, the same knowledge, the same condition.

I don’t know how much clearer this can be.

Further, you have teachers like Lopön Tenzin Namdak who literally state you are breaking your samaya by adopting the type of view that some are promulgating in this thread.

He states:

If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly.

He clarifies that it is the samaya of the basis called gcig pu, which is actually supposed

to be unbreakable, which is violated by asserting that dharmakāya is “one” in the tirthika manner adopted by some here.

In any case, some things to consider.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 31st, 2022 at 11:06 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Anders said:
Am I reading this correctly or misunderstanding what is meant by basis - is Namkhai Norbu saying that the Dharmakaya is individual to each sentient being? That there is a multiplicity of dharmakayas?

Aryjna said:
Basis is not equivalent to dharmakaya. There are some useful diagrams in some of ChNNR's books, e.g. in the "Crystal".

Ayu said:
What about Nagarjuna's saying "Not one, not many."?
Can't we assume that any single claim without context is bound to sound wrong?

krodha wrote:
“Not one, not many” is describing a generic characteristic, like wetness or heat. Not one, because there are countless discrete instances of wetness and heat. Not many, because the characteristic of wetness and heat are uniform wherever you encounter them.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 31st, 2022 at 10:46 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

Natan said:
That's why I asked him the question about Brahman so he could refute it. But he affirmed it.

Here's chapter one paragraph one of root tantra of Guhyagarbha

This is the translation approved by Khenpo Namdrol.

Here's the Scotsman Gyurme Dorje's translation of same:

Honestly that should settle the argument.

Holy mother Nyingma has a root tantra? I wonder if that means we should study it… Duhhhhhh

krodha wrote:
These excerpts are referencing an absence of characteristics in the ultimate.

For instance, the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā:

The descriptions from the element of self [atmadhātu] up to the element of all phenomena [sarvadharmadhātu] are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated.

This is just describing the realization of emptiness. Through realizing emptiness, the absence of characteristics is directly known due to the absence of a would-be inherent nature or “svabhāva” i.e., a core entity, to possesses said characteristics. At that time, because entities are realized to be non-arisen, the basis of imputation which was previously mistaken to be an object endowed with specific characteristics is recognized to be a misconception. In that awakened equipoise there are no distinct entities and everything is undifferentiated in the sense that everything lacks an essence in the exact same way. But this does not mean everything is one, single Brahman-like thing.

Natan said:
Not individualized already covers that, but there are descriptions of Brahman which reflect this same definition like posed here by Guhyagarbha. Like permanence, nondifferentiation, absence of characteristics, etc.

krodha wrote:
Yes, superficial similarities that can be confusing for people who don’t know any better.

Natan said:
Also shastras of the sutra class do not really apply to tantras. One uses shastras of the tantra class or Upadesha, because sutra has no idea about the means of liberation in tantra.

krodha wrote:
Yet many, many series of tantras will cite sūtra for clarification very routinely. This does not mean the methods of sūtra and tantra are being conflated.

Natan said:
For example and indestructible Bindu of subtle clear light has no correlate there.

krodha wrote:
It does in the tathāgatagarbha sūtras in a vague way.

Natan said:
And tantras explicitly say their goal is immortality. The clearest description of how the clear light appearances are Buddha's appearances comes from the Kalachakra tantra and commentaries where nonnamteriality is the key distinction, such that the nonmaterial clear light appearances are already not existing or nonexisting.

krodha wrote:
It is the same meaning as in sūtra if you understand it.

Natan said:
The ground and the field is the body and it's faculties who's ultimate nature resides in the source of consciousness in the heart Bindu which is pure, unborn clear light manifesting its qualities in yoga.

krodha wrote:
This does not disqualify sūtra texts from being useful to understand certain principles in context.

Natan said:
In Dzogchen, all the kadag/lhundrub language is subsidiary to the actual experiences of the basis, because it's not a thought process that leads on the experiences, as they do in sutra level, like four immeasurables and Bodhicitta prayers.

krodha wrote:
You need to separate view and method, Nate. And comprehend the notable subsidiary differences when they are applicable. It is not so black and white.

Natan said:
It's yoga and mudra. How are they not existent? Nonmaterial. How are they not nonexistant? They appear like mirages. This is all we need to distinguish form/emptiness, because in the method the mind does not analyse or describe beyond what is necessary to effectuate the method.

krodha wrote:
Still this does not disqualify sūtra citations from being useful in context.

Natan said:
Nonmateriality really gets to the heart of it because we truly cannot identify anything that isn't material.

krodha wrote:
If you don’t understand the view you can’t, sure. But that is your own limitation if the case. Prajñāpāramitā discusses immateriality, it is not a concept exclusive to tantra or ati.

Natan said:
So it's a causal, nondimensional, unquantifiable... everything that has any relationship with materiality except appearing. It natural qualities are revealed in practice not determined by words.

krodha wrote:
If you understand the view, you understand there is no material phenomena anywhere, and your experience of material phenomena is a symptom of your delusion and karma, the path removes these obscurations.

The eight examples of illusion are found throughout all Mahāyāna, there is nothing about immateriality that is exclusive to tantra or ati. Certain views, sure. Various methods, absolutely, but not that concept.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 31st, 2022 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
futerko said:
The unconditioned nature of the base

Malcolm said:
The basis is just your own consciousness. Accept it and move on.

futerko said:
Dzogchen the self-perfected state, p. 53
"The essence is the void, the real condition of the individual and of all phenomena. This base is the condition of all individuals, whether they are aware of it or not, whether they are enlightened or in transmigration."

Does this not suggest the base qua universal is common to all consciousnesses and therefore a priori the condition of any experience?

krodha wrote:
Norbu Rinpoche is pretty clear about the basis being individual:

We speak of a space, or sky. We speak of this space as present within a vase or a room, or the sky. It is the same space. This means the zhi [gzhi] or basis for everyone is the same. The difference we explain in Hinduism or in Dzogchen is the difference between individuals. Because when we say individuals, we mean that I am not you. You are not her. We are not the same. Nor does it mean that when someone is realized, everyone is unified into them and it becomes a kind of ??. That is not what is meant.

Zhi or basis is always composed of a clarity of the individual. This is what we refer to

with the example of the sun. If there were ten suns in the sky, we would distinguish ten different suns, and not say that all these ten are one sun. Thus sky and sun are two different things as a way of seeing.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 31st, 2022 at 1:24 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Natan said:
My direct question was a simple one, Why do siddhis like clairvoyance work? Answer, Because the Dharmakaya is all pervasive. My doubt, But that sounds like Brahman not Buddhism. His reply, Our traditions have much in common.

heart said:
"Dharmakaya is all pervasive" this means that emptiness is all pervasive. No matter how I look at that statement there is nothing strange with it. It certainly don't mean that dharmakaya is equal to brahman.

Natan said:
That's why I asked him the question about Brahman so he could refute it. But he affirmed it.

Here's chapter one paragraph one of root tantra of Guhyagarbha
Homage to the Bhagawan Samantabhadra Transcendent
Fully Endowed Conqueror!

When this speech is taught, the Tathagata-the fully perfected sambhogakaya buddha, the fully endowed transcendent conqueror of great abundance, and the nature of the vajra enlightened body, speech, and mind of all tathagatas of the ten directions and the fourth time-did not exclude, does not exclude, and will not exclude anything; and his nature is not individualized, but is inseparably undifferentiated.
This is the translation approved by Khenpo Namdrol.

Here's the Scotsman Gyurme Dorje's translation of same:
Thus at the time of this explanation, the Tathagata, genuinely perfect Buddha and transcendent lord, was endowed with great rapture which is the identity of the indestructible body, speech and mind of all the Tathagatas of the ten directions and four times. This is the nature in which all of them without exception, none excepted and omitting none at all are indivisible without distinction or difference.
Honestly that should settle the argument.

Holy mother Nyingma has a root tantra? I wonder if that means we should study it... Duhhhhhh

krodha wrote:
These excerpts are referencing an absence of characteristics in the ultimate.

For instance, the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā:

The descriptions from the element of self [atmadhātu] up to the element of all phenomena [sarvadharmadhātu] are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated.

This is just describing the realization of emptiness. Through realizing emptiness, the absence of characteristics is directly known due to the absence of a would-be inherent nature or “svabhāva” i.e., a core entity, to possesses said characteristics. At that time, because entities are realized to be non-arisen, the basis of imputation which was previously mistaken to be an object endowed with specific characteristics is recognized to be a misconception. In that awakened equipoise there are no distinct entities and everything is undifferentiated in the sense that everything lacks an essence in the exact same way. But this does not mean everything is one, single Brahman-like thing.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 30th, 2022 at 1:34 PM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
Natan said:
They also do not support any particular position which is why lamas can differ on these points. It doesn't say anywhere everyone has their own personal dharmakaya.

krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is just a tathāgata’s total realization of emptiness at the time of buddhahood. It is a Buddha’s jñāna. The teachings are clear that we all have discrete mindstreams, and dharmakāya is just the prakrti of a mind, not some sort of monolithic nature.

Natan said:
My direct question was a simple one, Why do siddhis like clairvoyance work? Answer, Because the Dharmakaya is all pervasive. My doubt, But that sounds like Brahman not Buddhism. His reply, Our traditions have much in common.

If you think all these doubts about translation apply to this conversation, I would suggest you are sorely mistaken. I'm a first hand account and a reliable witness, because I was educated and know to conduct interviews at a professional level.

krodha wrote:
Yes, you’ve always valued yourself highly, Nate. You don’t have to convince me that you think you’re qualified to make accurate assessments. I know you think that.

Natan said:
I spent 7 years following these DK lamas closely and knew how to ask direct questions in simple terms to avoid confusion.

krodha wrote:
Yes, we sat in Drubpon Rinpoche’s house together, I’m aware of your history.

Natan said:
I also did not want confusing answers. Maybe he's wrong. I don't say if I think he's right or wrong. All I know is he is realized at a level most lamas are not which is why folks experience so much amazing things around him. He's not just learned with integrity. He's a next level yogi, and the last his kind around.

You want to be dubious for the sake folding arms and appearing intellectual go ahead. People keep saying I didn't understand. Folks have said that about my conversation with HH Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche and I am sick of it. I took these conversations very seriously. I had to make appointments. I had to prepare. I made sure the answers were clarified and that my understanding of the response was accepted by the lama. So there's definitely no misunderstanding. I personally didn't like his response. I thought he was wrong. It is what he said. My own lama disagreed with his statement.

I've come to think he was influenced by someone not in DK. I later learned he got this from Khenpo Munsel. For a while I thought he was saying this as a skillful means to get people into his message about love and openness. I scrutinized it in scripture and one will be hard-pressed to find anything definitive on the topic of Buddhanature or dharmakaya from any tantra or commentary of the Sarma group.

krodha wrote:
I can’t speak on gsar ma tantras. Nyingma tantras are quite clear though. Sūtra is quite clear, texts like the Tarkajvālā are quite explicit in addressing these topics. In any case, I’m not out to convince you you’re wrong, I just disagree with Garchen Rinpoche on this matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 30th, 2022 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:

futerko said:
the discussion is simply about interpretation of terminology, no anecdotes!

krodha wrote:
Sure, but no one has cited a text which uses the term “pervasive” so that the context and meaning can be investigated. People are just referencing anectodal evidence,

which is meaningless in a discussion like this one.

“Lama X said this,” “X Rinpoche said that.” Did they? Where’s some actual substance?

futerko said:
I'm only speaking from my own view, sorry, I have no idea what any Lama said about it.

krodha wrote:
I think that is the point, none of us know what these Lamas actually said about it. We have firstly, anecdotal evidence, and secondly, the factor of interpretation, thirdly, language barriers, etc., there are myriad variables that can lead to miscommunication, misinterpretation.

Further, Rinpoches and Lamas are fallible according to the tantras, if this was indeed said, one might have to simply consider that this Lama who is otherwise very learned and a person of integrity is just mistaken about this topic. The tantras themselves do not say such things.

Then your personal discretion and personal risk tolerance. Lama X said “such and such”... but the sūtras, śāstras, tantras etc., do not say such things. Okay, well that is on you whether you choose to endorse such a view. Some people in this thread are very comfortable with all of these variables, myself, not so much.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 30th, 2022 at 3:53 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
krodha wrote:
Seems this discussion has veered into debating second-hand anectodal taglines, e.g., what “pervasive” means in some conversation that may or may not have been understood correctly.

Cite something concrete.

futerko said:
the discussion is simply about interpretation of terminology, no anecdotes!

krodha wrote:
Sure, but no one has cited a text which uses the term “pervasive” so that the context and meaning can be investigated. People are just referencing anectodal evidence, which is meaningless in a discussion like this one.

“Lama X said this,” “X Rinpoche said that.” Did they? Where’s some actual substance?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 30th, 2022 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Aphantasia & Dzogchen / tantric practices
Content:
krodha wrote:
Seems this discussion has veered into debating second-hand anectodal taglines, e.g., what “pervasive” means in some conversation that may or may not have been understood correctly.

Cite something concrete.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 17th, 2022 at 5:21 AM
Title: Re: The Transmission of the Dzogchen Great Perfection Tantras with Chris Wilkinson
Content:
Malcolm said:
So who can say that the samayas are not critical in Dzogchen teachings?

krodha wrote:
The great chigcharwa, Jules who has evidently exhausted dharmatā.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
He has way more than Shamatha courses on there.

krodha wrote:
I suppose my main issue revolves around the preservation of the sanctity of transmission and also being mindful of what could potentially be a slippery slope in terms of being loose with transmission.

Once we start making concessions in certain areas, this really opens the door to people assuming concessions are acceptable and where they end up from there is anyone’s guess. Why deviate from the standard that protects the integrity of the transmission?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:
krodha wrote:
I’ve never received mennagde teachings that were not prefaced with a clear yet

succinct history lesson prior to the transmission.

This was Norbu Rinpoche's attitude as well. When I visited Tenerife, Norbu Rinpoche gave trekchö and thögal teachings. They were originally intended to be his own Longsal cycle, but after all the attendees arrived, there were hundreds of people. Rinpoche felt uneasy about giving the Longsal transmission, so he instead gave transmission on Adzom Drukpa's cycle related to the same teachings. He did that to protect the Löngsal cycle related to those teachings, because his wish was for only those who were stable in the view to attend. He even joked the first day, stating "it is so nice to see so many people stable in the view." Being completely facetious. He knew people were just there to grasp at "high teachings."

People complained, and after a certain amount of protest Rinpoche rightfully or wrongfully, reluctantly gave in and offered the lung to the Löngsal versions so that attendees could at the very least obtain and read the text.

That is how serious he took the transmission. I don't see the same level of care coming from the DC Community today, and I can only conclude something was lost on them, as hyperbolic as that may be.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 3:57 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
I guess a related question is, given the current state towards transmission in the DC, what do you all claim SMS teachers should do differently, in succinct, non-hyperbolic terms?

krodha wrote:
I assume they can teach what they've learned in The Precious Vase text up to whatever section is equivalent to the level of SMS they are.

Certainly does not involve mennagde instruction, which trekchö is technically classified as.

I've never heard of any credible teachers giving the intimate instructions to uninitiated people. Mennagde is only found within the continuum of lineage transmission, and those who receive said transmission will be informed which cycle, which terma etc., the teachings they receive are from, there is never any ambiguity.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 3:50 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:
You guys talk as if you have some incontrovertible argument that this is a horrible thing. There are non-dc teachers who do things similar to this as well, you don't have to agree with it, and I have my own misgivings.

The idea that there has been some iron clad argument made and people should just agree though? Naw, you are way overestimating the clarity of the arguments being made against this approach.

krodha wrote:
There are non-DC teachers who teach men ngag sde without transmission?

Johnny Dangerous said:
They would be semde or equivalent to semde I think, but I really don't understand how/why that would alter your complaint, semde involves a pointing out or introduction, why would the issue be different?

krodha wrote:
What is equivalent to sem sde? B. Allan Wallace teaching śamatha?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
You guys talk as if you have some incontrovertible argument that this is a horrible thing. There are non-dc teachers who do things similar to this as well, you don't have to agree with it, and I have my own misgivings.

The idea that there has been some iron clad argument made and people should just agree though? Naw, you are way overestimating the clarity of the arguments being made against this approach.

krodha wrote:
There are non-DC teachers who teach men ngag sde without transmission?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 13th, 2022 at 2:55 AM
Title: Re: Issue with DC teaching and transmission
Content:

oldbob said:
--- and for those in the retreat, the Transmission continues without any conception of responsibility or no responsibility.

It is very nice to see the Transmission continue and to share that space within the Dzogchen Community.

krodha wrote:
Bob, we really should not be so desperate for some semblance of a DC transmission lineage that we ignore what the teachings actually say in order to provide table scraps for people.

If these things are not approached with care then we are being irresponsible and run the risk of harming others. This also has the potential to add insult to injury with the already present issues in the DC.

1970. You really are a veteran of the Dzogchen Community. Present prior to my own birth even. I very much so would like to relate to senior students like you for the wisdom you can offer based on your history and experience. But these cliches such as a freedom from responsibility or lack thereof, especially in relation to lineage transmission, are a disservice to the reality of this situation.

If you hold the DC and Norbu Rinpoche's teachings dearly in your heart as I know you do, just as I do, then please think on these things and perhaps reconsider your stance on this matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 10th, 2022 at 1:36 PM
Title: Re: Better late than never
Content:
krodha wrote:
That is not a lineage transmission. People completely outside the mandala may have been attending Elias' teaching. Your attitude towards that prospect is a bit reckless an brazen and is a notable departure from your past views, which revolved around a theme of strong interest in preserving lineage.

Passing By said:
So.....Is it ok for people with Dzogchen transmission from other gurus and lineages besides ChNNR to attend this?

(I am not DC. I have not attended yet, busy the past few days. Yes, I practice Dzogchen in other lineages)

krodha wrote:
Yes, although while Elias is capable of being a teacher, it seems he has one foot in and one foot out on this, which is the point of contention that this issue rests upon. He is giving teachings on the intimate instructions without giving direct introduction. Thus, is he acting as a teacher? A qualified teacher would provide the proper transmission start to finish in order to be certain that everyone in attendance receives the teachings in a

thorough and effective way.

Even those who have obtained transmission from Norbu Rinpoche, or any other lineage, should again receive a complete teaching from Elias. Including direct introduction in some fashion. It would be one thing if there were some measures taken to vet attendees, so that Elias was ensuring that those in attendance have all received proper transmission, but this isn't the case. What is worse, the advertisement plainly states that those who wish to attend do not need transmission so long as they intend to receive it at a later time. Who in their right mind came up with such a ludicrous idea? And who are these people who thought it was a good idea to endorse it? Is this really what these people are doing with Norbu Rinpoche's legacy? Breaking their own samaya and corrupting the dependent origination of those in attendance with (hopefully) sincere interest who have not yet received transmission?

This is a charade. Again, I rather like Elias, but this really is absurd. If the DC is endorsing this then they have failed to uphold a precious legacy.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 10th, 2022 at 10:09 AM
Title: Re: Better late than never
Content:
oldbob said:
Again – we differ.

krodha wrote:
What do the tantras say? They don’t say it is acceptable to teach trekchö to uninitiated individuals in cases where people’s opinions on the matter “differ.” The tantras actually state that the consequences are quite severe.

oldbob said:
I have nothing to say about who can or cannot give Direct Introduction. I can speak of my experience.

“For me, the experience was as traditional as any I’ve received. I have nothing to say and couldn’t if I wanted to.”

Perhaps that is the integrity of Transmission.

krodha wrote:
That is not a lineage transmission. People completely outside the mandala may have been attending Elias’ teaching. Your attitude towards that prospect is a bit reckless an brazen and is a notable departure from your past views, which revolved around a theme of strong interest in preserving lineage.

You were just feigning this entire time?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 10th, 2022 at 9:16 AM
Title: Re: Better late than never
Content:

oldbob said:
Respectfully – we differ.

For me, the experience was as traditional as any I've received. I have nothing to say and couldn't if I wanted to.

Full measure and no complaints or misunderstandings. The book and the Transpersonal stuff don't get in the way of Transmission and catching the view in words – which is not that easy to do.

Information and form are not the key points of Dzogchen.

Conveying Instant Presence and the Secondary Practices are.

krodha wrote:
Elias gave direct introduction then?

As one of the most vocal proponents of a proper continuity of Norbu Rinpoche's lineage I'm surprised that you're so easily persuaded to eschew the integrity of transmission.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 10th, 2022 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: Better late than never
Content:

oldbob said:
The 75-80 students who are learning Tregchod quite happily would disagree with anyone criticizing Elias. I am one of these students and I disagree. I've been doing Dzogchen since 1970.

I've studied with many Dzogchen Masters and Elias is Teaching Dzogchen quite successfully in his own style.
Those who attend the retreat are getting the benefit.
Each to their own.

krodha wrote:
These “teacher’s” personal style shouldn’t come at the expense of the established traditional guidelines we’ve had in place for centuries.

I like Elias apart from some weird transpersonal nonsense he dilutes Dzogchen teachings with, but the half measures with direct introduction are disturbing and should be disturbing to you as well, Bob.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 7th, 2022 at 7:28 AM
Title: Re: The Transmission of the Dzogchen Great Perfection Tantras with Chris Wilkinson
Content:
gelukman said:
You are able to transmit dzogchen tantras your self after you have received the transmission.

krodha wrote:
Oh boy.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2022 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: Is Frank Yang an arhat?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The arhathood claim is whatever, but in terms of just insight in general, I’ve heard this guy has some degree of credibility.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2022 at 11:41 PM
Title: Re: Trekcho rigpa vs thogal rigpa
Content:
Jules 09 said:
It is said that when the expression (display) dawns as sherab, as knowledge - when the expression knows its own nature - it is liberated, there is freedom. When the expression moves as thought, as thinking, it is bewildered - there is delusion.
In this distinction lies the whole difference.

krodha wrote:
Thought is only the utmost tip of the iceberg of delusion. The connate avidyā underlies imputation, which is non-recognition of the nature of mind and phenomena. This issue is therefore far deeper than you seem to realize. Your constant railing against thought is indicative of a view that needs quite a bit of refinement, mostly because it will cause you to conflate mere clarity with jñāna, or prajñā as you mention directly above. A major

error.

As others have mentioned, these discussions are an opportunity for you to learn, hopefully that isn't completely squandered.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2022 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Trekcho rigpa vs thogal rigpa
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Perhaps we can agree that cessation of mind (sem).., means cessation of mental events; i.e. thinking, rnam rtog...

krodha wrote:
That is not what the cessation of mind means.

Thoughts can cease in gnas pa and sems can still be fully in tact, which is why gnas pa is considered a deviation.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2022 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
heart said:
Ultimately thoughts don't even exist as Khenchen Namdrol Rinpoche taught recently.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Yeah, the "gnas gyu rig gsum" or division of the view into rigpa as a passive knower of the presence or absence of thought, is something provisional that is eventually seen as false once thoughts are realized to be non-arisen. But that is a later insight.

Not telling you this, but for the overall discussion, we have to work within the confines of the trio of "stillness, movement and knowing" to sort of retrain the mind and create the fertile circumstances for that latter insight (or awakening) to occur.

My point being that some are putting the cart before the horse on this one.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2022 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
krodha wrote:

Also the dgongs pa zang thal states, per Mipham:

The vacant state of not thinking anything, is itself the cause of ignorance and confusion.

Prefacing the citation of this quote with a warning that fixation on a thought-free state is deviating into taking the ālaya as the goal. Jigme Lingpa says if you make this error you will be like a blind man wandering in the desert.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2022 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
My assumption has always been that in the Dzogchen view namtog is a result of Marigpa. I am not sure I have ever seen this said directly, but probably something close?

krodha wrote:
Thought is fundamentally related to the movement of vāyu. The more uncoordinated the vāyu is, the more rapid and unruly the torrent of thought will be.

Ma rig pa occurs in a few ways, there are three marigpas, which are three primary aspects of marigpa, but yes, one aspect does involve this activity of imputation where thought sort of objectifies itself, and clarity mistakes itself for an inner subjective "self." And with that, the antithesis of self likewise manifests, which is external phenomena and so on.

Karmavāyu mixing with rtsal is the technical explanation.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2022 at 2:26 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Because if they do, you would be up to your neck in sem, all the time.

krodha wrote:
Hope you do realize that you indeed are "up to your neck" in sems and avidyā, all the time, until you begin to access the prajñā infused samādhi of an ārya.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2022 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:

In Tulku Urgyen's books he says repeatedly that there is no thought in rigpa. And in my experience of receiving many teachings from Chokyi Nyima, I never heard him say that there is thought in rigpa.

krodha wrote:
Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche and his sons also talk about different modalities of rigpa, two main types in their expositions.

Rigpa matures as the path develops. Every modality is part of the same continuum of rigpa, but not every modality shares the same characteristics.

Our mundane rigpa we start with occurs with the movement of thoughts, and you have to employ the view to develop that rigpa, that process includes working with the movement of thought in a skillful way.

Context is very important, and so is a qualified teacher you can interact with frequently, or at least periodically.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 19th, 2022 at 10:33 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Without thoughts, who or what, is there to liberate?

krodha wrote:
The neo-Advaitan trap.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 19th, 2022 at 8:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
If you have recognized the First Vital Point, you will know that there was never any self to be liberated.

krodha wrote:
The first “vital point” is identifying rig pa as mere clarity. The self is not seen through until the full measure of rigpa is actualized (or trekchö is realized), and isn’t an unbroken insight until buddhahood. Therefore your assertion here does not make sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2022 at 6:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:
Jules 09 said:
If there is still the belief that there is an actual practitioner there, who is experiencing the arising of concepts and engaging in the activity of "not blocking" them, then yes, I guess that is samsara. By which I mean, that it is not rig pa.

krodha wrote:
The presence or absence of the agent is cognitive in nature, it is not a belief.

You experience a self, and the subsequent bifurcation of inner and outer yings at all times within avidyā. Even if you attempt to delude yourself otherwise.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2022 at 5:23 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
So, you have a duality between you and the basis.

krodha wrote:
That is the reality of your experience in avidyā. You will only be free of that once you reach the first bhūmi, and even then, that freedom from a grasping agent will only persist as long as your equipoise lasts.

Only Buddhas who have accomplished the so-called transcendent state [dgongs pa] are truly free from such things.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2022 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
It has given me more context to understand the approach to practice that some of the people here might be following.

krodha wrote:
There is no alternative.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 2:57 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
I was under the impression that we were discussing the "view" of trekchö. It was you

who brought up the subject in the first place:

krodha wrote:
Yes, trekchö.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 8:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Sure.
But you will never "stabilize the view" by making effort.

krodha wrote:
This is a misconception.

You have to use a great amount of effort to stabilize the view and then effort is also applied in integrating specific characteristics of your experience.

If this is done correctly, then the view will develop and you will begin to have glimpses of the actual natural state. From there, you must continue to cultivate the view so that you can stabilize the instances of awakened equipoise that manifest. This takes the entire path to accomplish, and at every turn effort is required.

The actual meaning of “effortlessness” in these teachings is related to the nature of the postures, gazes and breathing. Then further, the “effortlessness” involved with stabilizing self-liberation in the context of the view, which is not easy despite the so-called “effortless” characteristics involved in the practice.

This is a very nuanced topic. But the important takeaway is that without skillfully applied effort your practice will never develop.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 6:52 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
There are so many methods, but making effort is not one of them.

krodha wrote:
Effortlessness has a very specific meaning in ati, it does not mean you do not make effort in practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 6:29 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
As concepts are liberated upon arising, we have nothing to hold on to, and take "face to face in the future."

krodha wrote:
Concepts are only liberated upon arising within the continuum of the view. If we are distracted, then concepts are proliferating endlessly, in what is called “black diffusion” by some.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 5:51 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Why do you mention this?

krodha wrote:
The correct view is a balance between stillness [gnas pa], movement [gyu ba] and the knowing [shes pa] of the two. There is a method to it, and in the beginning it takes effort.

Jules 09 said:
- So ?

krodha wrote:
You claimed earlier that only some people will utilize the movement of thought in their view. But in truth this is a universal aspect of the ati view which sets it apart from śamatha.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 5:46 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Why do you mention this?

krodha wrote:
The correct view is a balance between stillness [gnas pa], movement [gyu ba] and the knowing [shes pa] of the two. There is a method to it, and in the beginning it takes effort.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Zoey85 said:
it's surprising that people still insist on abiding within the gap between thoughts, or trying to continue in a thought-free state.

krodha wrote:
They don’t understand the deviation of cultivating nepa [gnas pa]. Norbu Rinpoche said people who practice with that view are “dancing on the books of teachings without having any experience of real practice.”

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2022 at 4:20 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages
Content:
Jules 09 said:
Yes, I am aware that there is a practice of 'taking thoughts as the path' using them as fuel. But, I would suggest that it is an instruction that a teacher would give to a specific student, or a specific group of students at a particular time , *when it is appropriate* for the individuals concerned. If a person were to attempt that practice too soon, and without personal guidance, they could go seriously astray.
But, you seem to think that, just because that is your current practice (maybe? I don't know), then it should apply to other practitioners too, and I think that this is a mistake on your part.

krodha wrote:
That is literally the “view” that is implemented for all ati practitioners. You aren’t practicing trekchö otherwise.

Jules 09 said:
Another observation one might make is: Yes, that sounds like a good practice, but how long do you want to do that for?

krodha wrote:
Until the view is stabilized.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2022 at 6:43 AM
Title: Re: What Does Jim Valby Mean by "Pure Perfect Presence"
Content:
Jules 09 said:
"Buddhism is not claiming that there is nothing existing 'out there'.
It's simply saying: You have no access to it.

What you have is your experience.
Each of us has to work with our own experience."

- James Low,
Doing Less, Experiencing More. (@4:15:29)

krodha wrote:
Buddhism also is not saying there are noumenal svabhāvas “out there.”

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 3rd, 2021 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: Realization and realized masters
Content:
clyde said:
So, please, are there living Zen teachers that you believe are realized and if so, who?

krodha wrote:
You seem dissatisfied with every reply to this question.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 2nd, 2021 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Realization and realized masters
Content:
clyde said:
And if there are realized Zen Masters (or teachers in other Buddhist traditions), who are they?

krodha wrote:
Meido Moore Roshi, who has posted here in the past is very clear on the view, and though I’m not clairvoyant, and he is very modest, his presentation and understanding of the path are indicative of someone with some degree of genuine insight or realization.

Certainly a reliable resource as far as Zen goes.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 29th, 2021 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Awareness, and consciousness, (rig pa) … oh my!
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
No, there is no subconscious in some Jungian sense, but there are certainly latent tendencies in people’s mind streams of which they are not fully aware, I mean that is baked into the whole deal.

That is all that is required for there to functionally be a ‘subconscious’...some definitive theory is not needed.

krodha wrote:
In the past when this idea came up here it was clarified that it is antithetical to Buddhist teachings, and that these processes are conscious in nature, never subconscious or unconscious.

Johnny Dangerous said:
The only way for that to be so is to engage in a pointlessly semantic argument about what "subconscious" means, which is exactly what I recall from that conversation.

Ignorance is the primary klesha, as such, there is most certainly a spectrum of experience or at least latent tendencies unavailable to the default settings of the samsaric mind, that shouldn't be controversial. If the vision of sentient beings is any way occluded by ignorance (which all teachings pretty much agree on), then there is something which is at least provisionally "subconscious". Similarly, beings are generally unaware of being moved around by the winds of Karma.

Whether or not we decide to turn that into a noun, or compare it to this or that theory is another question.

So really, if someone wants to make this objection, they should first define exactly what is meant by "subconscious" in the first place. FYI there is not some unified answer to that in Western Psychology at all, there is a wide range of sometimes contradictory views on what that term means.

krodha wrote:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=298160#p298160

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=470411#p470411

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 29th, 2021 at 9:02 AM
Title: Re: Awareness, and consciousness, (rig pa) ... oh my!
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
No, there is no subconscious in some Jungian sense, but there are certainly latent tendencies in people’s mind streams of which they are not fully aware, I mean that is baked into the whole deal.

That is all that is required for there to functionally be a ‘subconscious’...some definitive theory is not needed.

krodha wrote:
In the past when this idea came up here it was clarified that it is antithetical to Buddhist

teachings, and that these processes are conscious in nature, never subconscious or unconscious.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 29th, 2021 at 8:26 AM
Title: Re: Question about dependent origination
Content:
Sherab said:
What I was asking is whether the thing being referred to in "fundamentally there is no thing", only refers to the mental image in the mind and not to the physical thing from which the perceiving mind generates its image, or the physical thing or both. We all know that the mental image of a thing is NOT a true representation of the physical thing. The mental image is only a functional represention of the physical thing. Since it is only a functional representation, that thing being represented does not truly exist. But the physical thing out there could still truly exist. Therefore how the thing in "fundamentally there is no thing" is interpreted needs clarification.

krodha wrote:
This phenomena-noumena dichotomy is not found in Buddhist teachings. Positing a noumena beyond your senses is positing a svabhāva.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 29th, 2021 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: Awareness, and consciousness, (rig pa) … oh my!
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
What would correspond to the western concept of ‘subconscious’ I don’t mean dream state, but rather, that we are subconsciously aware of lots of things in our environment, even our bodies.

krodha wrote:
There’s no subconscious in Buddhist teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 25th, 2021 at 9:26 AM
Title: Re: Question about dependent origination
Content:
Rick said:
In Chapter 1 of the MMK, Nagarjuna appears to argue against <a certain understanding of> causality. But he never argues against dependent origination, quite the contrary: emptiness and dependent origination are definitive teachings.

So, Nagarjunaphiles, if causality is kaput, how in tarnation does dependent arising work?

krodha wrote:
Dependent origination works in a conventional sense, like Buddhapālita confirms in his commentary on Nāgārjuna’s MMK.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 21st, 2021 at 9:24 AM
Title: Re: Tim Dillon is the funniest person alive.
Content:
cky said:
He's funny, but I don't see the point in that particular bit.

krodha wrote:
Apparently his aunt sued him so I don’t think it’s a bit.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 19th, 2021 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: Tim Dillon is the funniest person alive.
Content:
krodha wrote:
His ongoing battle with his aunt is hilarious and also brutal.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 13th, 2021 at 9:34 AM
Title: Re: Break connection to non-Buddhist paths
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
If you practice properly, everything becomes part of the Dharma path. You can learn from Jesus or the Vedas, or Ben Franklin, Confucius, Pee Wee Herman, even Donald Trump.
If you have taken refuge, then you are a Buddhist, and you just pour everything into that.

krodha wrote:
Not sure that’s how it works.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 12th, 2021 at 8:24 AM
Title: Re: If there's no self, why does karma matter?
Content:
Nalanda said:
Without the self/person, why does karma matter? Upon rebirth, how does this karma connect or transfer to that new person? Isn't that unfair? How does it even connect the previous person's karma to the reborn person?

krodha wrote:
Because the afflictive dependent origination that gives rise to the fetter of selfhood is a completely agentless process.

Karma connects because there is a discrete conventional mindstream that is subject to afflictive conditions.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 12th, 2021 at 8:17 AM
Title: Re: Is impermanence the same or different than emptiness?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Deluded beings perceive impermanence because they experience entities and processes that arise, decay and eventually cease.

Awakened beings perceive non-arising in relation to entities, which is the emptiness of entities. This renders the perception of impermanence impossible because without entities that arise in the first place there is no decay or cessation.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 11th, 2021 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:
krodha wrote:
That is all well and good, but I do not have to accept gzhan stong as a view in order to accept tathāgatagarbha.

Matt J said:
I am curious as to how you would distinguish the two.

krodha wrote:
As far as I can tell the gzhan stong interpretation of tathāgatagarbha is that it is (i) truly existent, (ii) replete with all qualities and fully formed from the very beginning, and (iii) is absolutely distinct from all relative phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 10th, 2021 at 2:53 AM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:
Schrödinger's Yidam said:
As I've just said said, "some do, some don't."
As I've said, some do, some don't.

All my bases are covered.

krodha wrote:
You keep saying this, but “some do, some don’t” do what?

In re-reading this it isn’t clear what you are asserting some do and some don’t do. This “some do, some don’t” response was given as a rebuttal to various points. Unclear which point you are intending to address.

The only system that resembles the view you appear to be advocating for is gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 10th, 2021 at 1:20 AM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:
Schrödinger’s Yidam said:
Although there are plenty Indian Madhyamaka adjacent texts that discuss jñāna and so on.

To add, there are also many systems that are sympathetic towards Madhyamaka logic which say jñāna can be just as potent and viable without having to be truly established. Some do, some don’t. In the context of this discussion “some do” has been contested. That’s the point I was addressing.

We’ve been over this many times in the past. I just don’t get why this point needs to be refreshed intermittently.

krodha wrote:
You and I have never “been over this,” unless you had some other handle in the past.

“Some do (address jñāna) has been contested?” How? Texts such as the Ārya-akṣayamati-nirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra which features an entire section on vijñāna and jñāna, for example, are Indian Madhyamaka adjacent in the sense that they are considered to be foundational to that system of dialectics in certain ways.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 8th, 2021 at 4:52 PM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:
undefineable said:
Buddhism makes the definite ontological claim that only appearances are real.

krodha wrote:

I’ve never seen such a claim.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 8th, 2021 at 7:17 AM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:
krodha wrote:
People in this thread can engage in conjecture about hidden ontological principles until the day they die, but that isn’t buddhadharma.

undefineable said:
Buddhadharma does limit itself in this way, the point being that "hidden ontology", as long as it remains hidden (meaning 'until the day they die'), doesn't in and of itself help beings deal with their conditions on a psychological level. That's why a practitioner does, and can certainly afford to, take certain things 'on trust' to begin with at least[?]

krodha wrote:
With insight into emptiness the perceived substantial nature of any alleged ontology is put to rest for good.

That is a massive advantage rather than a limitation.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 8th, 2021 at 4:23 AM
Title: Re: I'm confused about Buddhist arguments against a creator God and what that entails for buddha activity?
Content:

undefineable said:
And although there are Buddhist texts that suggest that craving is the root not only of dukkha but of all reality as well, this doesn't explain how a) the external roots of the objects of craving manage to make an appearance,

Malcolm said:
They arise from causes and conditions. This is not mysterious.

PadmaVonSamba said:
the appearance they make, meaning what we perceive, is actually only to the degree of that craving itself, a reflection you might say, of that craving, although not in the gross sense of ‘craving’ lake extreme desire, but in the very subtle sense arising from the self/other dichotomy: as we imagine a self, we experience phenomena as existing purely In relation to that imagined-self.

krodha wrote:
Appearances you perceive are just inaccurately known. All of samsara arises because you have an inaccurate knowledge of appearances.

This is why buddhadharma is based on epistemic soteriology. Not ontological soteriology.

People in this thread can engage in conjecture about hidden ontological principles until the day they die, but that isn't buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 20th, 2021 at 7:55 AM
Title: Re: Killing animals... Is it acceptable in Dzogchen
Content:
Michael126unknown said:
Can we kill or hunt if we are a Dzogchen practitioner, or should we avoid killing animals unless it is necessary?
Further, may the meat/corpse from a dying animal be given in any type of offering practice (At least visualizing it as offered) or would it be disrespectful (not sure if this is the right term) toward the deities?
Thank you.

krodha wrote:
In the context of the samayas of body, speech and mind, taking life is the heaviest transgression related to the samaya of the body. If you are a serious Dzogchen practitioner it is best to avoid intentional killing.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 11th, 2021 at 5:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Virgo said:
Based on the fracture patterns and the crater effect I was able to determine which shot came first.

Virgo

krodha wrote:
Fastest gun in the west.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 11th, 2021 at 5:33 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Sherab Rigdrol said:
Hameed Ali is one of many pseudo intellectual, narcissistic elites who have created their own “spiritual system” based purely on their own delusion and has zero basis in wisdom.

I wish him nothing but the worst for trying to exploit and sully the stainless activity, love, wisdom and compassion of ChNN.

Tata1 said:
But yeah i dont even know why we discuss this kind of people. Who cares?

krodha wrote:
Karma will dictate people’s involvement with Hameed and others of his ilk, but it is still fruitful to discuss these pseudo-teachers because it might offer the opportunity for someone on the fence to dodge a bullet.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 2nd, 2021 at 2:43 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
oldbob said:
My 2 cents,

There are many kinds of Qualified Teacher. There are many uses of these words.

In Dzogchen, the Qualified Teacher is the one who introduces you to your Instant presence, to your realized mind, and then teaches you the Secondary Practices that support and stabilize this experience.

Sometimes this happens in strange ways. Read the lives of the Mahasiddhas.

The most Qualified Teacher that I met in my life was ChNN.

Everything he did and taught was from the place of being integrated 24/7 in non-dual Ati Dzogchen awareness.

Therefore everything he did and taught was authentic Dzogchen. Therefore he was a Qualified Teacher.

Shouldn’t new students be allowed to experience Dzogchen as was taught for new students by the Qualified Teacher?

Maybe the new students should have a choice as to how they learn Dzogchen in the Dzogchen Community. All of the original retreats of ChNN (from 1976 on) were recorded on audio and since 1982 – on video. Most of these early retreats are also transcribed into several languages.

The SMS Instructors are only qualified to give Instruction up to the level of SMS that they were approved for by ChNN. I don't think any of them claim to be a Qualified Teacher, yet some of them put themselves forward as "Qualified SMS Instructor" as if this is the same as "Qualified Teacher."

Most of these "Qualified SMS Instructors" are only qualified to teach the base level of the 10 levels of the SMS, having answered a few base-level questions and received an hour or so of "Teacher Training." Perhaps it is not ideal to have the newcomers contact with the Dzogchen Teachings of ChNN to come through contact only with "Qualified SMS Instructors."

Since there is no current Qualified Teacher, doesn't it make sense to arrange for the newcomers to be taught Dzogchen directly by the one Qualified Teacher that everyone agrees on: ChNN.

This is really obvious, yet in the 3 years of mourning, many of the would-be "Qualified Teachers" have created little courses for themselves and a few old students, and are completely happy giving a few teachings to these few old students. Now, this same system is being set up for the newcomers.

Isn't it better to allow the newcomers to hear and see the original words and translations of when ChNN first taught Dzogchen in the West?

Isn't it better to rely directly on ChNN and his Teachings?

Shouldn't the greater Dzogchen Community take responsibility for the newcomers instead of leaving them with a few courses from Base level SMS Instructors.

The Instructors can still be there to answer questions and to guide practices but isn't it better to allow the content of the course to be provided by the Qualified Teacher?

All best wishes,

Bob Kragen

krodha wrote:
Much of this feels like a call to rearrange furniture on the deck of a sinking ship.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 1st, 2021 at 4:34 PM
Title: Re: Let's talk about common misconceptions of Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
To recap: There is no first cause in these teachings. There is no external force. We do not

take refuge in any samsaric being. We negate universals. This is an atheist dharma.

nightbloom said:
If you've read through this thread, you'll have seen that I already addressed this.

krodha wrote:
If you still disagree that buddhadharma is atheist after considering those points, then you have failed to understand those points.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 1st, 2021 at 4:08 PM
Title: Re: Let's talk about common misconceptions of Buddhism
Content:
nightbloom said:
Scroll up, see my clarification. If you still think it's absurd, say why.

krodha wrote:
To recap: There is no first cause in these teachings. There is no external force. We do not take refuge in any samsaric being. We negate universals. This is an atheist dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 1st, 2021 at 3:54 PM
Title: Re: Let's talk about common misconceptions of Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm said:
Dependent origination is the Buddha’s central insight. If one is going to compare Buddhadharma with any other thought, it has to be in light of dependent origination. Any other comparisons are at best superficial and trivial.

nightbloom said:
I couldn't disagree more...

krodha wrote:
Absurd.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 26th, 2021 at 9:28 AM
Title: Re: On Rebirth - Is it the same guy?
Content:
Supramundane said:
You seem to be opting for a no self. Isn't there room for a non-self?

What about our Buddhanature....

krodha wrote:
“Non-self,” “not-self” and “the Buddha never said there is no self” are Thanissaro Bikkhu’s ideas. He treats anātman as an apophatic exercise, rather than what it actually is: a dharma seal. Many Theravadins parrot him and spread these misconceptions around the Internet.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 24th, 2021 at 1:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
oldbob said:
Also, this new transmission and Direct Introduction Guideline appears to be directly in opposition to the guidelines provided in the two communications of 2016 as to who can teach. In the two communications of 2016, it is clearly stated that anyone who has accomplished a practice can teach that practice. These criteria were not limited to SMS instructors but were applied to everyone. Also, the two communications of 2016 did not state at all that Transmission and Direct introduction were not included in the permissions given in the 2016 communications. Therefore Transmission and Direct Introduction are included and are allowed to be taught by " anyone who has accomplished that practice."

krodha wrote:
Better to just follow the guidelines from texts like the Rigpa Rangshar regarding who is qualified to give and receive teachings, including direct introduction.

Gambling one’s path on anything less is a fool’s errand.

The teaching will degrade quickly if we allow any moron who declares they have “accomplished a teaching” to give transmission to others. It will be the blind leading the blind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 23rd, 2021 at 6:48 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
The thing is, part of the DC is a cult

Malcolm said:
There, fixed it for you.

krodha wrote:
It is rumored this general sentiment is shared by the aforementioned prodigal son.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 23rd, 2021 at 2:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
tinylocusta said:
Regarding Yeshi. It is obvious to me that many people seriously underestimate Him... I won't elaborate more as everybody knows He doesn't like when one speaks of Him in this way and I want to respect that, but seriously, people need to realize how extremely lucky we are to have such a person alive

krodha wrote:
The concerned parties in this thread would probably feel a great deal “luckier” if Yeshi actually demonstrated interest in leading the DC.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 23rd, 2021 at 1:17 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Dorje Shedrub said:
Does anyone know why Yeshe would require a non-disclosure agreement? I don't understand this.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps he has been advised by counsel to try and conceal his statements and activities with the DC so that it does not have some sort of potentially negative effect on his professional life.

He’s always seemed to have a conflicted relationship with his father’s legacy and community.

He may find that much to his dismay, in some countries NDA’s aren’t all that enforceable.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 18th, 2021 at 3:34 PM
Title: Re: Why is enlightenment never mentioned in 4NT and 8FP?
Content:
Supramundane said:
Except nirvana is never mentioned... that's my point.

Why not just say nirvana... nirodha is similar.... i guess.... could be...

krodha wrote:
Nirvana is the “cessation of suffering” or the “end to suffering” that characterizes the

third noble truth.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 15th, 2021 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: What are your thoughts on DMT and the entities people claim to encounter?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I interacted with a mushroom spirit a few months ago, luckily she was kind and just wanted to share information. These spirits are definitely out there.

dharmafootsteps said:
When taking mushrooms?

krodha wrote:
Yes.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 15th, 2021 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: What are your thoughts on DMT and the entities people claim to encounter?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I interacted with a mushroom spirit a few months ago, luckily she was kind and just wanted to share information. These spirits are definitely out there.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 9th, 2021 at 8:04 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
You have no obligation to be affiliated with the DC organization.

amanitamusc said:
No obligation but if he wants to get the material he needs to practice what he recieved from Rinpoche then that would be all the reason he needs to join DC.

krodha wrote:
Maybe. I was with ChNN since 2008 and never officially joined DC. Sort of joined in 2015 when I visited Tenerife, but then my info was lost somehow. I eventually just resorted to notifying the Shang Shung store that i had X transmission and wanted X book via message and they'd just send it.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 9th, 2021 at 7:07 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Damchö_Dorje said:
I am Norbu Rinpoche's student, through the webcast, relatively late in his life (November 2016).

I have wondered whether to be affiliated with DC, because I have come across conflicting information re: if it is required for samaya reasons. Sometimes the language has been that people in the Community have received teachings that affiliation is required.

krodha wrote:
If you received transmission you're inextricably affiliated with the lineage, which is the only affiliation that really matters.

You have no obligation to be affiliated with the DC organization.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 6th, 2021 at 2:25 PM
Title: Re: translation of Dra Talgyur and its commentary by Vimalamitra
Content:
yagmort said:
i think this video is from the beginning of the project, circa 2015. Adriano is saying that Elio is only about to begin translation. one year ago covid was already at full swing, Elio passed away in November. ChNNR passed away in 2018. Adriano is talking like none of this happened.

krodha wrote:
You must be right then. I actually had not heard of Elio's passing until now. How terrible.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 6th, 2021 at 11:13 AM
Title: Re: translation of Dra Talgyur and its commentary by Vimalamitra
Content:
yagmort said:
that video can not be from the last year. Adriano is sayin "shortly, Elio Guarisco will start..."

krodha wrote:
It was uploaded to the Dzogchen Community Vimeo page 1 year ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 6th, 2021 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: translation of Dra Talgyur and its commentary by Vimalamitra
Content:
krodha wrote:
Apparently as of 2020 the Shang Shung Drataljur project still required 2 to 5 years to complete:

https://ka-ter.org/index.php/the-ka-ter-translation-project/the-dra-thalgyur-translation-project-of-the-shang-shung-institute-austria/

Adriano Clemente update from last year:

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 2nd, 2021 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Choiceless awareness
Content:
krodha wrote:
Michael Tweed has said that in addition to Vimalamitra's five definitions, one could feasibly add (i) the vidyā [rig pa] of the basis, (ii) vidyā of the path, (iii) vidyā of the result, and also (iv) vidyā as a synonym for sems, but still, even despite these other possible definitions, none of them trend towards vidyā as "awareness."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 2nd, 2021 at 2:18 AM
Title: Re: Choiceless awareness
Content:
Matt J said:
There is more to Dzogchen than what is contained in any book, or books. Propagating such a narrow definition in the face of how many lineage teachers often use the term will only lead to confusion.

Also, not to belabor the point, but this does not say "only these definitions are acceptable, and none other."

krodha wrote:
This begs the question then, what other definition is apt?

What definition do you feel is missing from Vimalamitra's five examples? It seems his assessment of the different contextual uses runs the gamut, but if you disagree I'm interested to hear why.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 2nd, 2021 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Choiceless awareness
Content:
Matt J said:
Not necessarily.

krodha wrote:
Invariably.

Vimalamitra:
Furthermore, based on the power of repelling the armies of samsara, vidyā (rig pa) is 1) the knowledge (vidyā) of names designated by words, 2) helpful, worldly knowledge such as healing, arts and crafts, and so on, 3) the five sciences (rig pa gnas lnga) of the treatises and so on, 4) knowing (vidyā) as a factor of consciousness, 5) sharp and dull worldly knowledge and so on, and 6) the knowledge of the essence (snying po) that permeates all that is free from ignorance, unobscured by the obscurations of ignorance and so on.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 2nd, 2021 at 12:34 AM
Title: Re: Choiceless awareness
Content:
Passing By said:
I don't understand why awareness is an inadequate translation for it though

krodha wrote:
Granted there are different modalities of rigpa, but in terms of why “awareness” in an inadequate gloss, squirrels have awareness, a dog has awareness, for example, but they do not have rig pa. Rig pa is “knowledge” in every use of the term, and in the definitive sense, knowledge of the snying po, or essence.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 31st, 2021 at 1:39 AM
Title: Re: Being on the high bhumis without knowing?
Content:
Lhasa said:
And what is the difference between Recognition and Realizing? If one has Recognized, then what?

krodha wrote:
Recognition [ngo shes] is generally related to the example jñāna the guru introduces. Then realization, rtogs pa, comes later.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 12th, 2021 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Atheism vs Buddhism (was Non Cultural Buddhists: What Made You Stay?)
Content:
krodha wrote:
I also hold that the buddhadharma is ultimately atheist and consider myself an atheist.

These teachings are true atheism in my eyes, going far beyond the popularized scientific materialist “atheists” who essentially worship mundane direct perceptions and cling to their own beliefs... no different than the religions they reject.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2021 at 12:59 PM
Title: Re: What is and isn't Yogacara?
Content:
karmanyingpo said:
Was the other stuff I said accurate?

krodha wrote:
I edited my post above and cited Mipham stating that true aspectarian also negates entities external to the mind.

As for whether everything you’ve said is accurate or not, my knowledge of the nuances of Yogācāra is somewhat superficial so I can’t be certain.

I do know that the premise of “mind only” is that phenomena or appearances are metal factors, and result from an activation of karmic traces in the ālayavijñāna.

Yogācāra also asserts a “container universe” which is a nexus of mutual influence where all sentient beings participate in manifesting what appears to be an external environment. This principle is also adopted in Vajrayāna systems.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2021 at 12:30 PM
Title: Re: What is and isn't Yogacara?
Content:
karmanyingpo said:
Yogacara does not mean that there is a mind that is like some kind of creator god that "projects" reality in the sense of fabricating things out of nothing

krodha wrote:
False-aspectarian Yogācāra does indeed assert that.

Edit: it appears true aspectarian may negate “extramental” entities as well, from Mipham:

In the case of the True Aspectarians, there are three possible ways in which the mental

aspects and consciousness may be said quantitatively to relate. This is similar to the situation with the Sautrantikas, except that whereas the latter affirm the existence of outer objects and say that they cast their aspects on the mind, the Chittamatrins simply consider that the object is an appearing mental aspect and deny the existence of extramental entities. This is the only point on which the Sautrantikas and Chittamatrins disagree.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 6th, 2021 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: Where are the "pratyekabuddha-yanist"?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In my understanding, pratyekabuddhas manifest realization based on their contact with a guru in a previous life (in some cases it has to be contact with a samyaksambuddha), and only manifest pratyekabuddhahood in a time and place when/where there is no Buddha nor extant lineage of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2021 at 4:07 PM
Title: Re: r/streamentry Reddit
Content:
cjdevries said:
For anyone that hasn't seen the subreddit r/streamentry, it's full of excellent meditation guides, conversations with serious practitioners about meditation techniques and experiences, and a list of reputable teachers. It's too good of a resource not to share with those that haven't seen it.

krodha wrote:
In my experience the stream entry subreddit is replete with people who are essentially deceiving themselves. There is no harm in exploring it, but be very careful.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 22nd, 2019 at 10:27 AM
Title: Re: Finding a qualified Teacher
Content:
passel said:
I thought Lama Lena was attached to Lama Wangdu, not Lama Wangdor?

krodha wrote:
Lama Wangdor.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 22nd, 2019 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Mind essence introduced in advaita and TB
Content:
Sherab said:
If not, I am left with the conclusion that you don't really understand what I wrote or you don't bother to understand what I was trying to say.

Finally, as far as I can see, the authority you cited in no way contradict my actual position and I have reasons to back that.

krodha wrote:
Your mentioning of the ideas I pointed out above, specifically the “mental representations” and breaking things down to fundamental constituents, seemed to be your position. If they aren’t then they certainly muddied the waters in terms of understanding your actual position.

At first you appeared to be taking issue with the import of Candrakīrti’s view on the two truths being species of cognition, but now you are saying you actually are in agreement with his view.

Honestly it is hard to decipher your position, but it would be nice to if you want to unpack it further.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 22nd, 2019 at 7:42 AM
Title: Re: Finding a qualified Teacher
Content:
Pero said:
Also, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa finished the four visions but his body was still here.

krodha wrote:
It appeared to be there from the standpoint of people’s karmic vision.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 20th, 2019 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: Mind essence introduced in advaita and TB
Content:

Sherab said:
What is this object?

Malcolm said:
Any given object has two natures, according to Candrakīrti possesses two natures: one ultimate, one relative. If you are not happy with this, take it up with Candrakīrti.

Sherab said:
I went through the possibilities of what the objects of cognition could be for a table and an example and you clearly could not reply my question directly. Why?

If you bother to try to answer my question directly instead of evading, you will notice that the object of cognition for a relative truth and an ultimate truth for a table can never be the same object until you drill down to the final parts that made up the object.

For the same reason, you will also notice that the object of cognition necessarily has to be a mental image rather than the object itself for a relative truth until you come to the final parts that made up the object.

krodha wrote:
This notion that (i) the object of cognition has to be a “mental image” rather than the “object itself, or (ii) the idea that you must “drill down to the final parts that made up the object” in order to have relative and ultimate truths be simultaneously applicable to a given object… are these your own ideas?

I’m not sure where you are deriving these notions from.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 16th, 2019 at 4:22 PM
Title: What is the nature of mind?
Content:
tatpurusa said:
Shunyata has nothing to do with nihilism. If you think ultimately sentient beings are nothing at all, you definitely do not understand what emptiness means.

krodha wrote:
All phenomena, including sentient beings, are ultimately unfindable, this is the actual meaning of emptiness. The ultimate invalidity if sentient beings is an integral teaching of the Mahāyāna that is found even in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Regarding nihilism, because I have not negated the conventional status of sentient beings, I have not advocated for a nihilist view.

tatpurusa said:
What is awareness? What is reality and what is illusion? Are sentient beings really, absolutely deluded in your opinion? Are samsara and suffering absolute reality? What is time and what is the relationship between time and emptiness?

krodha wrote:
This is a landslide of questions

tatpurusa said:
I have not asked this "landslide of questions" in order to somehow confuse you.

krodha wrote:
I never said you intended to confuse me, but seven questions launched in consecutive sentences is a bit excessive and unnecessary. Perhaps choose one or two so the conversation is manageable.

tatpurusa said:
I have asked them because their clarification is necessary in order to understand what the difference and what the relationship is between *ordinary, conditioned, conceptual mind" and "nature of mind

krodha wrote:
The ordinary, conditioned mind is dualistic, it cognizes external entities, and mistakes itself to be an established entity, a self, that acts as an agent, engaging in activities and being subjected to positive and negative occurrences, etc.

The nature of mind is the ordinary mind's actual nature, which is its ultimate insubstantiality.

When the nature of mind is defined as inseparable emptiness and clarity [stong gsal dbyer med], the actual meaning of this is "the emptiness of clarity," the emptiness of the knowing or cognizant aspect of the mind, and the unreality of the self that is imputed into that knowing, cognizant quality.

To know the nature of the mind we must awaken [budh]. Buddha literally means "awakened one" because a Buddha has awakened to the nature of their mind and has eradicated all obscurations so that they rest in that nature at all times.

In brief: when the mind is ignorant of its nature then it is expressed as the ordinary dualistic mind [skt. citta, tib. sems], with all of the implications listed above. This ignorance occurs because the mind's clarity, or its aware aspect is not recognized to be empty, and is reified as an abiding, background substratum as a result. That substrate becomes the foundation for the misconception of a self, and the misconception of external phenomena by default.

When ignorance ceases, the mind awakens to its actual nature, and the nature of phenomena in general. Meaning the self, and the substrate the self is imputed upon are realized to be false, and allegedly external entities — persons, places and things are also recognized to be false.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 16th, 2019 at 8:20 AM
Title: Re: Interesting excerpt from the (Hindu) Mahanirvana Tantra
Content:
tatpurusa said:
"Who" and "what" are these sentient beings in reality? Their ordinary, ever changing

minds?

krodha wrote:
This depends on what you mean by “reality.” If by “reality” you mean their actual nature, then these sentient beings are ultimately nothing at all. That absence of identity, essence, etc., is the ultimate truth of sentient beings, and everything for that matter.

Nevertheless, we do not engage in these teachings from the standpoint of ultimate truth, and if we insist on an ultimate view from the standpoint of our relative condition then we err into nihilism.

Therefore in the context of the application of these teachings, sentient beings are beings who are deluded regarding their actual nature.

tatpurusa said:
What is awareness? What is reality and what is illusion? Are sentient beings really, absolutely deluded in your opinion? Are samsara and suffering absolute reality? What is time and what is the relationship between time and emptiness?

tp.

krodha wrote:
This is a landslide of questions, I’m not sure what your intention is in asking all of these questions.

The point we are discussing is the fact that sentient beings are precisely “sentient beings” because they are ignorant of their nature. That nature is veiled due to the presence of adventitious obscurations, and therefore is “latent,” meaning “present but obstructed by certain conditions.”

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 16th, 2019 at 5:56 AM
Title: Re: Interesting excerpt from the (Hindu) Mahanirvana Tantra
Content:
Malcolm said:
When krodha says the nature of the mind is "latent," he means it is not something which is obvious to everyone. For example, like a crocodile under the water.

tatpurusa said:
I understand what krodha means. This does not make it correct though.

krodha wrote:
If I’m incorrect, then all sentient beings are aware of the nature of their minds at all times. Is this what you are asserting?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 16th, 2019 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Interesting excerpt from the (Hindu) Mahanirvana Tantra
Content:
Pero said:
Not really. We aren't all part of a tathagatagarbha.

Grigoris said:
I think your are being overly literal in the interpretation of the passage.

The Tathagatagarbha is also referred to as the Dharmadhatu in some traditions, where the Dharmadhatu is the ground/space of all existence. If somebody views the passage allegorically instead of literally...

krodha wrote:
Dharmadhātu is the emptiness of phenomena, and moreover is not held to be something actually established or real.

Tathāgatagarbha is just a name for the latent and unrecognized nature of mind, while obscured by affliction, delusion, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 15th, 2019 at 12:02 PM
Title: Re: Interesting excerpt from the (Hindu) Mahanirvana Tantra
Content:
krodha wrote:
I gave this excerpt just a brief skim and saw numerous points of departure that not even a replacement of terms would rectify.

Grigoris said:
Would you care to furnish an example?

krodha wrote:
These statements cannot be warped to fit the Buddhist view:

(i) man becomes liberated by the knowledge that he himself is Brahman (115). Final liberation is attained by the knowledge that the Atma (Soul) is the witness...

(ii) The soul which is detached from all things is ever liberated...

(iii) As the Sun (though one and the same) when reflected in different platters of water appears to be many, so by illusion the one soul appears to be many in the different bodies in which it abides (132).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 15th, 2019 at 4:03 AM
Title: Re: Interesting excerpt from the (Hindu) Mahanirvana Tantra
Content:
Grigoris said:
If you fiddle with it just a tiny bit (replace some terms) you will find that it differs only very slightly from Buddhist Tantra.

krodha wrote:
I gave this excerpt just a brief skim and saw numerous points of departure that not even a replacement of terms would rectify.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 14th, 2019 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Mind essence introduced in advaita and TB
Content:
krodha wrote:
You're being a bit too liberal with your interpretation of Ramana Maharshi's advice. He means "exclude all phenomena" in a literal sense, not simply as a temporary means to avoid distraction.

Grigoris said:
Are you sure you are not being too literal?

krodha wrote:
If only the purusa exists, then no, I'm not being too literal.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 14th, 2019 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: Mind essence introduced in advaita and TB
Content:
fckw said:
I once read this meditation instruction for Advaita Vedanta, it was propagated by a very respectable student of Ramana Maharishi:
Direct the awareness towards the totality of itself and exclude all phenomena.
Now, if you have received Dzogchen instructions you will immediately understand that such an approach cannot be compatible with the Dzogchen view.

Grigoris said:
Observing one's mind without distraction by "external phenomena" (the senses) is a technique taught in Mahamudra.

krodha wrote:
You're being a bit too liberal with your interpretation of Ramana Maharshi's advice. He means "exclude all phenomena" in a literal sense, not simply as a temporary means to

avoid distraction.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 13th, 2019 at 8:07 AM
Title: Re: Tulsi Gabbard
Content:

SonamTashi said:
It is all just opinions either way, but I think it is highly unlikely that the Democrats won't win.

ford_truckin said:
What everyone thought in 2016 and then the complete opposite happened.

krodha wrote:
The opposite didn’t happen given that Trump lost the popular vote.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 13th, 2019 at 8:04 AM
Title: Ways to Identify Naga Incense
Content:
krodha wrote:
Interested in tips on identifying what is and is not incense appropriate for nāgā offering.

I went to my local ling to buy some but they did not have any. Decided I would try a local Tibetan shop and they had a wide variety however even with ingredients listed the contents were still ambiguous due to the lists often ending with “etc.” or “and other fine substances.”

Any brands or types that are generally acceptable?

I am mainly using it for offering of remnants in the context of ganapuja.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 10th, 2019 at 8:18 AM
Title: Re: Does Mahayana lose its entire validity...
Content:
Thomas Amundsen said:
What about two-fold emptiness? I thought this is asserted as being absent from Hinayana and Pratyekabuddhayana.

krodha wrote:
True according to Gorampa:

In the context of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, since the unshared path of the Mahāyāna is primarily explained, having considered that the realization of freedom from proliferation is the realization of the selflessness of phenomena, that is said not to exist for śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.
Malcolm noted that arhats realize the emptiness of the self imputed onto the aggregates but not the emptiness of the aggregates themselves. This means the Śravākayāna only produces realization of one fold emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 10th, 2019 at 7:25 AM
Title: Re: Does Mahayana lose its entire validity...
Content:
krodha wrote:
This was discussed recently. This post and thread in general may be helpful:

https://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=28521&start=20#p447143

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 9th, 2019 at 1:51 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
Most who have practiced both paths in a serious manner state that in addition to being conceptually different, they are also experientially different.

Grigoris said:
Of course they would. They are, in both instances, judging a non-conceptual experience via their currently existing karmic view, after all.

krodha wrote:
No, I am saying that those who have practiced both paths, report that they are qualitatively different in an experiential sense. Like the taste of sugar and salt.

One would not assert that the taste of sugar and salt only differ in the aftermath of tasting them, when the non-conceptual experience of each is described differently.

They are actually different, experientially, as non-conceptual tastes. The same goes for these paths and their respective realizations, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 9th, 2019 at 1:28 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Vaktar said:

For a quarter-century (!) I and one other person have periodically discussed these or similar questions with one of the world's leading Vedanta scholars, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=usu_cLGXLg4&t=965s. At the end of the day, I can only concur with Nyoshul Khen Rinpoche and certain other Dzogchen masters before him, that what we call "Dzogchen" is what others call "connate wisdom", "great bliss", "Buddha-nature", or "Atman", or "God" and so on.

So is there a subtle difference or not? I think there are subtle differences of understanding, according to individual karma. There are also differences in terminology used to indicate "non-duality". But no such description can ever be axiomatic, unless we are willing to accept the finger that points at the moon as the moon itself.

Grigoris said:
I also believe that all of them glimpse the same thing (on the basis of the reported accounts of their experiences), but that post-experience, when karma driven conceptualisation kicks in, it is defined according to the criteria of each believer.

krodha wrote:
Most who have practiced both paths in a serious manner state that in addition to being conceptually different, they are also experientially different.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 6th, 2019 at 6:49 PM
Title: Re: Essence = nature, but emptiness ≠ clarity
Content:
Viach said:
Why are the two different aspects of Basis (emptiness and clarity) called two synonyms: essence (emptiness) and nature (clarity)?

krodha wrote:
“Essence” is how the Tibetan term ngo bo is glossed. “Nature” translates rang bzhin.

The ngo bo aspect of the nature of mind is its emptiness. The rang bzhin aspect of the nature of mind is its clarity.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 5th, 2019 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Visions thread
Content:
Sherab Rigdrol said:
What happened to it? I was on page 5 and now I get this you aren’t authorized to read this forum message!! It was a great thread. WTF?!!

krodha wrote:
Yeah weird.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 16th, 2018 at 4:10 PM
Title: Re: Can we discuss Theravada teachings?
Content:

ford_truckin said:
Yes, It seems like every guru/lama has a different opinion on this or that. With theravada you can go directly to the source (pali canon) and get a definitive answer.

krodha wrote:
Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna and also have definitive and reliable texts.

ford_truckin said:
Isn't the primary focus in Vajrayana on what your gurus tells you since they are supposed to be seen as manifestations of enlightened beings?

krodha wrote:
An advantage of Vajrayāna is that a living teacher provides a living transmission. This is actually how the buddhadharma is intended to be taught, as an aural system and lineage.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 16th, 2018 at 8:11 AM
Title: Re: Can we discuss Theravada teachings?
Content:
2ndchance said:
Well I am mainly a Varjrayana practitioner with interest in Mahayana teachings as well.

Lately, I have been delving into Theravada teachings as they seem pretty straightforward compared to Vajrayana teachings.

ford_truckin said:
Yes, It seems like every guru/lama has a different opinion on this or that. With theravada you can go directly to the source (pali canon) and get a definitive answer.

krodha wrote:
Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna and also have definitive and reliable texts.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 5th, 2018 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: New Head of Nyingma: Kathok Getse Rinpoche
Content:

Malcolm said:
It is quite clear he knew prior to his passing that he was going to pass soon.

krodha wrote:
What indication did he give?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 2nd, 2018 at 9:34 AM
Title: Re: How do we know our practice is working?
Content:
LoveFromColorado said:
That makes sense and does not sound contraversial at all to me. I get the not improving nor corrupting the view. Thank you for clarifying.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps not controversial to you, but certainly to those involved with more common systems. Which is why it is best to avoid broadcasting openly. It can inadvertently create aversion, etc., which becoming an obstacle for someone else, in the sense of a barrier to Dzogchen, is extremely negative.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 2nd, 2018 at 7:54 AM
Title: Re: How do we know our practice is working?
Content:
LoveFromColorado said:
It feels that there is something bordering on nihilism here in this conversation that is out of balance. I get that our experience and mind are dependent arising and that rigpa is beyond both but that does not seem to address the delicate balance of interacting with our experiences. With this pretense, it would seem that even regarding someone as a guru would be false. Why do guru yoga then? Why make practices for ChNN's health if we merely stop at rigpa being beyond experience and mind? There would be no point - surely there is something deeper here?

Does that make sense, and can anyone shed any light here?

krodha wrote:
The point is that within the context of the intimate instructions, the view that is pointed out is not dependent on one’s actions. No virtuous activity will improve it and no unvirtuous activity will corrupt it.

This does not mean we should ignore our conduct, but really even if you are a horrible person, if you receive the instructions in question and apply them there will be results.

It sounds extreme but makes sense in the actual experience. This was covered first hand with Malcolm earlier this year in Santa Fe, and the teaching leaves no doubt.

That said, it is indeed controversial and not something to parade around. And while it is true, it isn’t license to be an awful person.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 25th, 2018 at 4:47 PM
Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra
Content:
Malcolm said:
A couple of observations:

The term "true self" is nowhere used in any Indian or Tibetan Buddhist text, not even in gzhan stong texts.

Even in the Uttaratantra, where we find the Tibetan term, dam pa'i bdag in the discussion of ātmapāramitā, the Sanskrit text simply gives the term as ātma. The "dam pa" was added by Ngog Lotsawa to distinguish this "self," free from the proliferation of the self [i.e. existence] imputed by the hindus and nonself [i.e. nonexistence] imputed by śrāvakas, as a quality of the dharmakāya, — in other words, it is another way of saying the dharmakāya is free from extremes. This usage in the Uttaratantra comes from contrasting the impurity, nonidentity, suffering, and impermanence of compounded phenomena, with the purity, identity, bliss, and permanence of dharmakāya. But if someone should think this contextual usage of "self" with respect to dharmakāya means dharmakāya is an existent self, they have not understood anything of Mahāyāna at all, let alone Dzogchen, or even Buddhadharma for that matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 13th, 2018 at 2:03 PM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
PSM said:
I suppose the issue I have is that there simply isn't a correct conceptual view which accurately describes the ultimate nature. It simply will not fit into a box.

Two excellent quotes from Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:
The major mistake occurs when one intellectually conceives of what Dzogchen is and holds on to that concept tightly. So it is very important to incorporate the teachings into personal experience through the teacher's oral instructions.
When we say "Let go into nonfabrication," isn't that itself also unnatural? Isn't letting go also a fabrication? We use words because we have no other way to proceed, but saying "Let go, rest loosely!", doesn't mean that there is something that is being let go of and somebody who lets go. True letting go is without these two, beyond duality.
When you have finally attained stability in your practice, relying on such words as "Let go, rest loosely!" can be quite damaging. How can words compare to the naked, self-existing awareness itself? Words are just like rice husks.You will gradually cast words

away as your view deepens, as it becomes more profound. When the view reaches fullness, you will really know how much damage words cause.The practitioner should then recognize how submerged or entangled in words he has become.

oldbob said:
All good posts (words) on a subject that defies language.

So we are reading all these precious "secret" Dzogchen books only to go beyond all words.

krodha wrote:
Ineffability is actually true wherever we look, and isn't a principle that is exclusive to the nature of our mind. Even the tree outside is ineffable, no word actually captures the direct experience of it. That is all "ineffable" and being "beyond words" means.

The ineffability of our nature does not mean we should diminish the importance of words. When these teachers speak of our nature being "beyond words" they are only advising that we don't conflate the words with the actual experience.

If we had never tasted sugar before but had received teachings on the taste of "sweetness," we would not want to conflate the idea of "sweet" with the actual taste of sugar.

Nevertheless, the word "sweet" is accurate. Describing the taste of sugar as "salty," would be inaccurate.

While the actual taste of sugar is ineffable and cannot be captured by the word "sweet" or "salty," the conventional designation "sweet" is still correct.

Likewise with our nature, there are correct descriptions and incorrect descriptions. The adepts of the past spent a great deal of time ensuring accurate descriptions were upheld, and incorrect notions, like a oneness of the tīrthika persuasion, were rejected.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 12th, 2018 at 8:02 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
climb-up said:
Thank you. Is that from one of his books?
If so, which one?

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure which text. The latter quotation is an excerpt of an explanation that is quite a bit longer.

Chögyal Namkhai Norbu shares the same sentiments:

We speak of a space, or sky. We speak of this space as present within a vase or a room, or the sky. It is the same space. This means the zhi [gzhi] or basis for everyone is the same. The difference we explain in Hinduism or in Dzogchen is the difference between individuals. Because when we say individuals, we mean that I am not you. You are not her. We are not the same. Nor does it mean that when someone is realized, everyone is unified into them and it becomes a kind of ??. That is not what is meant.

Zhi or basis is always composed of a clarity of the individual. This is what we refer to with the example of the sun. If there were ten suns in the sky, we would distinguish ten different suns, and not say that all these ten are one sun. Thus sky and sun are two different things as a way of seeing.

I think people get confused and think that Dzogchen falls short in its view because conventional distinctions are upheld in certain contexts. They really want a “non-dual” view but don’t understand the implications of the Hindu type non-duality they attempt to project onto Dzogchen.

In reality Dzogchen goes further, and refines that non-dual view more than tīrthika dharmas do. All at the same time making more sense, and avoiding the inconsistencies that sometime arise due to the substantial, transpersonal oneness type non-dual views.

Much of these objections are because people think Dzogchen does not go far enough, but it surpasses all other non-dual views.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 12th, 2018 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
smcj said:
I think Lopön Tenzin Namdak and Kongtrul have differing opinions on this matter. That's ok as far as I'm concerned. To each his own.

Malcolm said:
They don have differing opinions actually, but in your strange misconception of the Dzogchen, you imagine they do.

smcj said:
There’s more than one way to skin a cat.

krodha wrote:
(a) that’s gross, (b) it’s not accurate given that Köngtrul was providing a standard description of the basis in general terms and said nothing that contradicts Lopön Rinpoche.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 10:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Lukeinaz said:
in the great book "The Mirror", it is said:

"it is this decisive knowing, this pure presence of the true original condition, that is called nirvana."

so i thought the primordial state is beyond both samsara and nirvana. here it sounds otherwise. thoughts?

krodha wrote:
In a sense, samsara and nirvāna both appear for the practitioner, but not for the primordial state.

There is no delusion in your nature, delusion and the exhaustion of delusion both occur secondarily, “on top” of the nature, as Malcolm once shared Khenpo Ngachung saying.

In Dzogchen we aren’t refining our nature, the primordial state, which is already always originally pure and naturally perfected. Instead we are refining and working with our knowledge [rig pa] of our nature. Samsara and nirvāna both occur within this scope of refining our rig pa, purifying obscurations, etc.

Lukeinaz said:
so the decisive knowing and the primordial state are distinct.

krodha wrote:
Yes, in a sense they are distinct, because if your rigpa and your nature were identical, then your rigpa would never become marigpa.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 9:45 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Lukeinaz said:
in the great book "The Mirror", it is said:

"it is this decisive knowing, this pure presence of the true original condition, that is called nirvana."

so i thought the primordial state is beyond both samsara and nirvana. here it sounds otherwise. thoughts?

krodha wrote:

In a sense, samsara and nirvāna both appear for the practitioner, but not for the primordial state.

There is no delusion in your nature, delusion and the exhaustion of delusion both occur secondarily, “on top” of the nature, as Malcolm once shared Khenpo Ngachung saying.

In Dzogchen we aren’t refining our nature, the primordial state, which is already always originally pure and naturally perfected. Instead we are refining and working with our knowledge [rig pa] of our nature. Samsara and nirvāna both occur within this scope of refining our rig pa, purifying obscurations, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 9:26 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here is Lopön Tenzin Namdak elaborating on the thig le nyag gcig, what “single” or “one” means in the context of Dzogchen:

That is Chigpu - without any partition. It means that each individual being has mind and the Nature is of a very similar quality.

Don't think that there is just one Nature (for everyone). Don't think it is like the sun, that there is just one sun but its rays cover everywhere. Each being has mind and wherever there is mind, there is Nature- it is not separate from mind but Nature is not just the same (one). Each individual being has Nature and this Nature is practiced and realized by the individual; it is the individual who takes the Result.

When the text says Thigle Nyagchig, it means similar quality; Emptiness, Clarity and Unification are the same everywhere.

For example, if you cut down one stick of bamboo you can see it is hollow and so you don't need to cut down all the bamboo. In a similar way, if you realize (the Nature of your Mind) it is your mind which liberates into Nature. All sentient beings who have mind are integrated with Nature. That is Thigle Nyagchig. That is what single means.

He then warns:

If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
One's nature is individual in a conventional sense, because the individual is likewise conventional.

In the actuality of the way things really are there is not any individuality, because entities cannot be established, but this does not mean there is some other ultimate substance that everything is reduced to, or subsumed into.

The ultimate nature of Dzogchen is non-reductive, because it is the unreality of the entities suggested by our ignorance, i.e., the insubstantiality of mind, and the insubstantiality of phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 7:15 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Diversity and individuality are permitted conventionally in Dzogchen, but not ultimately. Singularity is not held to be tenable conventionally or ultimately.

By "conventionally" I mean in the sense of how things appear [snang lugs], and by "ultimately" I mean how things really are [gnas lugs].

In any case a singular oneness is not found in these teachings either conventionally or in an ultimate sense. Holding to an idea of a singular, ultimate nature that is shared or transpersonal actually breaks the samaya of gcig pu.

Lopön Tenzin Namdak has been very vocal on this matter. Norbu Rinpoche has also clarified that plurality is acceptable but not a shared singularity. Ju Mipham speaks out against a singular ultimate nature. And the Rig pa rang shar also negates tirthika oneness and rejects tirthika systems which promote such a view.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 11th, 2018 at 2:57 AM
Title: Re: Non-duality in dzogchen
Content:
PSM said:
the dharmakaya of all buddhas is one, but mindstreams of sentient beings are separate. Seems there is a fine line to walk between dualism and monism.

krodha wrote:
Not “one” in a monistic sense, but rather “one” in the sense of an identical generic characteristic. Like the heat of all fires is one and the same as a generic characteristic that all fires have in common, or the wetness of water. Wherever you go, that quality of wetness is uniform and the same, no matter where you encounter water.

The nature of mind of each sentient being is qualitatively identical in that they’re all inseparable clarity and emptiness.

This avoids a transpersonal oneness like tirthika dharmas promote.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 9th, 2018 at 2:12 PM
Title: Re: The Self-Arisen Vidya Tantra and The Self-Liberated Vidya Tantra A Translation of the Rigpa Rang Shar and Rigpa Rang
Content:
jnanasutra said:
If Gzhon nu Dpa’ bo stobs ldan is teaching a retinue (which includes Vajrapani) that is merely an emanation of his own pristine consciousness, then when this buddha sees the appearances of six realms of samsara it must be the case that the beings in each realm must also be emanations of his pristine consciousness. I understand the idea of the Yogācāra container universe model, however, this model works from the perspective of a deluded mind. So how does this buddha view sentient beings? Are sentient beings similar to the retinue in that they are his own emanations? I know the general phrases, “buddhas don’t see sentient beings” and “sentient beings do not exist.” That is not what I am getting at. I am trying to understand this from a Man ngag sde perspective. Any thoughts? Thanks.

krodha wrote:
Malcolm wrote last year:

Malcolm said:
Buddhas know what sentient beings perceive, they just don't perceive it themselves. For example, buddhas only perceive sentient beings as other buddhas, they do not perceive them as sentient beings. But they know that sentient beings suffer from delusion.

krodha wrote:
As for the appearance of these sentient beings being their (buddha’s) own emanation, that all gets a bit abstract. I won’t pretend to know the official men ngag sde position on the matter. However the mind of a Buddha is dharmakāya, which emanates the form kāyas. Buddhas do not mistake their rtsal to be external entities (Longchenpa states rtsal is relative and not ultimately established anyway), nevertheless through compassion appearances manifest and buddhas acknowledge that sentient beings appear and are seemingly deluded.

How this potentially relates to the aspect of the collective projection of the container universe is interesting. Malcolm has said that despite the fact that it seems contradictory, Buddhas still have aggregates, which means they must still relate to the container universe in some respect even though they know it is unreal, e.g., magicians who know their illusion to be unreal even if others perceive it to be otherwise.

That said I get that you are asking how the collective projection of a container universe by numerous sentient beings on the relative level with the catalyst of delusion is related to how a buddha perceives the appearances that are the basis of designation for the purported, aforementioned, relative phenomena in question (sentient beings, container universe etc.).

Thought provoking questions. I don't have the answer, but appreciate that you're asking questions of this nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 5:48 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
They manage, however, to cast doubt on people who are likely to play a major role in the future of the DC.

krodha wrote:
The intention isn't to cast doubt. But that said they do have some big shoes to fill. I hope they remain mindful of that and walk the line.

I'm all for individual expression, but not at the expense of the integrity of Rinpoche's legacy and the foundation he already laid via example.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 5:37 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Miroku said:
Understandable. However, for a year we are supposed to observe a mourning aperiod as requested by the family. And although your concern is for sure based on a good intention now it is not the time to share it. Lets just mindfully chill and do guruyoga.

krodha wrote:
That is all well and good. I'm just responding to the article the Melong republished yesterday.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 5:23 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:

Miroku said:
Elio has said he would do it differently so probably no need to worry about him becoming an advaitin.

Grigoris is right, this is better to take to the man himself.

krodha wrote:
Trust me no one is worried about Elio becoming an Advaitin, certainly not I. He only reconsidered controversial epigraph after the Vajracakra discussion was brought to his attention.

Really this isn't about Elio specifically, but about the integrity of ChNN's teaching being maintained by those who now carry the torch. That is the import of my gripe.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 5:12 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong rhetoric has nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Grigoris said:
Well, it seems that for some it does.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong is a sūtrayāna system, their principles are no more applicable to Dzogchen than any other sūtra system, arguably less so given that their tenets are in direct conflict with the view of Dzogchen in various ways.

Grigoris said:
And no Indian tathāgatagarbha literature ever used the term "true self" [satyātman].
You have read all the Indian tahagatagarbha literature in Sanskrit?

krodha wrote:
This has been discussed on here before, "true self" only appears in English translations of tathāgatagarbha sūtras and is a reflection of the translator's interests rather than anything accurate to the source material.

Grigoris said:
And maybe the Indian literature doesn't, but the Tibetan literature uses the term.

krodha wrote:
Rarely. Even then, figures like Dolbupa were certain to ensure such verbiage was understood to be a rhetorical device and not a reference to anything literal.

Nevertheless, this has nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Grigoris said:
I appreciate Elio’s contributions in terms of translations etc., but I’m not at all interested in why he harbors an affinity for tirthika type verbiage and ideas in general.
So you are not actually interested in receiving an answer for question, you are just here to bitch about Elio?

krodha wrote:
Im here to bitch and engage in constructive discussion.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 4:57 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
krodha wrote:
If it exists, it is exceptionally rare.

Grigoris said:
Not in Shengtong literature it isn't. There it is basically an epithet for Buddha Nature / Tathagatagarbha.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong rhetoric has nothing to do with Dzogchen. And no Indian tathāgatagarbha literature ever used the term “true self” [satyātman].

Grigoris said:
Why don't you contact Elio and ask him about his use of the term?

krodha wrote:
I appreciate Elio’s contributions in terms of translations etc., but I’m not at all interested in why he harbors an affinity for tirthika type verbiage and ideas in general.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 4:52 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
While I think this is absolutely silly, i'll let the thread continue if it generates something productive, but IMO given the recent requests regarding behavior, it's pretty borderline.

treehuggingoctopus said:
The thread is absolutely silly, and the timing is very bad.

krodha wrote:
“Silly” is not a valid assessment or critique. If you have an issue with the subject matter then at least attempt to use your words an explain your opinion like our friend Johnny did.

As for the timing, that is what prompted concern in the first place.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 1:57 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Again, there are other Dzogchen teachers who have used the term,

krodha wrote:
My teacher did not. None of my teachers have. I’ve really never encountered any Dzogchen teachers who use the term, and I’ve been interacting with individuals who would love fodder of that nature to substantiate their colorful predilections for nearly a decade.

If it exists, it is exceptionally rare.

Johnny Dangerous said:
say nothing of Tibetan teachers generally, context is everything, asnd using the term doesn't suddenly make someone an Advaitin.

krodha wrote:
At no point in this discussion did I assert it makes someone an “Advaitin,” I simply said it is potentially misleading, and misrepresentative of the teacher and legacy said author is writing on behalf of.

As for the rest of what you said, very well.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 1:40 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
IDK, I think it's kind of funny that so shortly after Rinpoches death you are publicly appointing yourself as a guardian of what he would or would not support,

krodha wrote:
I'm writing in a public Buddhist discussion forum, in the Dzogchen section. That is hardly "publicly appointing" myself. Don't be rude.

Norbu Rinpoche had many opportunities to translate numerous terms as "true self" and never did.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Beyond that, what "notions" do you see in the article, other than your objection to a specific term?

krodha wrote:
The article is generally just fine, as I've stated.

Johnny Dangerous said:
The point stands, saying that anything here is fundamentally "non-Buddhist" is your biases and experiences, not a reflection of the situation.

krodha wrote:
A "true self" is not a concept used in Dzogchen.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Someone simply using the term "true self" is not the same as teaching of Buddha nature as a fundamental substance or something, there's a distinction.

krodha wrote:
I would disagree but to each their own.

Johnny Dangerous said:
According to your understanding of Dzogchen

krodha wrote:
Not my own understanding, according to the teaching itself, which adamantly rejects all notions of a self.

Johnny Dangerous said:
I can think of Dzogchen teacher off the top of my head who uses the term occasionally, and again, using a term once or twice is not the same as elucidating a concept, and so far you haven't demonstrated that the latter is going on here.

krodha wrote:
Again I disagree with the use of the term, and the author in question is a bit of a repeat offender.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 1:21 PM

Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
I'm really failing to see how he is "introducing non-Buddhist concepts" into anything, he's used a contentious term - and sure, we can debate the merit of that term for sure, but then the other thing you are complaining about, apparently he already walked back. You had no issue with the rest of the article, So really, what is the problem?

krodha wrote:
Again, the issue is that Elio, amongst other individuals are now the spokespeople for my teacher's organization and are representing his legacy in the sense that they comprehend the subject matter and can effectively communicate Norbu Rinpoche's view.

Notions of a "true self" completely deviate from ChNN's teaching.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Additionally, while I think the "true self" thing can be loaded in some instances, Zen teachers have been talking in a similar manner for years, so while it might trigger the sirens of Vajrayana/Dzogchen-oriented practitioners, saying it is "non Buddhist" is debatable, not wrong, just debatable.

krodha wrote:
Well it does indeed go against the grain in a Dzogchen context.

East Asian traditions were in further proximity from the climate of polemics that the Indians and Tibetans regularly encountered, and thus yes, are at times a bit more loose with their terminology and ideas.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 1:04 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
It seems more like some Buddhists have an unnecessarily reactive relationship with some English words, even when contextually they seem fine.

krodha wrote:
Possibly. However at the same time these principles are quite foreign, despite your insistence that they are mere synonyms for more common tenets.

Johnny Dangerous said:
Beyond that, honestly, don't you think Rinpoche would have had something to say if he'd had this concern? Trying really hard to take this seriously, but having a hard time.

krodha wrote:

Elio clarified that he did not get permission from Rinpoche to use the Ramana Maharshi quote, and that if he had the opportunity to go back in time and leave the quotation out, he would.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 12:58 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Him using the term "self", and quoting Maharishi Ramana once is "introducing non-Buddhist themes"? Can you unpack that please?

krodha wrote:
“True self” is the term used, which is predominantly non-Buddhist.

Ramana Maharshi is a teacher of Advaita Vedanta.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 12:35 PM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
I don't understand your issues with the article.

krodha wrote:
I was clear from the beginning that I have no issue with the article itself.

I’m simply questioning Elio’s reoccurring habit of introducing non-Buddhist themes into his writings on Dzogchen. While at the same time questioning whether this activity accurately represents the intention of our late master.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 10:09 AM
Title: Re: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
It really seems like much ado about nothing, how different is it to use "True Self" vs. "True Nature"? I'm almost positive I've seen "True Nature" used in things in a similar or identical manner that you've never complained about, but I could be wrong. Seems perhaps you're finding an Advaitic conspiracy where none exists.

krodha wrote:
It’s no doubt much ado about nothing, but so be it. Stating that “true self” and “true nature” are synonymous or carry the same connotation is a far stretch.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 4th, 2018 at 7:09 AM
Title: Merging With The True Self While Dying by Elio Guarisco: Why?
Content:
krodha wrote:
http://melong.com/merging-true-self-dying/

The Melong resurrected this talk given by Elio in 2011, revised now in 2018 and republished.

A nice article in itself, but why Elio insists on the tirthika overtones, such as needlessly including “true self” in the title of this article which otherwise does not mention anything of that sort, is something I don’t get. Seems to be a continual theme in his contributions, which are otherwise quite nice.

This article was originally published 2 years prior to Elio’s Marvelous Primordial State which featured the controversial addition of a Ramana Maharshi quote as the epigraph. Elio later stated that this was perhaps a mistake, or at the very least something he should have reconsidered.

Why do I care? Because with Rinpoche passing, individuals like Elio are going to end up being spokespeople for Norbu Rinpoche’s organization and legacy.

ChNN was always very careful with his translation choices and what he decided to publish in written form. There was a clear and thorough attention to detail on his part.

Despite arguments that could be made in relation to the principle of bdag nyid chen po, the implementation of “true self” in such a cavalier manner — in the title of an article where it isn’t even necessary no less — is a bit reckless in my opinion.

While I should take Elio’s advice from this article, that ”…most of the time the opinions we hold on to with great attachment are useless.” I’m still marginally concerned and am airing my grievances.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 28th, 2018 at 11:45 AM
Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Update
Content:
krodha wrote:
The title of this thread is somewhat vague. This really isn’t any old “update,” not that the title needs to state anything explicitly, but it falls short of capturing the importance of this, and could be easily overlooked.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 28th, 2018 at 8:34 AM
Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Update
Content:
javier.espinoza.t said:
please mods, delete this thread. let's keep this quiet as is supposed.

krodha wrote:
The Namkhai Family has announced it and therefore wish it to be known. No need to keep it quiet.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 28th, 2018 at 8:27 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
FROM MERIGAR ITALY:

Dear friends,

Tonight, Thursday 27 September, at 9 pm our beloved Master left this earthly existence in a serene and peaceful way, at his residence, Gadeling, Merigar.
The Namkhai Family

We ask everyone to respect the privacy of the Family and the request for silence and reflection.

Students from all over the world are coming to Merigar to be together and practice. The daily collective practices are continuing and as soon as we receive directions from the Namkhai Family we will let you know how you can pay your respects and honor our beloved and precious Master.

Please remember that at the moment the Master is in Thugdam (Samadhi), a phase that lasts from 3 to 7 days that should not be disturbed.

Merigar Gakyil

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2018 at 2:55 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pema Yolo said:
Maybe this is a stupid question, but if one has the freedom and means to travel to Merigar (not to say that it would be easy, far from it) and is a student of ChNN, should it be endeavored at this time or is it better to practice at home? It's hard to know what to

do in this situation.

krodha wrote:
Now is the time to go.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 17th, 2018 at 11:58 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Nice turnout in Berkeley tonight. Our sangha is fairly small so glad to see numbers like this. Hopefully everywhere else is experiencing the same during this important time.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 17th, 2018 at 8:38 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2018 at 12:09 PM
Title: Re: What Shamatha tradition best prepares one for Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also per Malcolm, from the sgra thal ‘gyur tantra:
The faults of not meditating are:
the characteristics of samsara appear to one,
there is self and other, object and consciousness,
the view is verbal,
the field is perceptual,
one is bound by afflictions,
also one throws away the path of the buddhahood,
one does not understand the nature of the result,
a basis for the sameness of all phenomena does not exist,
one's vidyā is bound by the three realms,
and one will fall into conceptuality.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2018 at 11:11 AM
Title: Re: What Shamatha tradition best prepares one for Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Noteworthy prior examples of what Malcolm has written on this subject:

Samadhi/dhyāna is a natural mental factor, we all have it. The problem is that we naturally allow this mental factor to rest on afflictive objects such as HBO, books, video games, etc.

Śamatha practice is the discipline of harnessing our natural predisposition for concentration, and shifting it from afflictive conditioned phenomena to nonafflictive conditioned phenomena, i.e., the phenomena of the path. We do this in order to create a well tilled field for the growth of vipaśyāna. Śamatha ultimately allows us to have mental stability and suppresses afflictive mental factors so that we may eventually give rise to authentic insight into the nature of reality. While it is possible to have vipaśyāna without cultivating śamatha, it is typically quite unstable and lacks the power to effectively eradicate afflictive patterning from our minds. Therefore, the basis of all practice in Buddhadharma, from Abhidharma to the Great Perfection, is the cultivation of śamatha as a preliminary practice for germination of vipaśyāna.
And,
Rongzom makes the point very clearly that Dzogchen practitioners must develop the mental factors that characterize the first dhyana, vitarka, vicara, pritvi, sukha and ekagraha, i.e. applied attention, sustained attention, physical ease, mental ease and one-pointedness. If you do not have a stable śamatha practice, you can't really call yourself a Dzogchen practitioner at all. At best, you can call yourself someone who would like to be a Dzogchen practitioner a ma rdzogs chen pa. People who think that Dzogchen frees one from the need to meditate seriously are seriously deluded.
And,
Whether you are following Dzogchen or Mahamudra, and regardless of your intellectual understanding, your meditation should have, at base, the following characteristics:

Prthvi -- physical ease
Sukha -- mental joy
Ekagraha -- one-pointedness
Vitarka -- initial engagement
Vicara -- sustained engagement

If any of these is missing, you have not even achieved perfect śamatha regardless of whether or not you are using an external object, the breath or even the nature of the mind… Even in Dzogchen, the five mental factors I mentioned are key without which you are really not going to make any progress.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2018 at 11:05 AM
Title: Re: What Shamatha tradition best prepares one for Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Śamatha needn’t be Dzogchen specific.

As mentioned above the mental factors that accompany the first dhyāna are an ideal foundation for Dzogchen practice. The “first dhyāna” means the initial dhyāna in the

very same dhyānic strata cultivated in sūtrayāna.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2018 at 9:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Zen on enlightenment and post-enlightenment
Content:
krodha wrote:
Florin,

I respected your wishes regarding not sharing restricted quotes in the public forum but there's no way I'm continuing this discussion in the private messages. The prospect of a long drawn out discussion on pm is daunting.

I always view these interactions as collective ventures in a way, in that they engender constructive inquiry for everyone. I'd rather the forum as a whole have accesss to discussion.

In any case, I removed the quotes, and will refer to them in response but won't post them. By the way, many, or most of the quotes lack citations indicating where they originate from.

Maybe going forward we can simply say "X" tantra communicates such-and-such and share the message of the text in question via summary without having to worry about quoting restricted material verbatim.

Unfortunately much is left to be desired in your response sans all the quotations. Your arguments are deprived of reference, but your comments capture enough of your retort to reveal some semblance of the import the quotes are intended to substantiate.

In any case I didn't run this past you but your writing is straight forward and I removed the quotes so I don't anticipate you taking issue with bringing the interaction back to the main forum.

I will respond later this evening when I get a chance.

- Kyle
florin said:
Hi Kyle,

I thought long and hard about posting this in public.

Since most of the quoted material is restricted i decided to be respectful
Here is my answer.

First of all these are very complicated topics and some of the points reflected in these quotations are controversial and not easily understood.

My passion for dzogchen does not give me any license to uphold the correctness of my interventions around some of the quotes provided. So in other words passion does not equal correctness. Like many i struggle with these issues but i am trying my best to be respectful and understand these things correctly and in their proper context.

krodha wrote:
This does not mean samsara is pure

florin said:
There are many instances in dzoghcen tantras where both productions of samsara and nirvana are said to be understood as pure from the very beginning .
nor does it mean delusion regarding mind and appearance does not lead to suffering
.

My understanding is that if we do not valorize suffering through the view of dzogchen it remains an understanding that is of the lower yanas, where we have processes based on the subject object split and where causes and conditions play an important role in generating, across a temporal line, the result of suffering.
Nevertheless, sentient beings do not accurately apprehend these appearances.
In Dzogchen affliction is not found in appearances, it is found in the mind.
The fact that we use expressions like "deluded appearances " does not mean that we are thinking somehow that appearances are themselves deluded in isolation from the influence of misapprehension. In the context of the dzogchen view if you posit a mind like you seem to do you fall in the view of the two truths.
You are not differentiating between (i) mind, (ii) pristine consciousness [jñāna], and (iii) appearances.
Well, prior to knowing the state of dzogchen we can make as many differentiations as we like.
Why would we need to differentiate anything while in the state of dozgchen ? When the view is transmitted there is only one truth that we need to know.
But if we don't have the capacity to know that truth at that time we are not yet at the level of dzogchen.
We find a similar explanation from Rongdzompa:

khroda said:
Again, this is merely clarifying that appearance is the rtsal of vidyā, and is unafflicted.

florin said:
TNR made this statement to oppose the view that maintains enlightenment is ONLY when the mind is un-deluded. Since mind is seen as the energetical manifestation of our state it is not the case that the mind itself can get un-deluded ONLY, in isolation of the basis where arises from.
Your vidyā must be purified of mind
Since one rests in the knowledge of one's state what mind is there to purify ? One has already arrived at the supreme goal. At the time of knowledge mind has been completely conquered and diversity is understood as the empty clear light wisdom of

our already enlightened state.In lower yanas the abyss of no-knowledge and knowledge is crossed in eons or lifetimes but here through the empowering energy of our masters transmission the abyss is crossed in no time.
it is not the case that your vidyā is free from association with affliction at this time. This purification is accomplished at the time of the result, and not before then.
At any moment one can connect with the transmission of knowledge at that instant one is a Buddha.

But mostly we are Buddhas for a second or two.
That said, we are in agreement regarding appearances. Although it is worth noting that Dzogchen still differentiates between karmic appearances and the appearance of dharmatā, the latter is primarily used for support on the path, and the former is then at a later time, correctly apprehend as a result.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 20th, 2018 at 2:41 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Zen on enlightenment and post-enlightenment
Content:
florin said:
Here we are talking about essential views of yanas and not about explanations of inner workings or processes.

krodha wrote:
This is not entirely true.

florin said:
It is very useful if we can make a distinction between view that represents the essence of a given teaching and classifications, categorizations and explanations of inner processes.

Indeed dzogchen talks about how delusion arises but as per the unique view of dzogchen that is nothing other than the empty energetical manifestation of our own state.

krodha wrote:
Sure, however the point still stands that sentient beings do not properly apprehend the appearance of “their own state.”

florin said:
Through introduction this empty ever-changing but solidified light of our experience is turned upside down. At the time of introduction this view clearly explains that the entire diversity of samsaric and nirvanic activity is a manifestation of our own state.

krodha wrote:
This does not mean samsara is pure, nor does it mean delusion regarding mind and appearance does not lead to suffering.

florin said:
Again this quote is completely acceptable as the view of other yanas but is not something that is equivalent with dzogchen teachings.

"When the mind is deluded, that is cyclic existence.
If the mind is undeluded, that is called enlightenment."

krodha wrote:
Again the context is lost.

florin said:
The fact that appearances themselves are the nature of enlightenment whether they are deluded appearances or enlightened appearances.

krodha wrote:
This is a special tenet of Dzogchen. Unlike other systems which consider appearances to be the afflicted expression of mind, in Dzogchen appearances are considered to be the pure display of vidyā.

Nevertheless, sentient beings do not accurately apprehend these appearances.

In Dzogchen affliction is not found in appearances, it is found in the mind.

florin said:
Whereas the quote seems to ONLY recognise the un-deluded mind as enlightenment. Which is to say enlightenment is "this" but is not "that".

krodha wrote:
Enlightenment or awakening [bodhi] is indeed something specific.

You are not differentiating between (i) mind, (ii) pristine consciousness [jñāna], and (iii) appearances.

florin said:
This is a partial view and it is the rejection of oral transmission.

This partial view as Thinley Norbu explains is not the teaching of dzogchen:

Also, it is said:
When the mind is deluded, that is cyclic existence. If the mind is undeluded, that is called enlightenment.

This explanation is not the teachings of Dzogpa Chenpo or Mahasandhi, because it is the belief of all the lower vehicles. So therefore, here, according to the view of Dzogpa Chenpo, even though all phenomena are appearing in the mind, it must be decided that appearance itself is naturally enlightened Buddha.

krodha wrote:
Right, appearance is the rtsal of vidyā. That is the only point being made.

florin said:
Here below we find what is actually introduced at the time of introduction. I think it is important to understand this idea and not replace it with a view from other yanas.

In one body and in a single lifetime, without hardships, there can be the great ascendancy over the domain of the Original Protector. This is so because of the greatness of obviously apparent fully
enlightened Buddhahood. In the causal vehicle, effort is made to purify obscurations and accumulate merit over a period of many eons, and after
an extended period of time, the state of the result of Buddhahood is still
not apparent. This is not like that. This is directly being introduced to self awareness as the nature of the Three Kayas. Then, by staying in that state,
Buddha is just now. This is called the greatness of obviously apparent fully enlightened Buddhahood. From this, the lower views are conquered with splendor.

krodha wrote:
This is simply communicating that the path of Dzogchen is resting in the view of dharmatā from the very beginning. Even so, in Dzogchen obscurations and affliction is also exhausted and purified, just differently.

florin said:
From The Tantra of Victorious Wisdom of the Three Realms: Realizing the discerning nature of one's own mind Is fully enlightened Buddhahood. This is also the three realms of existence. This is also all the great elements. "The three realms" means all sentient beings of the three realms of existence. "The great elements" are the immeasurable elements of the three realms of existence. Thus, as said, that which is called the discerning wisdom of one's mind is unmistakably knowing the nature of mind.

krodha wrote:
This is also non-controversial.

florin said:
We find a similar explanation from Rongdzompa:
Clear understanding of one's mind means understanding perfectly the nature of one's mind. In this regard the (customary) explanation is that when the mind is deluded this is samsara while
when it has understanding and is no longer deluded this is enlightenment (bodhi), but this does not correspond to the Dzogchen tradition as it is also confirmed by the lesser vehicles. So
here [where the true Dzogchen tradition is explained] one must understand that, even though all phenomena appear as mind, appearance itself is the nature of enlightenment of the Buddhas.

krodha wrote:
Again, this is merely clarifying that appearance is the rtsal of vidyā, and is unafflicted.

florin said:
This is very clear. There is nowhere that says that because phenomena appear as mind we must consider that as samsara. When we are actually not recognising the fact that these bad experiences we have are the clear light energetical manifestations of our state

krodha wrote:
Fundamentally this is the case, but that is just an idea until you recognize it.

florin said:
we believe that we need somehow to get involved with various purificatory rites to accumulate merit and wisdom so we can turn our state into an enlightened state at a later date

krodha wrote:
Your vidyā must be purified of mind, it is not the case that your vidyā is free from association with affliction at this time. This purification is accomplished at the time of the result, and not before then.

florin said:
sometime in the future.This way of thinking becomes the perfect reflection of:

When the mind is deluded, that is cyclic existence. If the mind is un-deluded, that is called enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
If you believe your experience is free from affliction and your mind pure at this time, then alright, that is a belief you are welcome to uphold. I do not share this opinion.

florin said:
And for the record i am not one of those that advocates that this fact of innate liberation is constantly and at all times known by us and as a consequence there is nothing to do. No.The question of capacity to recognise this fact applies. But we should be aware of something very simple.The fact that we are not in this knowledge does no make it necessary to deviate via the lower vehicles and adopt their views.

krodha wrote:
The only “lower yāna” view being repudiated by the quotations you have cited is the view that appearances are the afflicted display of mind.

florin said:
It is not necessary to deviate.The capacity to recognise, stay and live in this knowledge gets developed exactly through the application of oral, symbolic and direct

transmission principles of dzoghcen. And here we find many methods.

krodha wrote:
No one is suggesting that you deviate, but if you do not think you are experiencing samsara at this time, or that your mind is not deluded, then you are confused.

That said, we are in agreement regarding appearances. Although it is worth noting that Dzogchen still differentiates between karmic appearances and the appearance of dharmatā, the latter is primarily used for support on the path, and the former is then at a later time, correctly apprehend as a result.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2018 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Zen on enlightenment and post-enlightenment
Content:
florin said:
There are lots of dzogchenpa's that hold the following view:
When the mind is deluded, that is cyclic existence.
If the mind is undeluded, that is called enlightenment.

Unfortunately this is completely incorrect .

krodha wrote:
Such a view is not incorrect. The fact that phenomena are already liberated does not mean you possess a working knowledge of this.

Vairocana:

At the time of vidyā, wisdom arises as the dhātu; at the time of avidyā, wisdom appears as samsara.

florin said:
The idea was that the view from that passage does not represent the teaching of dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Why not? Dzogchen as a teaching contains much nuance and context. It isn’t so cut any dry.

florin said:
You cannot hold that view and yet consider yourself a dzogchenpa .

krodha wrote:
Which view? That the deluded mind results in samsara?

The system of Dzogchen spends a great deal of time explaining how delusion occurs

and the mind becomes entrenched in suffering.

Many Dzogchenpas nowadays have trouble accounting for context. They will either (i) read an exposition given by an adept explaining the view of equipoise and/or non-regressive wisdom, or (ii) details explaining the actuality of one's nature as uncorrupted, etc.

They will then think either (i) or (ii) or both, apply to their current situation.

The latter, part (ii) is indeed applicable to our current situation but as a latent truth which must be recognized. Until such recognition occurs, delusion is present in the mind and samsara is in tact.

There is no samsara or nirvana for one's nature, but there is for you, the practitioner.

Inversely, part (i) is really only applicable to seasoned adepts.

It is imperative that we remain mindful of context and nuance in Dzogchen, otherwise we run the risk of deceiving ourselves.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2018 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Zen on enlightenment and post-enlightenment
Content:
florin said:
There are lots of dzogchenpa's that hold the following view:
When the mind is deluded, that is cyclic existence.
If the mind is undeluded, that is called enlightenment.

Unfortunately this is completely incorrect .

krodha wrote:
Such a view is not incorrect. The fact that phenomena are already liberated does not mean you possess a working knowledge of this.

Vairocana:

At the time of vidyā, wisdom arises as the dhātu; at the time of avidyā, wisdom appears as samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 17th, 2018 at 5:14 AM
Title: Re: Kenshō the first Bhumi?
Content:
krodha wrote:

Thanks for your insight Meido. You and I are saying the same thing, just coming from two different traditions.

When I say “equipoise” [tib. mnyam bzhag] I mean samadhi infused with prajñā just as you describe. In the system I practice, Dzogchen, the path is likewise considered incomplete until equipoise and post-equipoise, i.e., periods of lapse in samadhi, are seamlessly fused.

The process of which involves, just as you said, departing from and returning to equipoise again and again, until habitual patterns and obscurations are exhausted to a degree that the “view” becomes unfragmented.

Very refreshing to see this process mirrored in the Zen path.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2018 at 6:25 AM
Title: Re: Kenshō the first Bhumi?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Realization and insight are always sudden and immediate

Astus said:
An unstable realisation is not realisation at all, only a passing feeling. Attaining a stage of the path means not losing it later.

krodha wrote:
The insight is what one does not lose, but the experiential equipoise resting in a direct knowledge of one’s nature does indeed come and go.

What remains is the insight, like seeing a snake in a dark room to actually be a rope, that insight is never lost. There is no way someone could convince you that the rope is a snake ever again.

Same goes for seeing the nature of phenomena. That insight never diminishes. But equipoise in jñāna does indeed lapse back into normal vijñāna because the view is unstable due to habitual patterns of grasping and conceptual proliferation.

Astus said:
but just as in other Buddhist systems, that knowledge is unstable and must be carefully cultivated from then on in order to eventually actualize buddhahood.
Knowledge does need actualisation, hence the process of learning, understanding, and cultivation. But then seeing nature would mean not the perception of buddha-mind, but merely the concept that mind is buddha.

krodha wrote:
Initial knowledge merely requires a recognition of the dharmatā of mind or phenomena.

The equipoise that the knowledge results from is initially fragmented and unstable however.

Astus said:
Temicco shared some excerpts that demonstrate this
Clearly, there are various teachers with various teachings.

krodha wrote:
However these are Zen teachers, and their description of the path is very much like those we find elsewhere, such as Dzogchen for example. The fluctuation between equipoise and post-equipoise is a common theme.

Astus said:
I found this quite interesting, especially given the much asserted “non-gradual” view of Zen.
Yangshan said:

"The roots of delusion are deep. They’re difficult to cut off and uproot. So [the Buddha] established expedient means to grab your attention. These are like showing yellow leaves to a crying child, who imagines they’re gold and thus stops crying. You act as though you’re in a shop where someone sells a hundred goods made from gold and jade, but you’re trying to weigh each item. So you say that Shitou has a real gold shop? Well in my shop there’s a wide range of goods! If someone comes looking for mouse turds then I give him some. If someone comes looking for real gold then I give it to him."
(Zen's Chinese Heritage, p 187)

krodha wrote:
Again this goes back to the common misconception that those who practice Zen are actualizing buddhahood in one fell swoop. Sure, a rare few may have that capacity, but not the vast majority. Those with such capacity in Dzogchen for example haven’t been seen for hundreds of years according to the Dalai Lama, hence it is said they are rarer than stars in the daytime.

Astus said:
Evidently the equipoise and post-equipoise process that other systems deal with is also very much the case for Zen, and in this sense initial awakening can be viewed as something like first bhūmi, with equipoise beginning as fragmented and becoming slowly less so as obscurations are exhausted.
"Those with deluded minds appear to be cultivating and seeking buddhahood, but they are unenlightened to their self-natures. Hence are they of small capacities. If one is to be enlightened to the sudden teaching, one cannot cultivate externally (i.e., superficially): one should just constantly activate correct views in one’s own mind, and the enervating defilements of the afflictions will be rendered permanently unable to defile one. This is to see the nature."
(Platform Sutra, ch 2, p 32)

krodha wrote:

This is addressing those who have not yet known equipoise at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2018 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: Kenshō the first Bhumi?
Content:
shanehanner said:
is Kenshō considered the first Bhumi

Astus said:
Going by the stages is the gradual path. Seeing nature means the realisation of buddha-mind, and as such it is the attainment of buddhahood.

"[The teaching that one can] cultivate the six perfections and the myriad practices in order to achieve Buddhahood—this is the progressive [approach to Buddhahood]. Since beginningless time, there has never been a Buddha [who achieved that state] progressively. Just be enlightened to the One Mind and there will not be the slightest dharma that can be attained—this is the true Buddha."
(Huangbo: Essentials of the Transmission of Mind, in Zen Texts, BDK ed, p 14)

krodha wrote:
Zen and Chan technically teach progressive refinement just as every other system does.

Realization and insight are always sudden and immediate, but just as in other Buddhist systems, that knowledge is unstable and must be carefully cultivated from then on in order to eventually actualize buddhahood.

Temicco shared some excerpts that demonstrate this:

From Yuanwu:
When you reach the point where feelings are ended, views are gone, and your mind is clean and naked, you open up to Zen realization. After that it is also necessary to develop consistency, keeping the mind pure and free from adulteration at all times. If there is the slightest fluctuation, there is no hope of transcending the world.
And,
Keep working like this, maintaining your focus for a long time still, to make your realization of enlightenment unbroken from beginning to end.
Shido Bunan states:
If you can really get to see your fundamental mind, you must treat it as though you were raising an infant. Walking, standing, sitting, lying down, illuminate everything everywhere with awareness, not letting him be dirtied by the seven consciousnesses. If you can keep him dear and distinct, it is like the baby's gradually growing up until he's equal to his father-calmness and wisdom dear and penetrating, your function will be equal to that of the buddhas and patriarchs.
From Hongren:
[E]ven though phenomena are essentially empty, it is necessary to preserve the basic

true mind with perfect clarity, because then delusive thoughts do not arise, and egoism and possessiveness disappear.
Again from Shido Bunan:
Although our school considers enlightenment [satori] in particular to be fundamental, that doesn't necessarily mean that once you're enlightened you stop there. It is necessary only to practice according to reality and complete the way. According to reality means knowing the fundamental mind as it really is; practice means getting rid of obstructions caused by habitual actions by means of true insight and knowledge. Awakening to the way is comparatively easy; accomplishment of practical application is what is considered most difficult. That is why the great teacher Bodhidharma said that those who know the way are many, whereas those who carry out the way are few.
I found this quite interesting, especially given the much asserted “non-gradual” view of Zen. Evidently the equipoise and post-equipoise process that other systems deal with is also very much the case for Zen, and in this sense initial awakening can be viewed as something like first bhūmi, with equipoise beginning as fragmented and becoming slowly less so as obscurations are exhausted.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2018 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: Swat Valley/Oddiyana
Content:
passel said:
How is that different from a place that is not a power place?

krodha wrote:
The region in general is clearly a hotbed of conflict, tumultuous uprising and activity of the like.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2018 at 12:00 PM
Title: Re: Who is America ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The point isn’t to advocate for violence, but rather to convey that non-violent solutions are generally ineffective with these types of people.

Rinchen Samphel said:
Imagine if MLK had that view... Imagine how much more black people would have been beaten and/or died.

Anyone who tells others that violence is the only way to solve this (or any) situation are guiding those others to a lower rebirth. It is not a Bodhisattvas practice to think "oh, if i commit some non-virtues that are short term solutions here in samsara and i fall into a lower rebirth its all good because, hey, all for the benefit of others, right?" I dont think we should teach others that violence is a solution, because if it ever appears that way,

no one will ever stop using it.

krodha wrote:
I'm not "teaching" others that violence is a solution. Merely noting that it was the only thing that worked with the fascists that used to plague our community.

The people involved in the situations I'm referring to weren't practitioners, nor was I a practitioner back then, so the Buddhist angle while appropriate for this forum, was inapplicable to the situation ten or fifteen plus years ago I am referencing.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2018 at 11:35 AM
Title: Re: Who is America ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The point isn't to advocate for violence, but rather to convey that non-violent solutions are generally ineffective with these types of people.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2018 at 11:03 AM
Title: Re: Who is America ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
A lot of fascists were routinely punched when I was a kid going to punk rock shows in the Bay Area. Some were killed unfortunately. The violence was effective. We didn't have nazis in the Bay Area scene.

Nowadays things are different. The older crews who had the zero tolerance policies towards fascism have, well, gotten older, and they aren't around as much as active members in the scene. As a result there's been a resurgence of nazis.

While it is sad it takes violence to deter fascism, I agree wholeheartedly it is the most effective method.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2018 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: Immutable Nature of the Primordial State
Content:
smcj said:
Saying it is separate and Real is just adding emphasis.

krodha wrote:
Is it though?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: rtsal, shared samsaric vision, “other” sentient beings
Content:
krodha wrote:
The view is that the so-called external world is not mind, nor is it other than mind.

Adepts such as Longchenpa were very cautious in their explanation of this issue and are in no way advocating for a concrete, artifact-like external world.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 10:04 PM
Title: Re: Immutable Nature of the Primordial State
Content:
Matt J said:
I struggle to see any difference between shentong and a Madhyamaka-Yogacara synthesis. If I recall correctly, Brunnholzl makes the argument that what is called shentong is simply that.

krodha wrote:
In any case, gzhan stong as a view in itself is at odds with Dzogchen… however describing Dzogchen as a Madhyamaka-Yogācāra synthesis is perfectly acceptable. The defining and novel aspects of gzhan stong are its mapping of the three natures of Yogācāra over the two truths, which ends up compromising the intention of both Yogācāra (3N) and Madhyamaka (2T).

Also gzhan stong’s interpretation of Buddha qualities and the kāyas, specifically how they are treated in the basis, path and result schematic is absolutely in conflict with Dzogchen. Gzhan stong states that the kāyas are fully formed at the time of the basis and are fully established at the time of the result, nothing like this is found in Dzogchen.

Then there is gzhan stong’s novel interpretation of the five treatises, which is unrelated to Dzogchen but a sticking point for many.

Dzogchen synthesizes Yogācāra and Madhyamaka quite well. The same cannot be said for gzhan stong, which is wrought with numerous issues.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 7:45 AM
Title: Re: rtsal, shared samsaric vision, “other” sentient beings
Content:
jnanasutra said:
Hi all!

So, if all appearances are rtsal manifestations of the basis of each individual, then is it the case that the rtsal manifestations are shared “vision” among samsaric sentient beings?

Also, if all appearances are the energy of the basis of each individual, then how are appearances shared by sentient beings and how are sentient beings (with their individual consciousnesses) apparent to other sentient beings? Wouldn’t the appearance of other sentient beings only be the rtsal manifestations of one’s own basis?

Thanks!

Dorje Shedrub said:
I had the understanding that there is one basis not many, and that sentient brings each perceive the play of rtsal through their own obscurations.

DS

krodha wrote:
The basis is the nature of your mind. Every sentient being is endowed with a mind and each mind has a nature. Therefore each sentient being has a basis.

Those bases are singular in expression, but numerous in number. Much like the wetness of water is singular in expression, for every expression of wetness is the same, but numerous in number, because there are countless bodies of water.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 5:35 AM
Title: Re: Immutable Nature of the Primordial State
Content:
Malcolm said:
Nine of these passages support your claim.

krodha wrote:
Mine or smcj’s?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 5:30 AM
Title: Re: rtsal, shared samsaric vision, “other” sentient beings
Content:
krodha wrote:
The uniqueness of the Dzogchen cosmogony is maintained up through the onset of the imputing ignorance [kun brtags] and then the ālaya forms and you can look to the Yogācāra container universe model.

The collective traces of sentient beings manifest a common reality that coincides with the karmic disposition of the beings involved. Those beings can interact like we do in our everyday lives, and in more subtle ways, even influence each other's perceptions like the woman who terrorized her village by appearing as a tiger, for example.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2018 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: rtsal, shared samsaric vision, "other" sentient beings
Content:
jnanasutra said:
Hi all!

So, if all appearances are rtsal manifestations of the basis of each individual, then is it the case that the rtsal manifestations are shared "vision" among samsaric sentient beings?

Also, if all appearances are the energy of the basis of each individual, then how are appearances shared by sentient beings and how are sentient beings (with their individual consciousnesses) apparent to other sentient beings? Wouldn't the appearance of other sentient beings only be the rtsal manifestations of one's own basis?

Thanks!

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen defers to false-aspectarian Yogācāra principle of a container universe to explain this issue.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2018 at 2:02 PM
Title: Re: Immutable Nature of the Primordial State
Content:
smcj said:
Page 300 of "The Big Red Book" in the chapter titled "Superiority of Atiyoga". Remember, he is not discussing sutra here. He is discussing Dzogchen and why it is superior to the lower 8 yanas.

Also worthy of note is the fact that he says that Nagarjuna/2nd Turning and Asanga/3rd Turning are both contained in Dzogchen. That is to be expected and does not negate my point. All Shentong view includes Nagarjuna. Elsewhere he explains that his interpretation of the 3rd Turning is "Great Madhyamaka" (a.k.a Shentong). Interestingly he includes the Dharmadhaturstava ("In Praise of Dharmadhatu") as one of Nagarjuna's. It certainly is not like Nagarjuna's other writings.

Now concerning this natural expression of the Great Perfection: The Sugata, during the intermediate promulgation of the transmitted precepts*, did not reveal the structure of

the fundamental reality, though he did extensively teach the inconceivable, abiding nature without referring to symbols of elaborate conception. And, during the final promulgation**, though he did reveal the structure of the fundamental reality, he did not teach the characteristic path through which it is actualized. Therefore, the conclusive intention of the Two Promulgators*** actually abides without contradiction in the nature of the Great Perfection. This intention comprises the unaltered intention of the Collection of Madhyamaka Reasoning,, which consists of the commentaries on the intermediate promulgation by the sublime and supreme Nagarjuna; and his [Collection of Eulogies] including the Eulogy to the Expanse of Reality ****, and the commentaries by the regent Maitreya, the sublime and supreme Asanga, and his brother [Vasabandhu] and so forth, which together form the intention of the final [promulgation]. If one were to ask why this is the case, it is because these masters did not claim anything other than the profound abiding nature of natural reality, and because the Great Perfection itself is none other than that.
(bolding/underlining mine)

So he says, "... during the intermediate promulgation of the transmitted precepts, did not reveal the structure of the fundamental reality ".

But he then say of Asanga/Vasabandhu, "....because these masters did not claim anything other than the profound abiding nature of natural reality...,"

So he accepts the 3rd Turning as being "profound abiding nature of natural reality, and because the Great Perfection itself is none other than that.

So Dudjom R. had no problem utilizing the 3 Turning paradigm to explain and define how Dzogchen is superior to the other yanas. Since he saw it as appropriate, so do I.

*****

*a.k.a. The 2nd Turning of the Wheel of Dharma
**a.k.a. The 3rd Turning of the Wheel of Dharma
*** Nagarjuna and Asanga
****Available in English as "In Praise of Dharmadhatu"

******

All this is in regards to Dudjom R's interpretation of Dzogchen. Evidently he is an outlier in this among Nyingmapas. However Kongtrul also has a Shentong view of Dzogchen, and he is not an outlier among Karma Kagyupas. So at least one major school supports that idea within the context of Dzogchen specifically.

krodha wrote:
Is the “third turning” gzhan stong or just Yogācāra? Seems only Yogācāra is being referenced in the excerpt despite the assertion that his use of “third turning” is supposed to be a reference to gzhan stong.

In any case, gzhan stong as a view in itself is at odds with Dzogchen... however describing Dzogchen as a Madhyamaka-Yogācāra synthesis is perfectly acceptable.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 13th, 2018 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: all or nothing? what will it be....
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Buddhist view of emptiness is an epistemic insight into the misconception of ontological entities which reveals ontology is truly impossible.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Negation of ontology is also impossible.

krodha wrote:
A perception of ontological status is a figment of ignorance.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2018 at 10:58 AM
Title: Re: Mipham Rinpoche channels Weinstein:
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Snowbear, you've got to understand that for a lot of guys on this board Malcolm is like some kind of god and whatever he says is gospel, even when it contradicts other things he's said.

Snowbear said:
For saying what everyone knows but doesn't want to say, he deserves the title.

krodha wrote:
Neither of you have any businesss speaking for, or representing how this forum collectively feels about or perceives anyone or anything, in any capacity.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2018 at 12:04 AM
Title: Re: Advaitin vs. Buddhist takes on awareness/reality
Content:
haha said:
Now, there are Buddhist masters and texts that talk about mind essence or self-existing wakefulness (Rangjung Yeshe). If one cannot distinguish between these two (i.e. Withness and self-existing wakefulness), one will definitely dwell in the middle of both assertions for a long time.

krodha wrote:
“Self-existing wakefulness” is a very misleading gloss of rang byung ye shes.

Rangjung means “self-arising” or “self-originated” in the sense of coming from your own mind or consciousness, and not somewhere else. Your yeshe, manifests through insight into the nature of your own mind, it cannot be given to you by anyone else. That is the meaning of “rang byung.”

The term really has nothing to do with a self-existing wakefulness, despite the unfortunate prevalence of this translation, which undoubtedly causes much confusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 28th, 2018 at 4:10 PM
Title: Re: all or nothing? what will it be....
Content:
Supramundane said:
Buddhism is like the negative photo of Hinduism: Buddhism sees the self as ultimately empty, and if everything is empty, then all is One too.

krodha wrote:
Phenomena that are empty are unfindable. It is impossible to posit a universal or singular entity if no entities can be located.

Hinduism, specifically non-dual Vedanta, Samkhya and so on, is proposing an ontological position.

The Buddhist view of emptiness is an epistemic insight into the misconception of ontological entities which reveals ontology is truly impossible.

The two views are quite different.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 28th, 2018 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Advaitin vs. Buddhist takes on awareness/reality
Content:
↑ said:
this master must have refined his insight to a degree that others have not.

tomschwarz said:
There no accomplishment that you or any master (even crazy wise ones) will ever attain, that othrs have not. Think of enlightenment as subtraction more than addition (see removing obscuration/buddha nature/etc...). Dont forget, conciousness is one of the twelve links of dependent origination. Dont go there. Then where to go?

krodha wrote:

Advaita Vedanta, the system they are referring to, is a different path... and this suggestion that they refined their insight more so than other Advaitains, who seem to get caught up with a certain degree of insight, is not something I made up.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 28th, 2018 at 2:39 AM
Title: Re: Advaitin vs. Buddhist takes on awareness/reality
Content:
Rick said:
Brahman, taught right, is just a metaphor/raft to be left behind at "the other shore." But it's the last, stickiest metaphor to go in Advaita.

krodha wrote:
That is debatable. An Advaita teacher I know said that he's only encountered a single master of Advaita state that even Brahman or consciousness is not found at the end of the Advaitin path.

According to him this position is incredibly novel and he theorizes that this master must have refined his insight to a degree that others have not.

This statement was also not published publicly, perhaps because of its controversial nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2018 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Is everything "one" or are we just inter-connected without a center?
Content:
smcj said:
Correction: Situ R's "Ground, Path and Friution" Rangtong Ma-yin-gag view.

krodha wrote:
Correction to what?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2018 at 1:55 AM
Title: Re: Is everything "one" or are we just inter-connected without a center?
Content:
smcj said:
Khenpo Tsultrim is one of the leading proponents of the Karma Kagyu view on Shentong alive today. And he is certainly aware of the taboo of having the same view as Advaita Vedanta. So when Malcolm bragged...
Malcolm said:
I once forced Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso to admit (I have a witness, incidentally) that there was no substantial difference between Advaita Vedanta and Gzhan stong in terms of

how they presented their view.

smcj said:
...that either means that Malcolm made it up, or that he had Khenpo cornered so that he couldn't escape admitting to it. Personally I have enough regard for Malcolm's expertise that I see his victory as completely plausible.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong and Advaita both promulgate an ultimate truth that is devoid of what is considered to be relative.

Also gzhan stong's ultimate nature, in terms of the result, is fully formed at the time of their basis. The purusa of Advaita is also fully formed at all times.

Nothing about monism is proposed on gzhan stong's side.

smcj said:
Plus, in Kongtrul's ToK Book 1, "Myriad Worlds", the last cosmology he speaks of is the Dzogchen cosmology. He makes sure to preface the discussion as to how Ultimate Reality is before there are any sentient beings or buddhas inhabiting it. That's kinda Advaita like, don't ya think?

krodha wrote:
Certainly not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2018 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: Is everything "one" or are we just inter-connected without a center?
Content:
smcj said:
The Buddha specifically and categorically denied that view.
True, Sakyamuni specifically and categorically denied that view. No doubt about that.

But all the Karmapas since Ranjung Dorje (Karmapa III, 1284-1339) have embraced it. So it kinda depends on which authority you're referencing.

krodha wrote:
You seem to enjoy molding gzhan stong into whatever you want it to be, rather than meeting it on its own terms.

Perhaps your affinity in general revolves around your perceived malleability of the system since non-gzhan stong systems rob you of that leeway.

Gzhan stong is not a monistic view and does not advocate for a "oneness."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2018 at 9:15 PM
Title: Re: Thoughts on Dzogchen without buddhism?
Content:
Lingpupa said:
I know this is only part of the way back to the original topic, but I wanted to share this: a bit of digging turns up strong evidence (I'd put it at 98% confidence) that "omega point" is a pen name for one Daniel Ingram.

Make of it what you will.

krodha wrote:
Could be, but this Omega Point character has always been a big advocate of tummo, etc., which seems uncharacteristic of Ingram. However maybe Ingram is using an alias precisely for that reason.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2018 at 10:38 AM
Title: Re: Thoughts on Dzogchen without buddhism?
Content:
krodha wrote:
What is unconvincing or does not make sense, for example?

Widur said:
The whole preoccupation with painting the samsaric modes of becoming as a perpetual tragedy of endless suffering, thus stirring denigrating judgments and devaluations, cultivating aversions, cultivating volitions to cessate it all, escape it all, devalue it all, contriving it all, for one's own sake and for the benefit of all others that are likewise trapped. The picture that comes to me is how one is throwing oneself at the stranger one meet wandering under the open sky, trying to convince him he is not in fact wandering freely over the trackless ground, he is in reality confined, imprisoned, chained and suffering.

krodha wrote:
Sentient beings unfortunately are confined and suffering due to their ignorance regarding their nature.

Even those with some experience with insights into their nature are still for the most part, confined and subject to suffering.

This is accurate, Buddhism or not. Dzogchen with or without Buddhism, this is still the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2018 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Dzogchen without buddhism?
Content:
Widur said:
..but I'm afraid I find the buddhist underpinnings not very convincing at all. I have ordered and read some books about dzogchen, and while much of it makes very much sense, the parts occupying themselves with buddhist philosophy and assumptions do not.

krodha wrote:
What is unconvincing or does not make sense, for example?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2018 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: non-physical heat during dzogchen meditation
Content:
ZOOM said:
Thank you for the advice, I surely will return from time to time to read the news.

krodha wrote:
Unlike taobums there are genuine and well-informed practitioners who post here, but you can't come into this space convinced you already know, or know better than others.

If you can even feign the attitude that others may have something to offer, you will indeed learn something.

You and I used to interact on taobums, years ago, I don't frequent that forum anymore, but based off our previous discussions I believe you would benefit from interactions here.

Perhaps keep an open mind, and be mindful of any inkling of pride that may deter you from listening.

Many here do the same practices you do, certainly far more than any other forum, by a vast percentage. I assure you this is the right place to discuss the practices you are fond of in a structured and respectful way. Within reason of course.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2018 at 12:41 AM
Title: Re: non-physical heat during dzogchen meditation
Content:
Vasana said:
Can we try?

krodha wrote:
Would be nice to see.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2018 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: non-physical heat during dzogchen meditation
Content:
Norwegian said:
ZOOM,

If you don't have a qualified teacher of Dzogchen, there is no Dzogchen to be practiced.

krodha wrote:
This guy used to post on the taobums forums as well. Obsessed with men ngag practices and thinks teachers have no purpose.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2018 at 10:37 PM
Title: Re: Via Negativa
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Languages and religions differ everywhere but hearts and lungs all work the same.

krodha wrote:
Salt and sugar are different words but are all the same when placed in our mouths because our function of taste works the same.

Salt and sugar are visually similar but are all the same when placed in our mouths because our function of taste works the same.

Salt and sugar are similar in consistency when touched but are all the same when placed in our mouths because our function of taste works the same.

These three assertions are bold claims, and more importantly are known to be absolutely false according to those who have tasted salt and sugar.

Likewise, your claim that buddhadharma and sanatanadharma are identical or too similar to distinguish in taste is known to be absolutely false by those who have properly practiced them and have actualized the species of experiential insight championed by each.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2018 at 2:44 PM
Title: Re: Via Negativa
Content:
Wayfarer said:

The underlying logic is similar to 'neti, neti' (although of course Buddhism will always wish to differentiate itself from Vedanta.) But then, there's also similarly apophatic teachings in Christianity, for example the perennial mediation manual, The Cloud of Unknowing.

krodha wrote:
A dubious claim, and yet again you reference this purported need for the buddhadharma to be nominally different from sanatanadharma, et al.

That they may be drastically different on an experiential level appears to be a preposterous notion in your eyes.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2018 at 1:23 PM
Title: Re: Via Negativa
Content:
Rick said:
In Advaita, the only thing that cannot be negated (seen to be ultimately un-real) is one's own existence: I Am. (I'm not opening a conversation about Advaita vs. Buddhism. Been there, done that! I just used Advaita as an example of a tradition that relies on via negativa negation.)

Is there anything that cannot be negated in Buddhism? Can one's existence be negated? Or would it be right-er in Buddhism to say: I neither am, nor am not, nor neither, nor both? To what extent does the answer depend on the Buddhist school/tradition?

krodha wrote:
What Buddhists do not negate is (i) that appearances manifest, (ii) conventions are useful tools and (iii) the path and result have soteriological value.

Apart from that nothing is findable, and nothing is truly found in the three aforementioned points just listed.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2018 at 8:28 AM
Title: Re: Shakyamuni stabilizing his wisdom?
Content:
Temicco said:
To my knowledge, sutras do not generally present a system where you alternate between equipoise and post-equipoise, and where equipoise becomes more stable with some work to stabilize it, and where you accord with the unborn more fully and operate more freely the more you cultivate the expression of your insight.

krodha wrote:
Apparently the Dasabhumika sūtra is one of the first texts that discusses equipoise and

post-equipoise.

Temicco said:
Thanks for the tip; looks like I have a lot of reading to do. Can I ask where you heard this from?

krodha wrote:
From Malcolm, I don't have a link to the exact thread.

He wrote in the same discussion:
There is a distinction between equipoise and post-equipoise which exists right up to the last moment of the tenth bhumi.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2018 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: Shakyamuni stabilizing his wisdom?
Content:
Temicco said:
To my knowledge, sutras do not generally present a system where you alternate between equipoise and post-equipoise, and where equipoise becomes more stable with some work to stabilize it, and where you accord with the unborn more fully and operate more freely the more you cultivate the expression of your insight.

krodha wrote:
Apparently the Dasabhumika sūtra is one of the first texts that discusses equipoise and post-equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 2:04 PM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Sherab Rigdrol said:
What a shitshow.

Anyways, I highly recommend that those of you who are conflating tirthika views with dzogchen to please read The Mind Beyond Papers by Elias Capriles as he succinctly and painstakingly details out the differences of views and results. Most gnostic and advaita vedanta "realizations" are simply the formless realms, as well as the alayavijnana.

I for one believe Garab Dorje's 3 statements as being sufficient enough. Without Direct Introduction there is no path and result. So these other systems have no Direct Introduction, thus no path or result. Seems pretty simple. Then again this board thrives on circular thinking.

krodha wrote:

Elias has another brief write-up titled Transpersonal and Holotropic Delusion on this same subject.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Just doesn't add up fellas...

dzogchungpa said:
With all due respect, fella, I don't give a flying f*&k about what you think does or doesn't add up.

krodha wrote:
You should declare this loudly to all the kids when you conclude your magic performances.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 5:45 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Does this then mean there are countless gods, as the individual natures of countless sentient being's minds, that do not actually create anything? That would be the consequence.

Why call it a god at that point?

monktastic said:
I don't really know. I have my guesses but don't intend to pollute this forum with them.
Why call it an "all-creating king?"

krodha wrote:
Because all of supposed creation spawns from a failure to accurately apprehend the dynamic display of your own mind.

The collective error of countless sentient beings ends up coalescing into this apparent universe.

Thus the mind apparently creates all without actually creating anything. As described in the Guhyagarbha Tantra:

The wonder of it! This marvelous, astounding event/reality (Dharma): From that which involves no origination, everything originates; and in that very origination, there is no

origination! The wonder of it! In it's very enduring, there is no enduring! The wonder of it! In it's very cessation, there is no cessation!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Just doesn't add up fellas... especially when masters such as Norbu Rinpoche and Yongdzin Rinpoche say different. The latter states you break samaya holding this view.

monktastic said:
I don't know exactly how to reconcile it, but it doesn't bother me. The "all-creating king" is a literary device pointing at your own mind. "God" is another device pointing at the same thing, AFAICT. Of course there can't be a literal God anywhere (because emptiness), but that doesn't mean it can't be a remarkably useful pointer. There's no Real Buddha anywhere either.

These are all just my own limitations, of course. We work with what we have.

krodha wrote:
Does this then mean there are countless gods, as the individual natures of countless sentient being's minds, that do not actually create anything? That would be the consequence.

Why call it a god at that point?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
To add, Malcolm pointed out to me the other weekend in Santa Fe, which was a wonderful event by the way, that the Rig pa rang shar also states that tirthika non-dual views are untenable in the context of Dzogchen.

Not to mention the fact that the same text rejects 360 different views, the teachings of Adi Śankhara being one of them, with Śankhara listed by name.

How a teacher in any serious capacity can then say that one's view of Vedanta and Dzogchen are interchangeable is concerning to say the least.

It is one thing to say that like Vedanta, Dzogchen states that our notion of what is ultimately the case comes from within. But that is at best a surface level similarity.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
monktastic said:
Spelare: For what it's worth, my own guru (Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche) made it abundantly clear that the concept of God I learned from Vedanta is exactly the right way of looking at things (and the right direction in which to pray) -- as long as it's understood that this "God" is inside, not outside. Of course, that's also what my Vedanta guru taught me, but there was no reason to argue

krodha wrote:
Just doesn't add up fellas... especially when masters such as Norbu Rinpoche and Yongdzin Rinpoche say different. The latter states you break samaya holding this view.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Out of curiosity, how do the pro-syncretic individuals contributing to this thread propose to synthesize whatever form of Christianity you are championing with a system such as Dzogchen?

smcj said:
ChNN: Most Westerners receive a Christian education and in the Christian tradition God is very diffused. God is recognized as something outside. They don’t know that God is in our real nature. If you have that knowledge and you are reading the bible, you can see there are many words that indicate God means our real nature. But then it developed in a more dualistic way. When they started to say, “the unique God governing all universe”, then it became easy to think God is governing everything. But it does not correspond in the real condition. So it is very important when you follow the Dzogchen Teachings, that you really understand what God means. It is not necessary to wonder if God exists or not. Some people are worried there is no God in Buddhism. In Buddhism there are so many kinds of gods, but Buddhists do not speak of the unique God. The essence of Buddhist teaching is Dzogchen, which is the final teaching of the Buddha Shakyamuni. Through Dzogchen we can really understand what God is and we don’t have to worry if there is a God or not. God always exists as our real nature, the base, for everybody
Are you dismissive of ChNN as being pro-syncretic?

krodha wrote:
Rinpoche is not being syncretic, he is speaking to westerners who may harbor certain feelings about God and telling them not to worry or speculate about such a thing

because after acquiring a working knowledge of the nature of their mind, said speculation will be put to rest.

That Christianity as we know it today, may have been derived from some sort of gnostic insight is most likely true, however the assertion that the nature of said gnostic insight is identical to the species of prajñā championed by Dzogchen is a stretch. I see no evidence in the works of these Christian contemplatives that their insight is any different than that of the substantialist tirthika dharmas such as Samkhya or Advaita. And even then it appears much less refined.

Most every religion is likely predicated on certain individuals experiences with altered states of consciousness that were later interpreted within the confines of a specific culture.

However not all altered states of consciousness are created equal, and not all cultures exist in a region that is conducive to a refinement of understanding. Even East Asian buddhadharma sometimes gravitates towards substantialism as a result of its distance from the polemical climate of India. Tibetan Buddhism was in close proximity to India and as a result its tenets and practices are much more refined and distinct.

Early contemplative Christians appear to be little more than people who figured out you could access deeper states of consciousness through mediative practice. Some undoubtedly encountered more refined states like those championed in Advaita Vedanta, and called that expression of consciousness "God."

I see no indication that this so-called "God" resembles the nature of mind as championed by Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 1:55 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Out of curiosity, how do the pro-syncretic individuals contributing to this thread propose to synthesize whatever form of Christianity you are championing with a system such as Dzogchen?

How are the two similar in terms of the principles they champion?

No entity or principle survives the path of Dzogchen. One would think you would want this god to be affirmed at the end of the day, yet Dzogchen would rob you of this, as it compromises every attribute of its own process in the end.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2018 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Aryjna said:
Disparaging refers to pointing out the faults of these religions to their followers, being contemptuous or offensive. It does not mean one should not see their errors. In this case even bringing up disparaging other religions is completely out of place as this is a Buddhist forum.

treehuggingoctopus said:
Actually, what I have heard directly contradicted your reading. Garchen was very clear about it, and he was not the only one.

krodha wrote:
"Disparaging" would be gallivanting around openly declaring that followers of X religion or system are idiots, insulting said people to their face, telling others to shun them, etc.

Which is quite different than constructively comparing and contrasting systems so that one can better understand one's own.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2018 at 12:14 PM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
At what stage does fascination with rugby or card games perish? Can't we just find things intrinsically interesting? Calvinist theology is fascinating. I know it pretty well, and also that it's not going to save me. But that allows me to enjoy it more, not less.

krodha wrote:
If you know it won't save you then you don't have a serious interest in it.

By "serious" I mean a discipline you are implementing as a means to liberate yourself.

Spelare said:
you perennialists
You keep using this term "perennialist" as if it refers to a single, well-defined position and approach. It doesn't. You seem to consistently equate it with an "anything goes" mentality of haphazard syncretism. Whereas what I am suggesting is more like an extension of the rimé approach to our contemporary globalized context.

krodha wrote:
That is called "perennialism." You, yourself said you believe there is a single mountain that all systems climb.

Spelare said:
You explore different approaches while keeping an understanding of what is distinctive

about each. And you may commit yourself especially to a particular tradition, as I have.

krodha wrote:
Yet you believe the other approaches are equal in their soteriological value.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2018 at 11:42 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:

krodha wrote:
Fascination with tirthika tenet systems, beyond the pale of surface level interest, perishes at the bee stage.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
As a bee seeks nectar
from all kinds of flowers,
seek teachings everywhere.

Like a deer that finds a quiet place to graze,
seek seclusion to digest all you have gathered.

Like a lion, live completely free of all fear.
And, finally, like a madman, beyond all limits,
go wherever you please.

From: The Crystal and the Way of Light: Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen (Tibetan Buddhist Philosophy – accelerated path to self-perfection)
by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

krodha wrote:
Right. Serious interest in tirthika dharmas is not intended to survive the initial stage.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2018 at 11:17 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:

dzogchungpa said:
As a bee seeks nectar
from all kinds of flowers,

seek teachings everywhere.

Like a deer that finds a quiet place to graze,
seek seclusion to digest all you have gathered.

Like a lion, live completely free of all fear.
And, finally, like a madman, beyond all limits,
go wherever you please.

krodha wrote:
Fascination with tirthika tenet systems, beyond the pale of surface level interest, perishes at the bee stage.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2018 at 11:14 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
They proceed on an empirical basis, observing their own experience carefully. What they certainly don't do is memorize a single recipe book and get frustrated if they encounter a working situation that doesn't conform exactly to what they prepared for. They are able to work with circumstances.

krodha wrote:
Generally, the experiential insights that flower from keen empirical observation will negate the ontological positions that traditions such as Christianity are based upon.

And in that sense you perennialists are the ones becoming frustrated when you encounter a situation that contradicts your preconceived notions.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 11:54 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
So, in a way, this answers the question of what ChNN was doing talking about God and Jesus. He's in good company when we look at what Buddhist tantrikas did from early on.

krodha wrote:
What are you under the impression that the Buddhist tantrikas did early on?

Spelare said:
In that sense, what he said is not innovative, but in keeping with tradition. It just looks innovative to us because we're used to a contemporary Western way of holding religions

as closed canons that are unalterable, and where borrowing automatically entails a lamentable syncretism. These things were certainly regarded differently in Asia, and still are to a degree.

krodha wrote:
Evidently they are not regarded differently based on the outright negation of other systems we find in the Dzogchen tantras.

Spelare said:
It's like we're unwilling to be mentally supple in this particular regard, in spite of all that our tradition has taught us about such suppleness being worth cultivating.

krodha wrote:
This would be a misguided application of said suppleness.

Spelare said:
Masters like ChNN have no problem reading the Bible and its major figures from a Dzogchen perspective.

krodha wrote:
ChNN is doing his best to appeal to western students.

Spelare said:
They can view God as a conceptual stand-in for our real nature. And why not?

krodha wrote:
There are various reasons why not.

Spelare said:
Why not allow the scriptures, legends, and luminaries of other traditions to be encoded for you as reminders of the Dzogchen view?

krodha wrote:
Because they aren't. Again, I'm not a perennialist. Although I was at one time.

Spelare said:
Surely seeing them in that way is more in line with pure vision than feeling some need to avoid them. They are going to be encountered, so let them be seen as ornaments rather than as defilements.

krodha wrote:
The tenets and principles of their system(s) are at odds with Dzogchen.

Spelare said:
And you can do this knowing full well that the overwhelming majority of those around you in a given church, mosque, or synagogue do not share your understanding. That their views are not ones with the potential to liberate. But you can, at least, have the

minimal knowledge that enables you to be in relation and dialogue rather than holding yourself apart.

krodha wrote:
Why would I hold myself apart? I'm not a rude individual.

Spelare said:
You can enjoy the religious expressions of others while seeing clearly and not falling into confusion!

krodha wrote:
No one suggested otherwise.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 11:41 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
My view is that God has never been a separate, transcendent entity. But that he was created by us as a projection out of ourselves, into the sky, of what is actually entirely innate to us. It is a kind of category error, yes, though one that has given rise to fascinating cultural permutations.

krodha wrote:
I still have a hard time seeing how any notion of a god is applicable.

Also, you are a perennialist and believe all of these traditions are addressing a single truth in numerous ways. I do not share this sentiment.

Spelare said:
But, in that case, why then can't we, as Dzogchenpas, make the same move when we encounter the deities and texts of the Abrahamic religions that are so prevalent in our lived environment? Why can't we do the same when we hear about Brahman, Śiva, etc? It seems like there's now this purism about it that fears we will corrupt our view. Whereas the Dzogchenpas and Buddhist tantrikas of earlier eras apparently had no such qualms.

krodha wrote:
They did have qualms given that they flatly rejected such views.

Where would a Brahman or a god fit into the Dzogchen view? They are completely foreign ideas that do not correspond to the Dzogchen teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Norwegian said:
Or as the great Dharmakirti put it, on the belief in God: " [It's] the mark of the crass stupidity of witless men. "

liuzg150181 said:
Dharmakirti is the Richard Darwins of Buddhism?

krodha wrote:
*Dawkins

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 8:34 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
Indeed, that is the intent. However, much of the language of Kunjed Gyalpo sounds like it could have been borrowed from a Hindu scripture

krodha wrote:
Many Buddhists texts use subversive rhetoric. The Kun byed rgyal po was not novel in that regard.

Spelare said:
and not only the title. Do we know that this deiform language was always understood in that way by its proponents and any detractors there may have been?

krodha wrote:
The Dzogchen tantras are quite clear about their view, one would have to do serious violence to the literature in order to justify some sort of theistic spin.

Spelare said:
Also, aside from the linguistic aspect, how was yidam practice defended in Indian and Tibetan contexts?

krodha wrote:
You'll have to be more specific.

In any case, is it your opinion that the aforementioned rhetoric in the Dzogchen tantras was originally intended to be theistic? Your line of inquiry seems to continually insinuate that this is your view.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
So, how would these great scholars of pramāṇa regard the metaphorical use of phrases like "all-creating king" in Dzogchen tantras? I'm curious if anyone knows how such language was formally justified in a historical Buddhist context, either Indian or Tibetan.

krodha wrote:
Vasubandhu and Dharmakīrti were Yogācārins. Dzogchen is a Madhyamaka-Yogācāra synthesis in terms of view. Given that the "all creating king" is only intended to refer to your own mind, there is nothing for Yogācārins to object to in that sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 6:48 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here is Vasubandhu's critique, from his Abhidharmakosabhasyam:

All the dharmas that arise arise by reason of the five causes and the four conditions that we have just explained. The world does not proceed from a single cause that is called God, or Purusa, or Pradhana, or any other name.

How do you prove this thesis?
If you think that the thesis is proven through arguments, you betray your doctrine that the world arises from a single cause.

64d. Not from God or from any other cause, since there is a succession, etc.
That things are produced by a single cause, by God, Mahadeva, or Vasudeva, is inadmissable for many reasons.

1.) If things were produced by a single cause, they would arise all at the same time: now each of us knows that they arise successively.

[The Theist:] They arise successively by virtue of the desires of God, who says, "May this arise now! May this perish now! May this arise and perish later!"

If this were the case, then things do not arise from a single cause, since the desires (of God) are multiple. Moreover these multiple desires would have to be simultaneous, since God, the cause of these desires, is not multiple, and things would all arise at the same time.

a. [The Theist:] The desires of God are not simultaneous, because God, in order to produce his desires, takes into account other causes.

If this were so, then God is not the single unique cause of all things. And the causes that

God takes into account are produced successively: they depend then on causes which are themselves dependent on other causes: an infinite regression.

[The Theist:] It is admitted that the series of causes has no beginning.

This would admit that samsara does not have an origin. You then abandon the doctrine of a single cause and return to the Buddhist theory of causes (hetus) and conditions (pratyaya).

b. [The Theist:] The desires of God are simultaneous, but things do not arise at the same time because they arise as God wishes them to arise, that is, in succession.

This is inadmissible. The desires of God remain what they are. Let us explain. Suppose that God desires "May this arise now! May that arise later!" We do not see why the second desire, at first nonefficacious, will be efficacious later; why, if it is efficacious later, it will not be so initially.

What advantage does God obtain from this great effort by which he produces the world?

[The Theist:] God produces the world for his own satisfaction (ptiti).

He is then not God, the Sovereign (Isvara), in what concerns his own satisfaction, since he cannot realize it without a means (upaya). And if he is not sovereign with regard to his own satisfaction, how can he be sovereign with regard to the world?

Further, do you say that God finds satisfaction in seeing the creatures that he has created in the prey of all the sufferings of existence, including the tortures of the hells? Homage to this God! Well said, in truth, is the popular stanza, "He is called Rudra because he burns, because he is excited, ferocious, terrible, an eater of flesh, blood, and marrow"

3.) The followers of God, the single cause of the world, deny visible causes,—causes and conditions,—the efficacy of the seed with regard to the sprout, etc. If, modifying their position, they admit the existence of these causes, and pretend that these causes serve God as auxiliaries, this then is no more that a pious affirmation, for we do not maintain any activity of a cause besides the activity of the so-called secondary causes. Furthermore, God would not be sovereign with regard to auxiliary causes, since these cooperate in the production of the effect through their own efficacy. Perhaps, in order to avoid the negation of causes, which are visible, and in order to avoid the affirmation of present action by God, which is not visible, the Theist would say that the work of God is creation: but creation, dependent only on God, would never have a beginning, like God himself, and this is a consequence that the Theist rejects.

We would refute the doctrine of Purusa, of Pradhana, etc., as we have refuted the theist doctrine, mutatis mutandis. Thus, no dharma arises from a single cause.

Alas, persons are unclear! Like the birds and the animals, truly worth of pity, they go

from existence to existence, accomplishing diverse actions; they experience the results of these actions and falsely believe that God is the cause of these results. (We must explain the Truth in order to put an end to this false conception.)

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Norwegian said:
Or as the great Dharmakirti put it, on the belief in God: " [It's] the mark of the crass stupidity of witless men. "

Spelare said:
I believe Dharmakīrti made such remarks in the context of critiquing Śaiva tantra. Had he known of Buddhist tantric practice, he would likely have viewed it as a corruption of Buddhism and criticized it in similar terms. I think most of us would disagree with such an assessment.

krodha wrote:
Vasubandhu roasted the notion of a creator deity (as a first cause) as well, so Dharmakīrti was familiar with the absurdity of the idea.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 6:05 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
pael said:
Do Theravada and Mahayana understand dependent origination same way?

Virgo said:
No. Theravadins use it to understand the emptiness of persons. Mahayanists use it to understand the emptiness of all phenomena. Tantrikas, of course, are understanding it the same way, but also going beyond just emptiness alone.

Kevin...

krodha wrote:
Common Mahāyāna does not fixate on emptiness alone either, it just isn't as insistent about clarifying that emptiness always pertains to mind and appearances.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2018 at 3:12 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:
But "God" could of ALWAYS BEEN HERE TOO...NO BEGINNING OR ENDING TO "HIM"....and we are Dependant Originally on this Creator Being.....maybe that's what ChNN means ?(And that's where the AdiBuddha (self created) comes in ?)

krodha wrote:
Definitely not.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018 at 12:46 PM
Title: Re: Guess who said this?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ah yes, another www. jesuswheel .net moment.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018 at 6:07 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
I don't mean that that the initial awakening experience is all they need, but that in each of us are all the resources and capacity we need to develop that initial glimpse into full and sustained realization. Whether we figure that out is another matter. Obviously, the overwhelming majority who succeed in so doing benefit from the guidance of a living master. But some fortunate few awaken without. Attribute it to past-life merit if you will, or to the guidance of great masters who appear in the minds of beings through dreams, visions, and so on.

Certainly, it would be foolish to expect such blessings to arise in one's own case; it definitely isn't my experience. But such accounts are found in the Indo-Tibetan tradition: of awakening through the guidance of masters not met in the flesh, and of students who are instantly liberated upon their first awakening. Such instances don't undermine the need for most of us to be guided by realized teachers, but they do affirm the principle that awakening is intrinsic to our nature and without limits.

krodha wrote:
It is possible for initial awakening to occur without a support system, but no one is becoming liberated without a support system, meaning a qualified teacher, the correct teachings and expert guidance.

Those who reach non-regressive liberation instantly, like cig car bas, are no longer present in this degenerate age.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018 at 6:01 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
But is it not equally true that our experiential insights may lead us to revise or abandon previously held views?

krodha wrote:
Sometimes, sure.

However there are also cases where the paths we become involved with either (i) experientially cultivate the very assumptions we enter them with, or (ii) experientially cultivate the assumptions we are taught.

And so "right view" becomes important.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018 at 5:46 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
And suppose a formally Christian, Jewish, or whatever person does study Buddhist philosophy and then has a spontaneous realization of emptiness in their direct experience. Why should they then go to the trouble of formal refuge? Why need they affiliate or disaffiliate from any institution? They have awakened in their own mind without any of those outward trappings, and have all they need to live a liberated life if they are sufficiently discerning.

krodha wrote:
Considering an initial instance of awakening, in whatever form, to qualify as "all one needs" in order to be liberated is a very misguided assertion. Especially if said individual merely stumbles into that insight without any support system.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
So, from what I understand, wrong view is a barrier to realization, and this is why non-Buddhists are said to be out of luck. However, is it not characteristic of human experience that view, like all thoughts/concepts/mental stances, is intermittent? We may have a deeper felt sense of that wrong view being true, but that conviction and its associated emotions are also intermittent. No view is held consistently at all times, but is regularly punctuated by nonconceptual gaps. And one's view may shift subtly or

drastically in the course of moments, minutes, hours, days, months, years . . .

Now, why could not a non-Buddhist taste the true nature of self and things in a nonconceptual gap? If emptiness is not itself a conceptual construct, shouldn't an uninstructed person be able to encounter it?

krodha wrote:
"View informing realization" means your underlying assumptions about mind and reality in general will more often than not, color your experiential insights. Realizations will conform to presuppositions.

Take the Advaitan who takes the passive knowing witness to be an ultimately substantial background substrate. That apparent attribute is assumed to be an unerring and unassailable characteristic of consciousness, and said practitioner will use that characteristic as an anchor in their practice, which will then be refined into its purest form as what the Advaitan considers to be their ultimate purusa.

For Buddhists, that same characteristic (revered by the Advaitan) is considered to be an afflictive byproduct of delusion. It is seen as faulty, ultimately erroneous and an obscuration. Jigme Lingpa, for example, states that those who mistake that substrate and its strata as definitive and something to be cultivated are "like blind men wandering in the desert without a guide."

Thus, even inferentially, our view can influence the way our path unfolds and will then lead to a different result.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2018 at 4:33 PM
Title: Re: deadliest mass shooting in the U.S.
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2018 at 4:00 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:

dzogchungpa said:
Indeed. This thread, however, appears to be immortal.

Virgo said:
So it appears.

Kevin...

krodha wrote:
Not immortal, but definitely reborn. Here is its previous incarnation:

https://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=26425

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2018 at 10:25 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
What if the "other" to whom you pray liberates you not as a reward for your faith but through revealing to you that you were never really bound? That He is actually the basis of all you have ever experienced? That "you" are a temporary appearance manifesting in, as, and through Him?

krodha wrote:
Hopefully "his" name is Papaji and "he's" teaching neo-Advaita replete with all the scare quotes over first, second and third person singular pronouns... because that is what it sounds like.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2018 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Dorje Shedrub said:
I just gave three sources that disprove your statement, but I don't wish to argue.

krodha wrote:
My friend, there is no way you've "disproven" any assertions. You've only cited information you choose to consider valid.

There is alleged evidence both for and against the historical character, Jesus Christ. If forced to take a side I would align with the latter, but I have no vested interest in either side because the teachings of Jesus are wholly irrelevant to my life.

And that leads me to the main question: as a practitioner of the buddhadharma, why do you care?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2018 at 10:07 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
smcj said:

There is actually no evidence for the historical personality, Jesus of Nazareth, apart from Christian sources.
Uh huh. And how many contemporaneous records do we have about Sakyamuni? Nāgārjuna? Padmasambhava? Milarepa?

krodha wrote:
Unlike Christianity, the integrity of the Buddhist teachings do not depend on the authenticity of these historical figures.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2018 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Fictional characters are capable of many feats. I just saw a film recently where a raccoon flew a vessel through outer space.

Dorje Shedrub said:
Though his attainments can be debated, there is evidence of the historical Jesus apart from the numerous Christian sources.

krodha wrote:
There is actually no evidence for the historical personality, Jesus of Nazareth, apart from Christian sources.

In fact there were twenty plus historians who lived in the region where Jesus allegedly travelled around performing miracles, directly during the time he supposedly lived, and not one of them mention any miracle performer, prophet or son of god.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2018 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I have it on good authority that anything at all that is well spoken is the word of the Buddha.

krodha wrote:
A teaching that is "well spoken" in the context of Mahāyāna is one that accords with dependent origination, karma, cause and effect, emptiness, bodhicitta, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 12:18 PM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?

Content:
krodha wrote:
Fictional characters are capable of many feats.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
Aren't we all fictional characters ?
I highly doubt you or i will go down in history for thousands of years....

krodha wrote:
I'm just stirring the pot.

In all honesty, the amount of avid Jesus fans who frequent this forum is surprising.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 10:31 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
Jesus performed many miracles....just like Enlightened Yogis. So he must have been Enlightened. Christianity is not an accurate representation of Jesus...just like Buddhism is not an accurate representation of Buddha. Buddha was not a Buddhist. Jesus was not a Christian.

Can YOU walk on water ?
Can YOU raise the dead ?
Can YOU feed 5,000 + people with one loaf of bread ?
Can YOU cure leprosy ?
Can YOU change water into wine ?

Just to name a FEW things HE did.

krodha wrote:
Fictional characters are capable of many feats. I just saw a film recently where a raccoon flew a vessel through outer space.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 5:02 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
We're all on the same mountain, whether we know it or not. Some are climbing it, and others are circling the base.

Some paths are more direct, others gradual, and still others quite tortuous. Some reach dead ends, which require one to go back the way they came and take another path.

The shortest path is to recognize that one is only ever on the mountain. Then even a foot that strays from "the path" remains on the path.

krodha wrote:
Or, different views, different paths, different results.

If view informs realization, which the buddhadharma states is the case, then there are many different mountains.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
emaho said:
I too was (and still am) reluctant to engage in this discussion, because it tends to lead to hostilities. - Not that there haven't been any hostilities yet, but it's much less than what I feared. Every time I think I should really ask the mods to close this thread something interesting comes up from which I'm learning, and then I change my mind and decide not to ask the mods.

krodha wrote:
The thread hasn't led to this type of hostility yet...

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 1:09 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
As we've seen on more than one occasion, many masters express greater open-mindedness than their disciples towards other traditions.

krodha wrote:
If I were a teacher I'd express open-mindedness towards monotheistic religions as well. Can you imagine the Dalai Lama or any other master openly deprecating monotheism? It would not go over well and would tarnish their image greatly.

Not to mention the fact it would potentially alienate individuals who may be interested in the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:
Chagdud too? Heretics. Horrible heretics, all of them.

emaho said:
tss, tss....

krodha wrote:
It's cool if you guys like God, you don't have to employ the slighted remarks, all that accomplishes is introducing a gateway drug that may cause you to descend into routine sniping like our resident expert, dzogchungpa the magician. You guys are better than that.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2018 at 12:49 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
smcj said:
As a generalization I think it safe to say that Tibetan lamas do not share--or even understand--our antipathy with "religion". They understand that we don't like monotheism, because they don't like it either. And they really don't understand how our antipathy towards Christianity gets imported into our approach to Dharma as preconditions and acceptable interpretations.

When we listen to the Dharma through the filter of, "...but that sounds like Christianity, so that obviously can't be what he really means..." we do ourselves a disfavor.

krodha wrote:
There is no buddhadharma that sounds like Christianity apart from the basic ethical pointers.

Also no one has advocated for importing any opinion of Christianity into dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2018 at 4:20 PM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Vasana said:
As far as I can see, it's redeeming aspects viewed through the lense of the Buddha dharma are that the Christian path results in rebirth in a particular heaven or in the human realm where there is a greater chance of meeting the dharma.

krodha wrote:
Christianity is the cause of such a rebirth? This is the first I've heard of such a notion.

Vasana said:

What is a truly decent human being? Beings and their propesnsities are context dependent. If you are born in a ghetto or difficult environment then surely it's better for the kids to learn morality and find meaning and community in their nearest available faith rather than from the streets. How beings arrive at their ethical and moral compass is not as pertinent as the fact that they now have sown those seeds. I know many unethical atheists that engage in nonvirtue but I also know a few ethical Christians who practice various virtues. Who's in a more fortunate position?

krodha wrote:
And I know many ethical atheists who engage in virtue and also unethical Christians who engage in non-virtue.

Vasana said:
It is said that Bodhisattvas and Buddhas can appear in the heaven realms so I think they have a much greater possibility of meeting the path of liberation than those weighed down by heavier karma. Also, many Buddhists die afflicted beings to be reborn again too.

krodha wrote:
I'm still unsure where you are getting the idea that Christians are bound for any sort of higher rebirth as a result of their relationship with their faith. This does not make sense.

Vasana said:
'simply because' seems like a simplification of a complex set of phenomenon and circumstances. I think it's more interesting to notice the skilfull means of various Buddhists when dealing with the sensitive topic of other faiths. Maybe the Dalai Lama is teaching us something about skilfull means in his open arms approach to other faiths.

krodha wrote:
My son was raised without religion and exhibits healthy skepticism towards systems of belief, yet is kind and compassionate because he was shown that is the way to be, without religion.

I also have family members who are Christian. My daughter attends a Christian elementary school. I'm courteous and kind to any Christian I interact with and respect their relationship with their religion. My outward display does not reflect my personal feelings whatsoever, and if there are skillful means involved, that outward tolerance, patience and kindness is surely it. That is all that those such as the Dalai Lama are intending to communicate.

Inwardly, I really don't care for their religion and have many family members who feel the same way.

Vasana said:
And that's another point too- building interfaith solidarity and respect will probably help the world and it's inhabitants sooner than philosophical and theological debate.

krodha wrote:

Perhaps.

Yet it is also evident that Judeo-Christian values and tenets are at the root of the anthropocentric attitude that many human beings approach both other species and our planet with, to their detriment.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2018 at 1:43 PM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
emaho said:
Yeah, nevermind. A lot of people are suffering from serious allergies. I know what that's like, I'm allergic to pollen and dust.

krodha wrote:
As far as I can tell, Christians, Catholics, etc., worship some sort of asura, and they are welcome to do so, but look at the massive scale of bloodshed that has occurred as a result.

What redeeming aspects does Christianity have? Instilling a moral compass? If you need a god to threaten you with judgement and eternal damnation in order to be a decent human being, then you are not a decent human being.

If you are truly a decent human being then you are that way with or without Christianity, and in that case what does Christianity really offer? A sense of community? You can find that in any subculture.

Christians have no possibility to be liberated. They cling to a system of belief in this life, and die as afflicted sentient beings, to be reborn again.

I do not understand why people lend Christianity so much legitimacy, simply because massive amounts of people have adopted it and choose to adhere to its teachings.

But to each their own.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2018 at 10:43 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
ChNN must not have gotten the memo since, apparently, he considers Jesus to have been an enlightened being.

emaho said:
Neither has Chhimed Rigdzin Rinpoche. He once said during a teaching that Jesus was

a high Bodhisattva and if he'd enter the room, he, CRR, would immediately step down from his throne and prostrate to Jesus.

Dorje Shedrub said:
HHDL has also called JC a bodhisattva.

krodha wrote:
They're just being kind.

Moreover, there is no evidence Jesus ever existed, and even if (i) he did exist, and (ii) his convoluted teaching that has been butchered over centuries has any merit, it still has no application in the context of the buddhadharma.

Those interested in seeing Jesus as some sort of bodhisattva in a legitimate sense are trying to reconcile cultural baggage with some sort of guilt.

But then again I feel Christianity has been a scourge in this world, and has most likely done more harm than good.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2018 at 8:33 AM
Title: Re: Trekchod/pointing out instructions
Content:
florin said:
You are asking sutra level questions (selflessness,illusion,ego, etc...) in a topic with a dzogchen title.

krodha wrote:
Selflessness, illusion, etc., are core Dzogchen principles.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2018 at 7:47 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
Fine, but you never answered whether that understanding is in the tantras themselves, in self-commentaries presumably written around the same time or not long after, or in significantly later commentaries. Later commentators would have a strong vested interest in tying up any apparent loose ends or ambiguities, and they would do so according to their scholastic monastic training.

krodha wrote:
Overall, what does it matter? Are you insinuating that you believe there is a case to be made for interpreting the use of "I" literally?

That the intention behind including said pronoun in these texts is solely meant to communicate that there is some sort of actual personification of the nature of mind, existing somewhere, that is giving teachings like some god?

That would be the consequence of such a position.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2018 at 6:52 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
My point is precisely that Eckhart uses the first person singular pronoun "I" as a rhetorical device. His sermons, while ostensibly to his audience, were also a way for him to give an exposition to himself; to clarify his realization. He is personifying a recognition, something that was strange and new to his listeners.

krodha wrote:
His expositions appear to be no different than the Advaitan authors who used "I" as a means to indicate their transcendent nature, and the Advaitans are certainly not using said pronoun rhetorically. For them it is referencing something truly substantial that is endowed with an ontological status, there is no reason to assume Eckhart was not doing the same.

Spelare said:
When Eckhart had to defend himself at trial, he testified that he had been employing a literary device. So, that's a non-difference.

krodha wrote:
Eckhart pivoted to his claimed "literary" position under duress, in order to literally save his own head.

The Dzogchen tantras on the other hand are understood to use the same language rhetorically and this information was voluntarily provided under no threat of beheading.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2018 at 5:51 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
That quotation sounds totally arrogant and presumptuous if you read it as simply a delusional human being. But if the "I" speaking there is the same "I" that in our own tradition's scriptures says "I am primordial self-originating wisdom. I am the primordial source of all phenomena. I am the all-creating king, pure perfect presence," what he has said is the opposite of arrogance or presumption.

krodha wrote:
There is no actual "I" in the Dzogchen teachings that says such things.

The style of prose which involves a first person perspective that is sometimes employed in the Dzogchen tantras is "direct," as opposed to the "indirect" style we find in the Śravāka suttas and Mahāyāna sūtras and śastras. Which means that instead of the text being a second hand report of an account, beginning with "thus I have heard, on one occasion...", it is styilized as a direct teaching or exposition from the personified dharmakāya. The retinue, rather than a group of aspirants and practitioners in the sūtras, is the nature of mind itself. The nature of mind is giving an exposition to itself, where the retinue is the form kāyas. Therefore we see the personified teacher using the first person singular pronoun "I", as a rhetorical device.

The Dzogchen tantras even go as far as to note what the pronoun "I" represents in the texts in question, and are clear it is a literary device. It isn't stating that there is some sort of transcendent self or "I", nor is it saying anything remotely similar to esoteric Christian teachings.

Spelare said:
Does he have to have fully realized and integrated that awakening in order for us to suspect he had a genuine glimpse? Of course we won't find Buddhist words coming out of his mouth, because he was unacquainted with Buddhism. However, if we take seriously the teaching that all sentient beings have buddha-nature . . . very possible.

krodha wrote:
There is no evidence these Christian mystics acquired insight or had experiences that were commensurate with the definitive species of realization championed in Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2018 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
Spelare said:
It depends on how you are measuring and for what. Arguably, the greatest mystics of the Christian East and West have more in common with Dzogchen masters than they do with the Christian "fundamentalists" you use below as a strawman. Of those mystics, who are to be found among the Desert Fathers and later monastics as well as lay practitioners, the spiritual lineages of Evagrius Ponticus and Dionysius the Areopagite merit special attention. They used what they had received from Jewish esoterism and Greek Neoplatonic philosophy, arriving at a new synthesis through ascetic praxis.

krodha wrote:
Although take Dionysius for example, his writings are replete with descriptions such as "the darkness," "unknowing," which was a staple of his teachings that his magnum opus was titled after, not to mention his affinity for the apophatic approach. None of this

resembles Dzogchen or Buddhism in general in any way.

Spelare said:
Very broad brushstrokes.

krodha wrote:
Yet accurate.

Spelare said:
But when it is not manifestly dysfunctional, as it often can be, it gives a moral foundation analogous to the outer teachings of Buddhism. With additional unnecessary baggage, arguably. But I have heard respected lamas say that an ethical foundation and relative relief of suffering are not to be belittled, even when they are not ultimately liberating.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, yet the intention behind the so-called moral foundations of each are worlds apart.

Spelare said:
Really? Isn't that your own reading of what he was doing? In my reading, certain masters in the Eastern and Western Christian worlds were using skillful means in their employment of established doctrine, theology, and ascetic practice to communicate a realization beyond the understanding of most Christians. That is clearly what Evagrius, Eckhart, and Gregory Palamas were doing, to name only a few bright luminaries.

krodha wrote:
Any and all esoteric, shamanic, mystic, gnostic traditions explore so-called "altered states" of consciousness. This coarse observation does not mean esoteric Christianity and Dzogchen have anything in common apart from that.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2018 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Advaita Vedanta is more refined than Christian Gnosticism, and even it is not commensurate with Dzogchen or Buddhist teachings in general.

The nonsense that Christianity has spun into this day in age is very far removed from its gnostic branches and is now little more than a platform to enslave the minds of the spiritually less fortunate.

When Norbu Rinpoche makes comparisons to Christianity he is using skillful means, as no one is becoming liberated through Christianity.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2018 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: If the Mahayana Sutras were not spoken by the Buddha what authority do they hold?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In Mahāyāna the tathāgata is not considered to be name and form, therefore the word of the Buddha is not tied to the statements of any specific historical figure.

Fortyeightvows said:
Yes mahayana texts like the diamond sutra say this. We should add that mahayana texts also have plenty of verses saying how great they are. So how can we know that a text is great? Because the text itself says its great!

Since these teachings "not tied to the statements of any specific historical figure" then why do we have them set in places that the historical figure taught at? With an audience of other historical figures? etc.
I'd think one reason to do this would specifically be to 'tie them to the historical figure.

My only point is that often people will say things like 'mahayana accepts all the lower teachings', but if they looked at the pali texts, we find alot of things which contradict the mahayana teachings.

krodha wrote:
My point is that the authenticity or legitimacy of the Mahāyāna teachings does not hinge upon whether Buddha Śākyamuni taught them... whether he did or did not, it is all the same.

The Ārya-aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra states that the tathāgata is not to be viewed as name and form. Therefore the Buddha is not actually the historical figure Gautama Śākyamuni:

Those who are attached to the tathāgata as a form or a name are childish and have corrupted discerning wisdom... the tathāgatas are not to be seen as the rūpakāya; the tathāgatās are to be seen as the dharmakāya.

Then in Malcolm's current signature, in the quote from the Ārya-adhyāśaya-sañcodana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, the definition of buddhavacana or "the word of the Buddha" is provided in the context of the Mahāyāna:

[A]nything at all that is well spoken is the word of the Buddha.

Viewing the Mahāyāna teachings in this way allows the question that this entire thread is based upon to dissipate and become a non-issue, which is nice.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2018 at 9:30 AM
Title: Re: Quote by ChNNR about Dzogchen and God - where is it from?
Content:
emaho said:
PS: I was going with the entry from the RY Wiki, the part that I've marked blue: alaya - all-ground. Literally, the 'foundation of all things.' The basis of mind and both pure and impure phenomena. This word has different meanings in different contexts and should be understood accordingly. Sometimes it is synonymous with buddha nature or dharmakaya, the recognition of which is the basis for all pure phenomena; other times, as in the case of the 'ignorant all-ground,' it refers to a neutral state of dualistic mind that has not been embraced by innate wakefulness and thus is the basis for samsaric experience [RY]
http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/kun_gzhi

I wasn't aware that ChNN uses this term in the sense of the green part. Thanks for explaining.

krodha wrote:
The blue and green sections are part and parcel to one another. If there is a basis for pure and impure phenomena then is afflicted.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2018 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: If the Mahayana Sutras were not spoken by the Buddha what authority do they hold?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In Mahāyāna the tathāgata is not considered to be name and form, therefore the word of the Buddha is not tied to the statements of any specific historical figure.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2018 at 5:57 AM
Title: Re: Dialectical Monism / Emptiness
Content:
Wayfarer said:
...the expression:
ultimate truth is nothing more....
Does make me a bit uneasy because it seems reductionist.

krodha wrote:
Non-arising is non-reductive.

Wayfarer said:
Again, I think what we have to understand is that there is nothing to get. Yet we have to constantly strive to get it.

krodha wrote:
The nature of phenomena is something to recognize. That nature is always already the case, and so in that sense there is nothing to "get" in terms of acquiring something new. However, given that we do not possess a working knowledge of said nature, that knowledge must be acquired through awakening.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2018 at 9:52 PM
Title: Re: Energy healing, will it disrupt prana from Vajrayana/Dzogchen
Content:
MiphamFan said:
Will learning or receiving New Age type energy healings disrupt prana for Vajrayana/Dzogchen practice to your knowledge?

I remember Khandro Kunzang, Lama Dawa's consort and assistant, still does some New Age type healing, but forgot what it was exactly.

What about reiki or other "energy" type stuff?

krodha wrote:
Unless you're actively involved with practices that are intended to slow or still your karmavāyu I think you're ok.

And if you are involved with such practice, reiki and new age healing are the least of your worries, as any relative use of body, speech and mind is going to disturb your vāyu.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2018 at 8:35 PM
Title: Re: Dialectical Monism / Emptiness
Content:
Sherab said:
When it is asserted that an ultimate truth is merely a conventional truth, it necessarily implies that there is only the conventional truth.

And it all went down into a logical rabbit hole when combined with the definition that "An ultimate truth is the veridical perception of a given entity, a relative truth is the non-veridical perception of a given entity" because it follows that the relative/conventional truth is now both veridical and non-veridical.

krodha wrote:
So-called ultimate truth is nothing more than an absence of arising and absence of

characteristics that is intended to be recognized by afflicted sentient beings. Ultimate truth in name, and as a principle in itself, is equally conventional because said truth is nothing more than a solution to your current samsaric predicament.

Afflicted sentient beings posit an ultimate truth to be realized from the standpoint of their ignorance, which is again, only the non-arising of the figments of their own delusion. Tathāgatas likewise only posit an ultimate truth for the sake of afflicted sentient beings.

In the same vein, only afflicted sentient beings perceive tathāgatas. Tathāgatas do not perceive sentient beings or other tathāgatas, nor do they perceive or conceive of relative or ultimate truths. The two truths are a relative model employed to help you find a way out of your afflicted situation.

The misperception of conditioned phenomena manifests as a result of ignorance, and said misperception is undone with the cessation of ignorance. There is no other "ultimate truth" to recognize, and said ultimate nature is nothing more than the absence of arising and absence of characteristics in allegedly conditioned phenomena. Hence there is nothing to identify as "ultimate" beyond said absence, and when that non-arising is realized there is no more ultimate truth to be apprehended.

The Pitāputrasamāgamana Sūtra states:

Great king, the dharmadhātu cannot be explained apart from being just a name, just a symbol, just a convention [just relative], just an expression and just a designation.

And this goes for both truths, as the Mahāsiddha Virupa communicates:

The two truths don’t exist in the dharmadhātu, the dharmadhātu does not exist.

Therefore those who say the ultimate is unfindable, are also saying the relative is unfindable.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2018 at 8:22 PM
Title: Re: Dialectical Monism / Emptiness
Content:
Sherab said:
Note also that "...it does not arise, does not cease..." This implies that it simply is.

I think it is better to understand the ultimate as above then to say it is non-inherent.

krodha wrote:
This is because you have an Advaita Vedanta type view.

Sherab said:

Being simply is can imply non-inherence but non-inherence does not imply being simply is.

krodha wrote:
If something "simply is" it has arisen and has an ontological status.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2018 at 3:30 PM
Title: Re: Dialectical Monism / Emptiness
Content:
Sherab said:
And there are Buddhists who assert that there is no implicate order (ultimate) and that there is only the explicate order (relative). You will find on this board the voices with the most influence belong to the latter. I think they are wrong though.

krodha wrote:
No one involved with this board asserts "the latter." The issue is that you personally harbor inaccurate views that prevent you from comprehending what the alleged "latter" are actually saying.

Which is why I said a gestalt shift is required in your own understanding, and until that occurs you will continually fail to grasp what is being said and will persist in your misrepresentation of the position you are objecting to.

Every single time you interact with "the latter," an impasse is reached and it becomes evident that there is no point in continuing the discussion. You're welcome to your opinion but you are deceiving yourself if you think you understand the actual view of those you are disagreeing with.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 4th, 2018 at 4:11 PM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
Luca Vliolini said:
Hi khorda my English is very primitive so I try to answer in a very coarse a simple way but if you understand italian Ican give you a refined reply.
First of all the discussion is about alleged different semantic opinion about khyabrig rigpa between Lopon tenzin namdak and Tenzin Wangyal
but according all the quotation that I did for both master khyabrig rigpa is all pervading the whole existence.Lopon did a very clear definition
the put below
(All-)Encompassing Awareness means that all the Natural State called Buddha Nature which encompasses all sentient beings and whole of existence; therefore it is called (All-) Encompassing Awareness"
Namkha Truldzo 2-7 August 2005

second week page 33 (this book is edited by Shenten Dargye Ling)
I speak about semantic and this is very crucial point .Jla spoke about a private talk with lopon tenzin namdak where Lopon gave a different semantic interpretation but in public teaching Lopon Tenzin namdak said just opposite.

(All-)Encompassing Awareness means that all the Natural State called Buddha Nature which encompasses all sentient beings and whole of existence; therefore it is called (All-) Encompassing Awareness"
So the first and main premise of Jean Luc was contradicted directly by lopon Tenzin namdak in a public teaching.

It is the main point because is about the semantic
.In a language we must make a clear distiction(There is a scientific work by Tarsky)between language and meta language . Between syntaxex and semantics.
In Italin will make a long speech between difference Meta language and language but here is beyond my English.But is a crucial an d important topic

Anyway Jean Luc is free to say that say khyabrig rigpa is not all pervading the whole existence and say that is an eretic position but he cannot say thathis opinion is the same opinion of Lopon Tenzin namdak because in a public teaching Lopon Tenzin Namdak 2-7 August 2005 told that (All-)Encompassing Awareness means that all the Natural State called Buddha Nature which encompasses all sentient beings and whole of existence; therefore it is called (All-) Encompassing Awareness.

krodha wrote:
Like I said, this issue is more nuanced than simply stating objects are or aren't the "natural state." Or that X species of rig pa does or does not pervade "existence."

To understand how rigpa "encompasses" or "pervades" so-called "existence" (I personally would not put it this way) one must first understand how the objects, persons, places, etc., that constitute existence come to manifest. This process is detailed in the teachings.

Jean-Luc is not contradicting Lopon Tenzin Namdak, he is merely clarifying the import of Lopon's statement, demonstrating how it can be misconstrued and why it is important not to misconstrue it that way.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 4th, 2018 at 12:42 PM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:

krodha wrote:
Overall if understood correctly is a non-controversial point, however if we fail to understand the nuances involved and mistakenly believe that (i) objects are endowed

with rigpa, or (ii) that our perception of objects constitutes a cognition of the so-called "natural state," then we have erred and misunderstand the import of the statement.

These are the issues that Jean-Luc raised, and they are pertinent.

Johnny Dangerous said:
I have never seen anyone say rocks and trees have rigpa.

krodha wrote:
Apparently Jean-Luc encountered this view, to a degree that he felt it warranted multiple entries in his blog in order to clarify how and why it is misguided.

Luca's name was thrown out there by JLA, so he is associated somehow.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 4th, 2018 at 10:34 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
krodha wrote:
It is difficult to decipher what the controversy is at this point.

Luca, you seem keen on reiterating that objects are "pervaded" and "encompassed" by rig pa... this is in some semblance true, but is also very coarse as a broad assertion and could use some further unpacking.

Overall if understood correctly is a non-controversial point, however if we fail to understand the nuances involved and mistakenly believe that (i) objects are endowed with rigpa, or (ii) that our perception of objects constitutes a cognition of the so-called "natural state," then we have erred and misunderstand the import of the statement.

These are the issues that Jean-Luc raised, and they are pertinent.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 4th, 2018 at 7:26 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
Luca Vliolini said:
With pleasure .

Namkha Truldzo 2-7 August 2005
second week page 33 (this book is edited by Shenten Dargye Ling)

the definiton Kyab rig by Lopon Tenzin namdak
"1. (All-)Encompassing Awareness means that all the Natural State called Buddha Nature which encompasses all sentient beings and whole of existence; therefore it is

called (All-) Encompassing Awareness"

Namkha Truldzo teaching 23 July -11 August 2006 page 39 (this book is edited by Shenten Dargye Ling)
By Lopon Tenzin Namdak
"All phenomena which exixts-internally externally -are all natural state ,so if everything is natural state then the question arise :Is the pillar the natural state or not?It has to be the natural state because we have already said ,we have made the premise ,that everything is the natural state .But it is not easy for us to accept that a pillar or a table is natural state"

krodha wrote:
The issue is that this specific topic is more nuanced than simply saying objects are or are not the "natural state."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2018 at 5:05 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
TWR: When we talk about wisdom or rigpa, they talk about three kinds of rigpa. One is pervasive innate awareness or pervasive space, which is everywhere - beyond your body, beyond your mind, in matter. You share that same space. You share that space with matter. You share that space with all other people, with every other consciousness. We are connected. Totally connected. No matter how far or close you are there are no differences.

krodha wrote:
This is certainly unconventional, especially given how the body and matter manifest.

dzogchungpa said:
Yah, is that a beauty or what?

krodha wrote:
It is a sloppy exposition.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2018 at 2:42 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
TWR: When we talk about wisdom or rigpa, they talk about three kinds of rigpa. One is pervasive innate awareness or pervasive space, which is everywhere - beyond your body, beyond your mind, in matter. You share that same space. You share that space with

matter. You share that space with all other people, with every other consciousness. We are connected. Totally connected. No matter how far or close you are there are no differences.

krodha wrote:
This is certainly unconventional, especially given how the body and matter manifest.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2018 at 12:09 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
Luca Vliolini said:
11 Year Ago I was Italy organizer Lopon Tenzin namdak Rinpoche retreats .I asked him about this isuue and he pointed me a book transcripted his Namkha truldzo teaching and he told me to read that transcription . I read
l Namkha Truldzo 2-7 August 2005
seconda week page 33 (this book is edited by Shenten Dargye Ling)

the definiton Kyab rig by Lopon Tenzin namdak
"1. (All-)Encompassing Awareness means that all the Natural State called Buddha Nature which encompasses all sentient beings and whole of existence; therefore it is called (All-) Encompassing Awareness"
The same of Tenzin Wangyal definition.So I think that Tenzin Wangyal and Anne Klein are right about this issue .In the passage that i post by Anne klein there is a traslation of a writing about this issue by Lopon tenzin Namdak
"pervasive open awareness (khyab rig) is the clarity that pervades everything".Her translation fit very well with transcription of Shenten.So I wonder where Twr is wrong

krodha wrote:
The controversy centers around the suggestion that rocks, etc., possess rig pa.

Khyab rig can encompass or pervade phenomenal appearances without said phenomena possessing rigpa.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2018 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
Luca Vliolini said:
Hi there is man opinion between scholar about .The Bonpo master have their opinion I put a very important explanation by Tenzin Wangyal and about Anne Klein.
Here Tenzin Wangyal Explanation.1992-1993 Austria 21 Nails

there is a very important explanation of the Rigpa. It is also a very rare kind of explanation and is honoured because of its clear distinction. It explains that there are

three kinds of Rigpa. Usually one question arises in the normal usage of explanation of the Rigpa. If the Rigpa is never distracted in its base or essence and it is like Buddhahood, does that mean that we don`t need to practise. If Rigpa is never distracted we shouldn`t need any practices to overcome our own distraction.
This first Rigpa is called khyabrig, with the meaning of all pervading awareness; in Tibetan kun khyab means all pervading, rig stands for Rigpa which is usually rendered as pure awareness. This rig, which is not awareness in our normal way of understanding as being aware of something, but awareness as nature or essence which is presence. This first Rigpa we are talking here is called khyabrig or whole pervading because it is everywhere. It is the base. It is primordially perfect. For example the sun in the sky, meaning there is light everywhere in the whole sky and at the same time there is the reflection of the sun in the water, the ocean; There is a light, this light in and on the water which reflects on the wall and on the wall there is again sunlight from the top. This different forms of sunlight have differnt qualities like a very heat quality, one has a very wet quality, one is a dry quality but still all have the quality of sunlight in that specific quality. This means this first Rigpa is everywhere, in each base, therefore kunkhyab (kun khyab) - all pervading or pervading the whole existence.
The second kind of awareness is called samrig (bsam rig), which means consciousness-awareness. This consciousness awareness is very important because it is this where we usually have problems. Problem in the sense that we have usually understanding and non-understanding. All our questions which arise from this consciousness-awareness. When we do not understand and when we are distracted we go to the master and try to receive teachings. Then we try to practise and when we manage to practise in the right way we come to an understanding. Sometimes we are distracted, sometimes not. These changes of awareness is called samrig or consciousness-awareness. Before we explained the external vision, we said that there are no limitations. Everything is possible. In the same way as the visions are not limited our awareness is omnipervasive. Our awareness has no limitations. It can perceive everything in an equal taste. The problem is just our consciousness which is our conceptual consciousness. It comes as the dualistic mind and it is at that point that we don`t understand anymore the things which are actually quite simple. This mind blocks ourselves to understand. When it does not arise we understand things how they are. This is the function of the consciousness-awareness. It is different from the first awareness which is always present. Before, in the teaching there was this explanation to just leave it in that omnipervasiveness, this awareness pervading everything. It is the potential or possibility of all visions. To leave it there means don`t move the other consciousness-awareness, which is grasping. Then, there is the third one which is called yerig or primordial-awareness. This is more connected with the second one, the conciousness-awareness. There is always the unification of the Rigpa as a consciousness-awareness with the vision. It is not seperate. It is pure. It has the quality that there is always presence in the vision, therefore it is called primordial. Even if it were to be distracted it is not really distracted. There is this consciousness on this awareness which is always there and this is called primordial. It is the one which always stays in presence, and with this presence I integrate all my visions. That means that through my consciousness I actually remove my distractions and integrate everything with this consciousness-awareness samrig. The base, which is one for all things, is already there all the time, uninterupted is called the primordial awareness or yerig.hese

three kinds of Rigpa are explainded here and I find them very important because when we usually talk of Rigpa we do not distinguish. In a sense we always talk of Rigpa as being pure, perfect and then what happens is that we constantly find ourselves ignorant. We are just confused all the time. It is important to understand why we are confused when Rigpa is perfect. Our own Rigpa is perfect and at the same time we are confused. That is because our primordial awareness is spontaneously perfect from primordial time. And because of that awareness (ye rig) we have the possibility to develop the consciousness-awareness (bsam rig). It is like if we shake milk, if there is not the possibiliy to become butter we could shake endlessly it would never become butter. In the same way as we have that quality of awareness (ye rig) we can develop our consciousness-awareness (bsam rig). That is important to understand.
In the same way the primordial awareness or yerig is always there and through our consciousness-awareness or samrig which is sometimes distracted ond sometimes present we can arrive in that primordial presence. Whereas the whole pervading awareness or khyabrig, which pervades all existence is always there. It is the nature of existence. This is called awareness or Rigpa because everything has one fundamental quality or nature. For example a flower has this all-pervading awareness or khyabrig but a flower has no consciousness-awareness (bsam rig) and therefore no primordial awareness (ye rig). This allpervading awareness is not an awareness in our normal way of thinking and understanding awareness or consciousness, therefore we use Rigpa and not consciousness. But when we talk of kunzhi as the base of everything and it would not exist in some way in the flower then it would not be the base of everything. And it is not only the base of the flower but of every existence. This quality is the absolute reality of all existence. It is not only the reality of us human beings.
But then you might ask, if it is in everything why is there only for us human beings the possibility for realization? Why can`t a flower realize the nature of mind? It is because the flower has no consciousness-awareness, only all-pervading awareness. For example the sun shines in the sky and does reflect everywhere but not in a piece of coal. It reflects in the crystal because a crystal has the potentiality and quality to reflect and the coal has no potential quality to reflect. That does not mean the sun does not shine everywhere.
Another way of understanding is when we talk usually that everything you perceive outside is like a dream. You should always remember these things which are already explained to you; otherwise it does not make any sense to explain it. We can also say that this flower is like a dream It does not exist in the way as we are perceiving this flower. There is something, but it could also be a stone. What we see there could be a flower but also a stone and if it is something what we perceive we call it flower. Then if we go and analyze this flower on what we think or expect to be a flower and take out the parts of the flower like the petals one by one, we do not find something concrete which is the real flower. What we think the flower is we do not find anywhere if we search for it. This is a very conceptual way of looking at things and we don`t do that type of analyzing things. It is important to understand that in Dzogchen it is not important at all to analyze, but sometimes as we need to discuss we can also use this way of explaining. It is important to understand that if you really want to know what the flower is and you analyze that flower part by part, you take out petal by petal and so on. You don`t find a part which is the base of the flower. In each part of it we try to find the flower and we don`t find the flower at all. Then when you understand that there doesn`t exist

something concrete called flower, that is called the base. Still there is something called the flower and that is allpervading awareness. It is important to discover this subtle existence. That is called clarity (gsal ba). Normally we do not discover this subtle existence or all-pervading awareness but we see only our flower. Likewise in the Sutra (mdo) it talks a lot about emptiness, Shunyata or tongpanyi (stong pa nyid). In the Sutra it is said to prove that something does not exist is easy. It is easy to prove that there doesn`t exist something concrete like our flower, but to prove or to show you that there is something that exists is very difficult!
Sometimes you might think it is not important to teach in this way and you think you want to have direct introduction and direct experience. And it might be that you even have this direct understanding, but still you are in a dualistic condition. Therefore it is important to clarify yourself and your understanding with such a teaching

krodha wrote:
Aren't you one of the individuals Jean-Luc was addressing about this issue?

JLA said that while Tenzin's contributions to these teachings are no doubt noteworthy, he was mistaken about this specific principle [khyab rig] when he wrote this text, for whatever reason.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2018 at 3:45 PM
Title: Re: Illusion in Dzogchen
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
If EVERYTHING comes from ONE thing, How can there be anything separate? ...everything in the Universe came from the same source.

krodha wrote:
This is not actually a view supported by Dzogchen, or Buddhism in general.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2018 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Illusion in Dzogchen
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
Krodha wrote:

Something "real" would be substantial in nature, meaning truly established as a concrete entity.

Illusions appear but are not established or substantial entities, therefore they are not "real."

Nothing is held to be real in the view of Dzogchen.
==========

Real was meant here as an answer to something which we also can left aside then we get
Nature is the ultimate , maybe better said.

Guess illusions are inherent connected to Nature but are empty (in Nature)
So Nature has some "real" characteristics.

The view of Dzogchen has sure "real" views and some wrong ones like:

Now, while you are meditating, if you think something and
focus to the object side, then that is Thagpar Tawa, Eternalism.

If you think that the mind and Nature do not exist, then that is
Cheta, the View of Nihilism.

If you just focus and think whether something exists or
something doesn't exist, then that is Lungma Tenpa, Neutral View
where there are neither virtues nor negativities.

If you use mantras or think when you are meditating, then that
is Zulum, your own view - it is not according to Dzogchen.

In "real" Nature, there is no focusing nor does it use consciousness or speech.
Here you can see, we use again the word "real".

There are more wrong views possible for a Dzogchenpa.

krodha wrote:
The term "real" can be used in many contexts, but referring to your nature as your "real nature" is just a way of communicating that your nature is the actual condition of your mind that you are meant to recognize.

"Real nature" in that context does not mean your nature is substantial or established.

This is a semantic issue.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2018 at 1:10 AM
Title: Re: Illusion in Dzogchen
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:

Illusion is the ultimately real.

kalden yungdrung said:
Maybe Nature is the ultimate real?

krodha wrote:
Something "real" would be substantial in nature, meaning truly established as a concrete entity.

Illusions appear but are not established or substantial entities, therefore they are not "real."

Nothing is held to be real in the view of Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2018 at 12:28 AM
Title: Re: Illusion in Dzogchen
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Illusion is the ultimately real.

krodha wrote:
"Ultimately real" and illusion are the antithesis of one another.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2018 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: US and Allies Launch Strikes on Syria
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's also this point of interest for European countries involved:

http://www.news.com.au/world/middle-east/is-the-fight-over-a-gas-pipeline-fuelling-the-worlds-bloodiest-conflict/news-story/74efcba9554c10bd35e280b63a9afb74

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2018 at 5:02 AM
Title: Re: Great Transference question
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also, disappearance of the body does not necessarily indicate the body of light, this was discussed on here before some time ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2018 at 9:28 AM
Title: Re: Great Transference question
Content:
Josef said:
Yes, the Longsal Thogal and Longsal Yangti books are restricted to students who attended those retreats in person.

krodha wrote:
The Longsal Thogal was published?

Rinpoche said it was in the works at the retreat and then I never heard anything after that.

Josef said:
I don't know if it's available.

krodha wrote:
Thanks, the only update I found was this:

ROOT TEXT AND COMMENTARY OF LONGSAL THODGAL

This book contains the teaching that Chögyal Namkhai Norbu transmitted in its complete form in Tenerife, 2011.

The text has been translated and Adriano also worked with Rinpoche a few weeks ago in May 2016 in Tenerife. Now Adriano needs to recheck it and edit in its final form, before being edited and published, hopefully by the end of this year.

From here:

http://melong.com/translation-projects-update/

There are some other great projects on the way as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2018 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: Great Transference question
Content:
Josef said:
Yes, the Longsal Thogal and Longsal Yangti books are restricted to students who attended those retreats in person.

krodha wrote:
The Longsal Thogal was published?

Rinpoche said it was in the works at the retreat and then I never heard anything after that.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2018 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Andrew David Boyle said:
I don't think there is any difference.

krodha wrote:
There is a monumental difference.

For one, the Dzogchen tantras reject the Advaita view by name and also explicitly reject the view of non-duality that Advaita Vedanta promulgates. The view of Advaita also breaks a Dzogchen samaya.

There's no room for interpretation on this one, and the Dzogchen corpus made sure of that.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2018 at 4:52 AM
Title: Re: melong pendant
Content:
Lukeinaz said:
Now where do I find some good cord to attach it?

krodha wrote:
I use two cords, in case one fails.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2018 at 2:16 PM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
You hold the view that there is only cognition that is conventional, i.e. cognition that goes through a sense media. I hold that there is cognition which goes through an intermediary and a cognition which does not. This is a point of disagreement.

krodha wrote:
The issue is that you are conflating contexts. In the overarching picture the two truths are a conventional dichotomy, meaning at the end of the day the two truths are merely a pedagogical tool that is implemented to allow the aspirant to comprehend the nature of the predicament the buddhadharma aims to resolve. The model does not survive in the

end, and therefore it is only conventional in nature.

Then within the more specific context of two truth model itself, we treat saṃvṛtisatya or "conventional truth" as fallacious and pāramārthasatya or "ultimate truth" as valid or "veridical." Yet ultimate truth is only veridical in that it is a working knowledge of a lack of validity in so-called conventional truth. It is not "veridical" in the sense that it is a legitimate nature that stands apart from what is termed "conventional" within the scope of the two truths, as you seem to be suggesting.

An ultimate truth is only taught because there is something to be understood about the nature of phenomena that is not currently known. One's current knowledge of phenomena is afflicted by ignorance, giving rise to the inaccurate conviction that there are entities, structures and processes that are truly real and established. The intermediary you bring up is precisely one of those structures. Meaning "sense media" is a false appearance, and because it is a fallacious appearance there is not actually a species of cognition that functions through an intermediary and a species of cognition that functions independently of said intermediary. Rather, there is simply the very same noetic capacity that is either (i) plagued by ignorance or (ii) free from ignorance, and the appearance of an intermediary, in this case sense media, manifests or subsides accordingly as a result of said cause.

Sherab said:
Veridical means truthful or veracious. By definition something that is non-veridical cannot be relied upon for the truth. So if you accept Malcolm's definition of conventional truth as a non-veridical cognition of an entity, then you also have to accept that conventional truth is not truthful and therefore cannot be relied upon for truth.

krodha wrote:
What "truth" do you think there is apart from the absence of origination in allegedly conditioned entities?

If the so-called "truth" in question is merely a lack of validity in relation to purported entities that are in actuality misconceptions that were never established in the first place, how is that lack of establishment itself a truly established or substantial truth?

The "truth" you are intended to recognize is that conventional entities are "non-veridical."

This is what is meant in texts which state the dharmadhātu is a mere name, and not truly existent. Or that nirvana does not actually exist, or that upon exhausting dharmas, dharmatā is also exhausted, etc.

Regarding recognition, the entire process of liberation from beginning to end is conventional in nature. Within that overarching conventional scope we define impure and pure cognitions as "conventional" and "ultimate," however this dichotomy is again, merely conventional. Thus we can say recognition occurs, and jñāna, the modality of cognition that manifests during instances of equipoise, is a "veridical" species of

consciousness because it apprehends the dharmatā of mind and/or phenomena, but this does not mean jñāna is something ultimately established that stands apart from so-called conventional phenomena. Likewise, other so-called "veridical" attributes of the path, such as prajñā, dharmadhātu, dharmakāya, etc., are also merely conventions, despite their roles as definitive principles that are related to so-called ultimate truth.

All entities and processes are illusory and ultimately without substance. Occurrences like the recognition of dharmatā appear and have soteriological implications and value, but are ultimately essenceless appearances like anything else.

Sherab said:
This is another point of disagreement. For me, non-duality refers to no distinction of "self" and "other". Hence, dualistic cognition always involve a subject and an object. In non-dualistic cognition, there is no distinction of subject and object.

krodha wrote:
Freedom from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence means no subject or objects can be found.

Therefore, whereas your interpretation views a lack of duality as a fusion of subject and object which creates a reductive and substantial ultimate nature that is "non-dual," the view I am communicating demonstrates that subjects and objects cannot be found when sought to begin with. Because subject and object are recognized to have never arisen in the first place, the treatment I am championing contrasts your own in that it promotes a non-reductive and insubstantial non-dual nature as a lack of essence. The difference between these two views is subtle but important, and contrasting interpretations like this is what sets the buddhadharma apart from substantialist tirthika dharmas.

In any case, it seems you believe there is actually some sort of established or substantial ultimate nature, and this error in view causes you to perceive various substance dualities.

A gestalt shift is in order...

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed;
Independent of the conventional, no [ultimate] truth can be found.
-- Bodhicittavivarana

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2018 at 8:33 AM
Title: Re: "Wild Wild Country" - Osho documentary on Netflix
Content:
krodha wrote:
Just wait, it gets more insane by the episode. Unethical behavior disguised as spirituality all around.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2018 at 4:27 AM
Title: Re: ‘Dharmas do not arise’
Content:
krodha wrote:
From Buddhapālita, per Malcolm:

Here, with respect to your claim for an ascertained cause for the production of a result, wheat, etc., and a non-productive condition and non-condition, ‘the arising of a result is not accepted’ was previously explained. If that result does not exist, where will ‘these are not conditions, these are conditions’ be accepted? If both of those come to be from depending on a result, also that result is does not exist. Because the result does not exist, where will there be a non-condition or a condition? If that is so, still results are not accepted, and even conditions and a non-conditions are non-existent. Because results, conditions, and non-conditions do not exist, descriptions for arising are merely conventional.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2018 at 7:54 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
The basic problem is this: when recognition is convention, it is non-veridical.

krodha wrote:
Recognition is a conventional occurrence. What are we ideally recognizing? The dharmatā of phenomena, which is their non-arising. We present that non-arising as the ultimate truth of the given dharma in question, but even that ultimate truth is in the end, a convention.

Sherab said:
If it is non-veridical, it cannot be relied upon

krodha wrote:
Sure it can, and in fact the very definition of a correct convention [tathyasaṃvṛti] is that it can be relied upon to function consistently with the caveat that in order to be acceptable, it must be unable to withstand ultimate analysis.

Sherab said:
for what is the real truth but only what is conventionally accepted as truth.

krodha wrote:
The real truth is that any and all processes and entities perceived from the standpoint of ignorance cannot withstand scrutiny. Therefore what is conventionally accepted as true

is essentially all that you have, and not even it is true.

Sherab said:
In other words, there can be no certainty that a conventional truth is really true.

krodha wrote:
No conventional truths are "really true."

Sherab said:
To put it in another way, if conventional truth is all there is, then all there is is non-veridical.

krodha wrote:
Precisely, and recognizing this, experientially, is a cognition of ultimate truth.

Sherab said:
If there is a real truth, it cannot be reached.

krodha wrote:
The real truth is reached via a failure to locate the entities and processes inferred by imputation and perceived through the veil of afflicted cognition.

Sherab said:
If there is no real truth, that is fine. But you cannot rely on conventional truth to tell you that.

krodha wrote:
You have no other choice.

Sherab said:
All dualistic cognitions are cognition of conventional truths. Ultimate truth is cognized non-dualistically.

krodha wrote:
Ultimate truth is a cognition of non-arising. It is "non-dual" because the purported entities that are known to be non-arisen are free from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence.

They are free from existence because to exist an entity must first arise. They are free from non-existence because for an entity to cease to exist it must first exist.

Therefore in cognizing ultimate truth we come to know that appearances are non-dual.

Sherab said:
Therefore there is a distinction between what is conventional and what is ultimate and there is a distinction between what is conventional truth and what is ultimate truth.

krodha wrote:
Sure, conventionally.

Sherab said:
In this regard, "epistemic" is not an adequate adjective for the ultimate if it makes no distinction between dualistic and non-dualistic cognitions.

krodha wrote:
Epistemic is perfectly adequate, as it is through knowledge that we apprehend the actual way of things. We can also make an argument for phenomenology, but never ontology in the context of the buddhadharma because the ultimate truth of phenomena is that they lack an ontological status.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 26th, 2018 at 9:27 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
krodha wrote:
An ontological non-duality [sanatanadharma] is where everything is reduced to a single substance that exists alone by itself. For example if subject and object were merged and we then held a view that the union of the two as a single X is truly substantial and valid.

Sherab said:
This cannot be true as it implies that once an individual is enlightened, all will be enlightened immediately thereafter.

krodha wrote:
That is one implication, yes. But since this is a tirthika position and has nothing to do with the buddhadharma it does not really matter.
On the other hand, an epistemological non-duality [buddhadharma] is simply a recognition that the nature of phenomena is free from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence, hence "non-dual". This is a non-reductive non-duality because it does not leave anything in its wake, there is no X left over once the nature of phenomena is recognized.

Sherab said:
This too is problematic because if the recognition is dualistic,

krodha wrote:
The recognition is conventional, therefore diversity and dualities are acceptable. For instance, a conventional subject recognizing a conventional object.

Constructs of that nature are acceptable because we know that conventions are merely nominal inferences that cannot withstand keen scrutiny nor bear ultimate analysis. We only implement said conventions for purposes of communication, knowing full well they do not reference substantial entities or processes.

Sherab said:
it is not amenable to any explanation of how external phenomena arise and yet do not arise in reality.

krodha wrote:
The misconception of arising is an error in cognition that manifests as a direct result of ignorance regarding the way things really are.

Sherab said:
If the recognition is non-dualistic and individual

krodha wrote:
Recognitions are always individual.

Sherab said:
then it implies an ontology which can only be described as neither one nor many.

krodha wrote:
The principle of "neither one nor many" is illustrated in the above entry which discusses fires and heat.

Heat is not one because it is found wherever fire occurs, yet it is not many because heat is identical in expression wherever it is found.

Sherab said:
In this case, the word "epistemological" is an inadequate adjective for that ontology.

krodha wrote:
"Epistemic" is referencing knowledge. The cause of the misconception of conditioned entities and processes is the result of a knowledge obscuration and is overturned through knowledge [vidyā] of the actual nature of mind and phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 6:09 PM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
ItsRaining said:
Huayan says the same of phenomena/dharmas as they arise only in the mind so they are all of the same nature. Being identical in nature is why it is said the "one" (nature) is the same as the "all" (phenomena). But like you said the nature or the one isn't a Vedatin notion of a single monolithic and established entity. It's the nature of the mind.

krodha wrote:
The one nature is emptiness, which means dharmas do not arise at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 2:09 PM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
krodha wrote:
The crypto-Vedanta view of "one mind" is treating the "singular" aspect of the principle as an entity rather than a quality or characteristic.

"One mind" does not mean there is "one" singular, transpersonal mind. "One" in this context means "same" in the sense that the nature of mind as non-arisen and luminous [aka pure or stainless] is a generic characteristic that all minds share.

In the same sense that all instances of fire share the common and generic characteristic of heat, or all instances of water share the common, generic characteristic of wetness. But all fires do not share the same, transpersonal expression of heat, like a singular field or entity of heat that all fires arise from. The same goes for the nature of mind: all minds share the common generic characteristic of being empty and luminous, but all minds do not share a single, transpersonal nature.

The principle of the Thig le nyag gcig in Dzogchen is the same way, often misconstrued by those with crypto-Vedantin biases as promoting a singular ultimate nature or oneness, but this is not the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 2:01 PM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Ogyen said:
And what are the implications of the quasi-Vedanta usage?

Wayfarer said:
There is a Buddhist term for non-dual, which is ‘advaya’. It is similar, but different, to the Hindu ‘advaita’. They’re different forms of non-dualism. And in this thread I think the distinction is being blurred.
https://www.google.com.au/search?q=advaita+advaya&rlz=1C9BKJA_enAU721AU730&oq=advaita+and+advaya&aqs=chrome.1.69i57j0l2.6840j0j7&hl=en-GB&sourceid=chrome-mobile&ie=UTF-8 on the distinction between ‘Buddhist Advaya’ and ‘Hindu Advaita’. They’re pretty academic, but then it’s a pretty academic question. (Actually the fourth ref is from DharmaWheel!)

krodha wrote:
T.R.V. Murti's Advayavada is the first hit on that search, I don't find his exposition to be all that clear.

I wrote this some time ago which goes over the difference:

Non-duality in Hinduism and sanatanadharma in general is a view that promulgates an ontological, transpersonal, homogenous, unconditioned existent. Which means that non-duality in the sanatanadharma is a substantial and reductive non-duality.

Whereas one's (ultimate) nature in the buddhadharma is epistemic, personal, heterogeneous and free from the extremes of existence and non-existence. This means that one's so-called "non-dual" nature in Buddhism is an insubstantial and non-reductive non-duality.

An ontological non-duality [sanatanadharma] is where everything is reduced to a single substance that exists alone by itself. For example if subject and object were merged and we then held a view that the union of the two as a single X is truly substantial and valid.

On the other hand, an epistemological non-duality [buddhadharma] is simply a recognition that the nature of phenomena is free from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence, hence "non-dual". This is a non-reductive non-duality because it does not leave anything in its wake, there is no X left over once the nature of phenomena is recognized.

In epistemic non-duality the nature of a conditioned phenomenon [dharma] and its non-arisen nature [dharmatā] are ultimately neither the same nor different, hence they are "non-dual", because the misconception of a conditioned entity is a byproduct of ignorance, and therefore said entity has never truly come into existence in the first place. This means that the allegedly conditioned entity has truly been unconditioned from the very beginning. And to realize this fact only requires a cessation of cause for the arising of the misconception of a conditioned entity, i.e., a cessation of ignorance. If dharmins and dharmatā were not non-dual then it would be impossible to recognize the unborn nature of phenomena because that nature would be rendered another conditioned entity.

Malcolm also wrote:
Once again, here Advaita and Buddhadharma are absolutely incommensurate, and as I pointed out, it is only Hindus who imagine that Advaita and Buddhadharma are talking about the same thing, i.e., knowledge of Brahman.

The only resemblance between Advaita and Buddhadharma is that we both seek to solve the same problem — avidyā. What we understand vidyā to be is completely different.

First of all, the way the term ["non-dual"] is used in Buddhadharma and Advaita are very different.

For example, the Tarkajvakla, a famous commentary on Nagarjuna 's MMK states:

Therefore, that which is the inner earth element, that is is the external earth element,

that is the meaning of nondual.

Or:

When that yogin dwells in the experience of nonconceptual discerning wisdom [prajñā] and experiences nonduality, at that time, ultimately, the entire reality of objects of knowledge are as follows, of the same characteristics, like space, appearing in the manner of a nonappearance since their characteristics are nonexistent, therefore, there isn't even the slightest thing that is not empty, so where could there be emptiness? Since there are no mental discriminations, there is no conceptual clinging of mutual dependence.

Or the Kaumudī, a famous Buddhist tantric commentary, states:

Because of the absence of inherent existence, the nondual essence of all phenomena is emptiness.

It also is understood, as Dzogchungpa point outed, as a consciousness devoid of subject and object, as the Ḍākinīvajrapañjara[-mahā]tantrarājasya pañjikā[-prathamapaṭala-]mukhabandha-nāma:

One is a nondual consciousness. Two is an apprehending subject and an apprehended object.
These quotes are not exhaustive, but they show that "nondual" in Buddhadharma is really quite different than Advaita.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 6:24 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:

ItsRaining said:
You seem to be just assuming that it is intended to be controversial and incendiary when it is not. There was no massive controversy over these work in the past.... It just affirms that affirms that the mind noes not lack qualities which is an important point, clarifying that it is not an nihilists emptiness. It does not require unpacking if it is read in context within texts that mention it like the Awakening of Faith that make the point of saying the mind (and other things) is empty and can't be grasped at. It is not just "upaya" though every teaching is upaya in a sense.

krodha wrote:
The author could have just as easily said "not lacking qualities" or "not deprived of qualities" etc., however they chose to parse it as "not empty," which is clearly intentional rhetoric that is made to appear contradictory on purpose.

ItsRaining said:
Clearly rhetorical? Why has no one taken it as so then in its day? It's just like the Srinagar Sutra which teaches the non-empty tathagatagarbha that's not lacking qualities. And in its context it is clearly non-contradictory.

krodha wrote:
Clearly intentional. Not rhetorical.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 5:40 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
Simon E. said:
Could someone remind me which Sanskrit or Pali or Tibetan term is being rendered as 'eternal'?

krodha wrote:
Nitya is the Sanskrit term.

smcj said:
Does that mean we're all "Nitya picking"?

krodha wrote:
You joke but confusion around terminology is one way wrong views are formed.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2018 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
Simon E. said:
Could someone remind me which Sanskrit or Pali or Tibetan term is being rendered as 'eternal'?

krodha wrote:
Nitya is the Sanskrit term.

Anitya is impermanence, therefore sans "a" it is just nitya, as permanence.

Translating it as eternal is shoddy work, but such is the nature of translation, which cannot be expected to be perfect. Especially in earlier decades.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2018 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Non-empty" is a play on words in that context. Many see the use of "non-empty" and think it contradicts śūnyatā, but it does not... it is merely a play on words that is intended to come off a bit controversial and incendiary. "Non-empty" is an embellished and shortened way of saying "not lacking qualities," but it appears attractive for those who might fear emptiness, it is intended as an upāya in that sense. The main issue is that it requires unpacking and given the fact that many who shy away from emptiness tend to be those who take comfort in the idea of substantial essences, the use of "non-empty" is oft misconstrued as affirming an inherent essence that contradicts emptiness.

ItsRaining said:
You seem to be just assuming that it is intended to be controversial and incendiary when it is not. There was no massive controversy over these work in the past.... It just affirms that affirms that the mind noes not lack qualities which is an important point, clarifying that it is not an nihilists emptiness. It does not require unpacking if it is read in context within texts that mention it like the Awakening of Faith that make the point of saying the mind (and other things) is empty and can't be grasped at. It is not just "upaya" though every teaching is upaya in a sense.

krodha wrote:
The author could have just as easily said "not lacking qualities" or "not deprived of qualities" etc., however they chose to parse it as "not empty," which is clearly intentional rhetoric that is made to appear contradictory on purpose.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2018 at 3:49 PM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
smcj said:
I am finding references to "True Self" in the Mahaparanirvana, between several translations, there was one that was different, the rest corroborated each other. But then there is no "True Self" (i.e. buddhanature??)
Here's a quick explanation of the idea by Thrangu R. in the context of a short commentary on the Uttartantra.

Thrangu R. said:
Because sentient beings harbor the notion of a self, an ego, the Buddha gave teachings on the lack of a self-entity. Nonetheless, since the ego has never had any true existence to start with, in reality, how can something called 'egolessness' have any true existence? The second quality, perfect identity, refers not only to the total pacification of one's artificial mental fabrication of a 'self', but also to the pacification of one's intellectual concepts about egolessness--that of individuals and that of things. This complete pacification reveals one's true identity. Mental constructs of self and non-self are completely absent in both the enlightened essence and at the time of realizing the

dharmakaya. Therefore, when conceptualizations about self and non-self are totally pacified the true identity is unveiled.

smcj said:
This quote is on p.61 of T.R.'s book, but in the context of the Uttaratantra itself it is in regards to:

A. 4th Vajra Point (chapter): "Buddha Nature". which has 10 points of explanation. Point #3 is called "Fruition", which is broken down into:
a. Perfect purity
b. Perfect identity
c. Perfect bliss
d. Perfect Permenance

So the above quote was in regards to "b. Perfect identity".

I've got another book with commentary by J. Kongtrul if you want another expert opinion on it.

krodha wrote:
Which is what I just pointed out. Ātman is a literary device that denotes one's nature. Not an actual identity.

It is perfectly okay to refer to dharmakāya or jñāna as a "perfect" or "true" identity if you are not deceived by the nature of identity and know the actual way of things. As Asaṅga says in his commentary of the Uttaratantra:

The Tathāgata, on the other hand, has attained the supreme perfection of the selflessness of all phenomena through the wisdom that is in accord with just how things truly are, and though there is no self according to how he sees things, he asserts a self all the time because he is never deceived by the characteristic of a self that does not exist. Making the selfless into a self is like saying "abiding through the mode of nonabiding."

However for those who are deceived by ignorance and are prone to essentialist and substantialist views, this verbiage has the potential to cause deviations into eternalism.

There are both provisional and definitive interpretations of the uttaratantra, the former leads to non-Buddhist misinterpretations of the text, the latter treats the rhetoric to be interpreted as creative subversion that is intended to represent Buddhist concepts which do not deviate from the standard presentation of the core tenets and principles we find elsewhere.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2018 at 1:24 PM

Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
aryasunyata said:
But it still doesn't address the elephant in my living room. If primordial awareness simply is... Then why is it "contradictory" to refer to as such when it is done in many a scriptural guide, sutras, tantras, etc... And... With many terms in many languages!!

krodha wrote:
No Buddhist teaching states that "primordial awareness" (what term that is a gloss for I'm not sure) "just is." This is never taught.

Ogyen said:
This is a reference to a conventional use of this term as is used among folks conversing about the subject... in Dzogchen there are plenty of teaching about the primordial state, original mind, etc... unless I've grossly missed something and been hallucinating this whole time...?

krodha wrote:
I just meant I wasn't sure what term "primordial awareness" is intended to translate. It really is not a good gloss for terms like ye shes or rig pa, etc.

aryasunyata said:
My question isn't asking the meaning of life... My question is about Buddhists who contradict themselves and their own sources, and pretend there is no contradiction... It's incongruous to me.

krodha wrote:
You'll have to cite examples of said contradictions.

Ogyen said:
Sorry for delay been meaning to get to this, getting stuff ready in between kids work etc... so here goes.. I was going through the Ratnagotravibhaga on a site that has versions in Tibetan, Chinese and Sanskrit – sources at the bottom of text. I have many other sutras and examples for this same kind of language, which my Mahayanist friends take as authority and my Dzogchen friends as secondary.... regardless I'm not interested in dissecting minutiae around esoteric interpretations of plain language clearly illustrated in the following examples... What I'm interested is coherence and why there so much negation/denial around "eternal" references on these boards, when the language appears over and over and over... so this is just the latest I was getting familiar with. The terms are USED, in multiple sutras, in multiple languages. I can also use google-translate-fu for Chinese terms.

krodha wrote:
I'm sure "eternal" is used in some translations, however whether it is an accurate gloss is another question.

Ogyen said:

I am finding references to "True Self" in the Mahaparanirvana, between several translations, there was one that was different, the rest corroborated each other. But then there is no "True Self" (i.e. buddhanature??)

krodha wrote:
The term "true self" is a gloss that some translators took liberty with, but the text never says true self [satyātman] it simply says ātman.

Tathāgatagarbha texts like the Mahāyāna-mahaparinirvana-sūtra employ ātman as a subversive literary device in the context of the upāya known as the four pāramitās. Which means ātman is simply a play on words to describe the latent potential for buddhahood that all beings possess... not an actual self. "Ātman" in that context is being implemented as a nominal subversion to the Hindu idea of a self. The Tibetan translation even goes as far as to state that all ātmans are merely conventional. Mere nominal designations, not to be considered actually real.

The four parāmitās of nirvāna are an upāya that is meant to communicate the nature of nirvāna, they are:

(i) Purity; meaning free from defects.

(ii) Identity; meaning the liberation of a Buddha is precisely just that, and is not a flimsy state that can just become whatever like mind does. In some presentations this usage of "ātman" is intended to communicate that one's nature is free from the imputed dichotomy of self or lack thereof. Much like sometimes when we see "essence" used in the same way, to denote an essenceless essence, or "nature" as a natureless nature, this use of ātman is something like the selfless self, so again, just a play on words. In many of these texts the term ātman is intended to be literally synonymous with "essence."

(iii) Happiness or bliss; meaning the peace and relief that even the word Nirvāṇa (meaning to blow out, exhale, extinguish) suggests. Also signifying the absence of suffering. Sometimes "peace" is used, which represents a state free of arising and cessation.

(iv) Permanence; meaning that authentic buddhahood is not reversible, once attained the plague of ignorance is irrevokably cured.

None of these suggest that dharmakāya or nirvāna are a literal self, "true" or otherwise.

Ogyen said:
The text begins with a bow to Vajrasattva...

krodha wrote:
Yes, again many have used this gloss "eternal" but that does not mean the translation is accurate or warranted.

Ogyen said:
The scripture it quotes is as follows:
O Lord, if there would be the people who have the notion of Eternity, Unity, Bliś, and Purity [regarding the Absolute Body], they would he the legal sons of the Buddhas and be of no miscomprehension. O Lord, [verily] they would be of perfect perception. For what reason? [Because], O Lord, the Absolute Body of the Tathāgata is verily the Supreme Eternity, the Supreme Bliś, the Supreme Unity and the Supreme Purity. O Lord, those people who perceive the Absolute Body of the Tathāgata in this way, perceive perfectly. Those who perceive perfectly are, O Lord, the legal sons of the Buddhas"
so... here, they're talking about the 4 virtues of Nirvana - eternal, bliss, self and purity - (here, they translated self as unity, right?)

krodha wrote:
"Permanence" is a better gloss than "eternal" in the context of the four pāramitās.

Ogyen said:
So here is where I see many people negate absolutely everything with emptiness? Yet... what I'm reading is saying the Buddha Nature is being described as NOT empty.

krodha wrote:
"Non-empty" is a play on words in that context. Many see the use of "non-empty" and think it contradicts śūnyatā, but it does not... it is merely a play on words that is intended to come off a bit controversial and incendiary. "Non-empty" is an embellished and shortened way of saying "not lacking qualities," but it appears attractive for those who might fear emptiness, it is intended as an upāya in that sense. The main issue is that it requires unpacking and given the fact that many who shy away from emptiness tend to be those who take comfort in the idea of substantial essences, the use of "non-empty" is oft misconstrued as affirming an inherent essence that contradicts emptiness.

Ogyen said:
So here I'm getting that it's saying Theravadans/Hinayana like to contemplate the impermanence of phenomena rather than meditate on the eternity of the Buddha Nature

krodha wrote:
Again, it is better to use "permanence" than "eternity." Tathagatagarbha is sometimes described as "permanent" because it is the nature of mind as non-dual emptiness and clarity, therefore it is always the case that the mind's nature is that way. However this does not mean it is a substantial essence that is permanent and understanding this properly is vital otherwise it is easy to err into eternalist views.

The use of "permanent" in the context of the four pāramitās mentioned above is what is most important. Why is nirvana "permanent?" Nirvana is permanent because it is defined as a total cessation of cause for rebirth in the three realms. Since there is no possibility of cause for "re-arising" nirvana is said to be "permanent."

As I wrote before:

Buddhahood is irreversible and permanent. Nirvāṇa is the total exhaustion of one's ignorance regarding the nature of phenomena, and for that reason nirvāṇa is described as a cessation. What ceases is the cause for the further arising and proliferation of delusion regarding the nature of mind and phenomena, which is precisely the cessation of cause for the arising of the cyclical round of rebirth in the three realms we call "saṃsāra." For this reason, nirvāṇa is said to be "permanent," because due to the exhaustion of cause for the further proliferation of saṃsāra, saṃsāra no longer has any way to arise.

From Tsele Natsok Rangdrol:
You might ask, 'Why wouldn't confusion reoccur as before, after... [liberation has occured]?" This is because no basis [foundation] exists for its re-arising. Samantabhadra's liberation into the basis [wisdom] itself and the yogi liberated through practicing the path are both devoid of any basis [foundation] for reverting back to becoming a cause, just like a person who has recovered from a plague or the fruit of the se tree.
He then states that the se tree is a particular tree which is poisonous to touch, causing blisters and swelling. However once recovered, one is then immune.

Lopon Tenzin Namdak also explains this principle of immunity:
Anyone who follows the teachings of the Buddhas will most likely attain results and purify negative karmic causes. Then that person will be like a man who has caught smallpox in the past; he will never catch it again because he is immune. The sickness of samsara will never come back. And this is the purpose of following the teachings.
and from Malcolm:
Buddhahood is a subtractive process; it means removing, gradually, obscurations of affliction and obscurations of knowledge. Since wisdom burns these obscurations away, in the end they have no causes for returning; and further, the causes for buddhahood are permanent leading to a permanent result.

Ogyen said:
This Buddhahood is now eternal, everlasting and constant, Being endowed with all the pure properties of the Buddha, being inconceivable, eternal and ever-lasting, Being quiescent, constant, and perfectly pacified, Being all-pervading and apart from discrimination, The pure and immaculate Buddhahood is like space, It has neither attachment nor hindrance anywhere, it is ‘eternal’, as it is devoid of birth; It is ‘everlasting’ since it does not disappear; It is ‘quiescent’ because it is free from dualism, And is ‘constant’ because of endurance of Reality. now this threefold Body made manifest in order to be the support for the weal and happiness of the world, has an ‘eternal’ character [in its manifestation].

krodha wrote:
And so here we see "buddhahood" described as permanent, in so many words. The translation of buddhist texts is an ever evolving process, just because we encounter terms like "eternal" and so on, this does not mean they are truly accurate glosses and therefore it is important to be aware of the possibility that certain translations are

somewhat outdated or simply reflect a limited understanding of the source material.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2018 at 7:45 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
Sherab said:
Did the Buddha taught the avoidance of the two extremes of existence (eternalism) and non-existence (nihilism)? Yes he did.

(Here, a proper definition of the extreme of existence (eternalism) and the extreme of non-existence (nihilism) is needed to understand the Buddha's teachings properly.)

Did the Buddha somehow forgot about his own teaching of avoiding the two extremes of existence and non-existence when he taught about the born and the unborn? Certainly not.

So is the born not within the extremes of either existence and non-existence? Yes it must be, if the Buddha was consistent in his teachings.

krodha wrote:
The nature or dharmatā of an allegedly born i.e., originated conditioned entity is free from extremes. But the perception of conditioned entities that have been born is intimately tied to the fundamental misconception of existence. Therefore what is born is held to be existent, and this is the binding misconception one is meant to overcome through insight.

Therefore what is perceived as born is held to be existent even though it is truly free from such extremes due to being ultimately non-arisen [unborn].

Sherab said:
Is the unborn not within the extremes of either existence and non-existence? Yes it must be, if the Buddha was consistent in his teachings.

krodha wrote:
This is because the so-called "unborn" is nothing other than the very non-arising of what is misconstrued as being existent or "born."

Sherab said:
In brief, the born and the unborn do not fall into either the extreme of existence or the extreme of non-existence.

krodha wrote:
Ultimately this is true, however the issue is with the afflicted perception one intends to uproot, which is that entities have originated (been born) and therefore exist.

Sherab said:
Why did the Buddha talked about the born and unborn? Because, if there is not the unborn, there can be no liberation from the born.

krodha wrote:
"Born" and "unborn" are two species of cognition in relation to a single appearance or alleged entity, the former is afflicted whereas the latter is unafflicted.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 3:35 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
smcj said:
Yes, the end result was that eternalism grew in East Asia like "weeds in an untended garden," as Malcolm once put it.
Due to proximity to India Tibet held out longer. It was Dolpopa that first brazenly codified and put forward the heresy—big time.

...and I am profoundly grateful to him for that.

krodha wrote:
Even today his view is considered extreme, and no real interest is given to Dolbupa's work outside of the Jonang.

Non-Jonang gzhan stong is not Dolbupa's view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 3:06 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
smcj said:
In “When the Clouds Part” Brunnholzl makes the point that the scofflaws who took that view left India, where it was not accepted as Buddhism, and took their ideas to the Far East. That why it shows up earlier there than anywhere else.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, but it is also likely East Asian views became very eternalistic due to being divorced from the climate of polemics that Tibetans dealt with as a result of their geographical proximity to India.

smcj said:
Whether by chance or by design, either way the end result became the same.

krodha wrote:
Yes, the end result was that eternalism grew in East Asia like "weeds in an untended

garden," as Malcolm once put it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 3:05 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
aryasunyata said:
But it still doesn't address the elephant in my living room. If primordial awareness simply is... Then why is it "contradictory" to refer to as such when it is done in many a scriptural guide, sutras, tantras, etc... And... With many terms in many languages!!

krodha wrote:
No Buddhist teaching states that "primordial awareness" (what term that is a gloss for I'm not sure) "just is." This is never taught.

aryasunyata said:
My question isn't asking the meaning of life... My question is about Buddhists who contradict themselves and their own sources, and pretend there is no contradiction... It's incongruous to me.

krodha wrote:
You'll have to cite examples of said contradictions.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
krodha wrote:
If something "is", it is existent.

Jeff H said:
Hence the quotes. Awareness can't be identify and neither can it be denied; It neither exists nor does it not exist.

krodha wrote:
"Neither existing or not-existing" is the fourth extreme held to be untenable.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
smcj said:
In “When the Clouds Part” Brunnholzl makes the point that the scofflaws who took that view left India, where it was not accepted as Buddhism, and took their ideas to the Far

East. That why it shows up earlier there than anywhere else.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, but it is also likely East Asian views became very eternalistic due to being divorced from the climate of polemics that Tibetans dealt with as a result of their geographical proximity to India.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
smcj said:
One of the problems is here i think.
From what i know and understand we can't have a "something" that is beyond time. The rejection of an arbitrarily posited enduring principle or essence sits at the core of emptiness teachings.
Exactly.

But then, over time (and distance from India), the teachings on Buddha Nature evolved to become the exact thing the Prajnaparamita and Madhyamaka categorically deny.

krodha wrote:
Not really.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
Jeff H said:
Primordial awareness arises from ultimate truth: awareness simply “is”. That does not mean that it exists or does not exist; It does not mean it is timeless or timebound. You can never identify that which is aware because it is not a thing. However, neither can you deny that awareness asked the question.

krodha wrote:
If something "is", it is existent.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 23rd, 2018 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: Why is "unborn, unchanging, deathless" NOT eternal?
Content:
aryasunyata said:
Thank you for your thoughts.

I get the lack of eternal self... What I find confusing is that in my lineage, this "thing" that believes it to be an *I am* is essentially an illusion, but in the sutras for example, we find references upon references to "True Self" within the buddhist concept. Like the shurangama sutra off the top of my head. In several sutras the references to the "eternal" unchanging qualities of True Self arise from Budda nature.

I thought Dharma doesn't contradict itself, but of course people's interpretations do.... So this "True Self" is mentioned but also at the same time supposedly rejected by Buddhist where stated as such...

Are they distorted translations?

Is there subliminal language in the sutras too subtle for my feeble mind to grasp?

Do I speak too many languages and fail to integrate basic English in the translations I read?

Is there some secret sauce all Buddhist academics know of that we auto-didacts need to be let in on?

What's the deal?

I have friends from all traditions and some seem to get genuinely really upset and feel wrong Dharma is being taught because it goes against what they have clearly learned...

Does Buddhas outright contradict each other, or is it people... Or what gives??

Also.. if it's not a thing... It can be eternal then? Like the unborn undying deathless quality of the original mind?

krodha wrote:
Yes, they are distorted translations, the term "true self" [satyātman] does not actually appear in any Indian text.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2018 at 11:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life
Content:
krodha wrote:
Who else is planning to go to Santa Fe? I am.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2018 at 11:01 AM
Title: Re: Weed is now legal in California
Content:

krodha wrote:
https://flipboard.com/article/congress-protects-medical-marijuana-from-jeff-sessions-in-new-federal-spending-b/f-39394db438%2Fforbes.com

In ya face, Jeff.

Hopefully same protection will extend to adult use.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2018 at 8:09 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
Then when the Buddha said in the Samdhinirmocana that

"the ultimate is realized individually by the Aryas"
"the ultimate belongs to the signless realm"
"the ultimate is inexpressible"
"the ultimate is devoid of conventions."

he was in fact saying that the ultimate is non-existent? If so, why don't he just say so? Either that, or non-existent is not a proper attribute of the ultimate and it is the interpretations of what is meant by "freedom from extremes" and what is meant by "gnas lug med pa" that should be relooked.

krodha wrote:
The Saṃdhinirmocana also says the ultimate is without essence, is not a real thing and does not exist.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2018 at 7:32 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
My analysis led me to the position that everything can be ascertained in the ultimate, except that what is ascertained is indescribable. See the difference?

krodha wrote:
Why continually lean on the concept of "ineffability?"

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2018 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:

Sherab said:
Then you have missed what I wrote here : https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.p...40#p438687
My reasoning for maintaining that there is a difference between the relative and the ultimate is simply this. If the ultimate is truly indescribable, then you cannot say that it is truly non-existent. If it is truly non-existent, then the word "non-existent" would be an accurate and exact description.

Wayfarer said:
'It'?

As per the quote I provided from the Aspiration Prayer: not existent, not non-existent. Neither is, nor is not. Accordingly there is no 'ultimate' that does (or doesn't) exist. And the apophaticism required is realising the futility of trying to pin that realisation down to 'is' or 'is not' statements. As Master Seung Sahn used to always say: 'only don't know'.

(Tricky, I know.)

Sherab said:
Agree. As I said, my position was that the ultimate is indescribable. So words that reference the relative, the conventional, really cannot describe it as all designations in the relative/conventional cannot escape the dualistic underpinning of the relative/conventional. The best that can be said is that there is, or there ultimate is just is.

krodha wrote:
The ineffability of ultimate truth is no different than the ineffability of anything and everything else. And that being the case, there is no reason to opt out of discussing ultimate truth as all it requires is the employment of a correct description.

In declaring ultimate truth off limits because it is ineffable, you are exercising a decision that is no more profound than refraining to describe the taste of sugar because the experiential taste is ineffable. Yet for the rest of us, who have no problem with communicating, describing that taste as "sweet" is perfectly okay. Likewise describing said taste as "salty" would be inaccurate.

In this discussion Malcolm is essentially critiquing your insistence on describing the taste of sugar as "salty", and you are saying this critique has no basis because the experiential taste is ineffable.

This is (i) nonsensical, and (ii) a cop out.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 12th, 2018 at 8:07 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:

Sherab said:
The example of how a chariot is examined actually show what a conventional truth is, namely a designation made on the appearance of an object without examining what underlies the appearance.

Coëmgenu said:
If I might offer my own interpretation, I would agree with the above-quoted material, but I would also say, adding, that based on my reading of that simile, a conventional truth is namely a designation made on the appearance of an object even after having examined what underlies the 'surface' appearance. But perhaps this is too ambiguous in ways I don't foresee.

krodha wrote:
Really there is no need to examine what lies beneath an appearance. Any appearance will do. For example, Sherab's position that there is merit in breaking an alleged object down into constituent particles like cells and atoms etc., is actually just further extrapolation that serves to breathe life into the fundamental perception of an entity that we are attempting to overturn in the first place.

It is better to work with direct cognition. No need to get microscopic, that just fortifies perception of svabhāva.

Microscopic break downs may have been novel long ago, but this day in age everyone learns that things are composed of smaller things, and this view is now an integral aspect of science and trends in scientific materialism which champion physicalism, realism etc. For someone who suffers from materialist inclinations it is no longer a viable method in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 11th, 2018 at 4:49 PM
Title: Re: Nāgārjuna's Fourfold Negation & Śrāvakayāna
Content:
pael said:
My friend (He is God-believer) didn't like Fourfold Negation. He did say it is "empty rhetoric"
. Help?
I did say that Nagarjuna says: things are not-A, not-B, not-AB, neither not-A-not-B
.

krodha wrote:
Someone who believes in God is committed to believing in the existence of said god, and therefore upholds a view that aligns with the first extreme.

Really their opinion of the fourfold freedom from extremes ala Mahāyāna is worthless.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 11th, 2018 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Nāgārjuna's Fourfold Negation & Śrāvakayāna
Content:
krodha wrote:
In SN 12.15, Śākyamuni states:

"Everything exists": That is one extreme. "Everything doesn't exist": That is a second extreme. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle.

The fourfold catuṣkoṭi tetralemma in Mahāyāna is really just an extension of the above. Thankfully where the Śravāka suttas tend to be implicit and indirect, the Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras are generally explicit and direct, elaborating on some of these vague statements in the suttas.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2018 at 7:33 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:

krodha wrote:
To completely exhaust all possible landing points, Candrakīrti demonstrates:

(i) There is no chariot which is other than its parts

(ii) There is no chariot which is the same as its parts

(iii) There is no chariot which possesses its parts

(iv) There is no chariot which depends on its parts

(v) There is no chariot upon which the parts depend

(vi) There is no chariot which is the collection of its parts

(vii) There is no chariot which is the shape of its parts

Sherab said:
There is no chariot other than the parts and the relation of the parts to one another.

So do the parts and the relation of the parts to one another truly exist then and is therefore the ultimate?

To answer this, you have to continue with the analysis at the level of the parts, and so on.

krodha wrote:
Or so you think.

But these teachings argue otherwise... gcig shes kun grol.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2018 at 4:26 PM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
krodha wrote:
And Candrakīrti isn't suggesting one break down the chariot, rather he is challenging you to locate the chariot in general.

Coëmgenu said:
By having us look at the suggested chariot at the level of its constituents rather than at the level of the suggested compounded object.

Quite literally deconstructing the suggestion.

krodha wrote:
In a way, perhaps. But again, it is more geared towards challenging the assumption that there is an entity that possesses qualities and characteristics.

Like an apple, as an entity, that possesses the characteristic of being red, being round, being smooth etc., we even say "the apple is red," and so on. Which is fine on a conventional level, but becomes problematic when we misconstrue the situation and believe there is truly an entity there.

Candrakīrti is saying "show me the apple." Find the core entity.

The authentic failure to find the entity in question is the act of realizing its non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2018 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
krodha wrote:
Yet there are no parts or pieces to an entity that was never there in the first place. Hence why Nāgārjuna asserts that even constituent aggregates are merely inferential conventions.

And Candrakīrti isn't suggesting one break down the chariot, rather he is challenging you to locate the chariot in general.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2018 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Coëmgenu said:
But look at what it says: "We look at A and see that it is formed of B. At the level of B, A does not exist. We look at B, and see that it is formed of C...", ad infinitum, well-past the exhaustion of the latin alphabet.

Nothing is found here either.

Whether or not they intended it, the user Sherab presented the Chariot simile, essentially. I am not familiar with whether or not Ven Candrakīrti wrote a commentary on the Nāgasenabhikṣusūtra.

If I can some up my thoughts and the motivation for my participation here: I don't think the chariot simile is unBuddhist, and it reminds me of people who call other people names like "unAmerican" when I see people calling others unBuddhist and the likes.

krodha wrote:
That is not how the chariot example works in Candrakīrti's exposition, but perhaps that is now it is in the teaching you are referring to.

Coëmgenu said:
How does Ven Candrakīrti treat the long tradition of the chariot simile?

'Ad infinitum' is the novel element of its presentation in this thread. Nāgasena Bhikṣu is content to simply break down the chariot into constituents. He doesn't further break them down into particles etc.

krodha wrote:
Candrakīrti does not break the chariot into constituent pieces but instead demonstrates that the basis of imputation does not contain or produce a chariot at all.

In his Madhyamakāvatāra he employs the sevenfold reasoning in order to establish the lack of a fundamental, core identity (self) in phenomena. Candrakīrti argues that the identity of a given person, place, thing, etc., is merely an inferential, conventional designation that does not ultimately correlate to the appearances it is attributed to. Meaning: the alleged object that the designation infers (the existence of) cannot be found when sought due to the fact that the alleged object itself cannot bear keen analysis.

To completely exhaust all possible landing points, Candrakīrti demonstrates:

(i) There is no chariot which is other than its parts

(ii) There is no chariot which is the same as its parts

(iii) There is no chariot which possesses its parts

(iv) There is no chariot which depends on its parts

(v) There is no chariot upon which the parts depend

(vi) There is no chariot which is the collection of its parts

(vii) There is no chariot which is the shape of its parts

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2018 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Coëmgenu said:
How is it significantly different than when Nāgasena Bhikṣu deconstructs the chariot for Menander I principally by breaking it down into its constituents in analysis?

I wouldn't necessarily agree with the "properly" and "only" and whatnot in the above quoted material, but I wouldn't call deconstructing the atom unBuddhist.

krodha wrote:
For one, the alleged chariot and its parts are held to be equally unfindable, and the chariot is not considered to be composed of parts. At least per Candrakīrti's rendition.

Coëmgenu said:
But look at what it says: "We look at A and see that it is formed of B. At the level of B, A does not exist. We look at B, and see that it is formed of C...", ad infinitum, well-past the exhaustion of the latin alphabet.

Nothing is found here either.

Whether or not they intended it, the user Sherab presented the Chariot simile, essentially. I am not familiar with whether or not Ven Candrakīrti wrote a commentary on the Nāgasenabhikṣusūtra.

If I can some up my thoughts and the motivation for my participation here: I don't think the chariot simile is unBuddhist, and it reminds me of people who call other people names like "unAmerican" when I see people calling others unBuddhist and the likes.

krodha wrote:
That is not how the chariot example works in Candrakīrti's exposition, but perhaps that is now it is in the teaching you are referring to.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2018 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
The only way an ordinary being can properly analyze the relative is this: (I wrote this previously)
In analyzing the relative, we look at the appearance and then ask what is underneath that appearance. So we look at an apple and see that it is formed from molecules. The apple therefore does not exist at the level of the molecules. The apple therefore is simply the appearance of the apple if we don't look at the underlying reality of the apple. Similarly, when we look at a molecule, we see that it is comprised of atoms. At the level of the atom, the molecule does not exist and is simply an appearance. When we look at an atom, we see that it comprises other particles such as quarks and electrons.....

Do you agree or do you think there is a better approach?

SonamTashi said:
At this point, your argument has completely left the confines of Buddhism (and entered the framework of materialism and a very materialistic view of science);

Coëmgenu said:
How is it significantly different than when Nāgasena Bhikṣu deconstructs the chariot for Menander I principally by breaking it down into its constituents in analysis?

I wouldn't necessarily agree with the "properly" and "only" and whatnot in the above quoted material, but I wouldn't call deconstructing the atom unBuddhist.

krodha wrote:
For one, the alleged chariot and its parts are held to be equally unfindable, and the chariot is not considered to be composed of parts. At least per Candrakīrti's rendition.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2018 at 12:05 PM
Title: Re: Is Mind Fundamental?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Like Malcolm mentioned, there are two models. The latter model is indeed that there is no substantial external world, and that the appearances that are misconstrued for an external condition are generated by the minds of sentient beings with like karmic constitutions.

This means everything you experience is an appearance of mind, and there is no actual artifact-like world that lies beyond said appearances.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2018 at 11:51 AM
Title: Re: "One Mind" in Hua Yen thought
Content:
Sherab said:
Do you agree or do you think there is a better approach?

krodha wrote:
You really are a materialist.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 4th, 2018 at 8:06 AM
Title: Re: Is Mind Fundamental?
Content:
Grigoris said:
Nope. I believe that we are just as much a part of this environment as other phenomena (we are just a phenomenon anyway, we differ in that we possess sentience too: form AND mind).

Malcolm said:
I think what he is asking you is of you think the universe exists independently of minds.

Grigoris said:
I think that the universe exists independently of our perception of it. It's not like Antractica vanishes just because I am unaware of it.

krodha wrote:
Antarctica can be generated by mind without vanishing when it isn't cognized. This is the entire import behind the Yogācāra principle of a container universe, which is also implemented in Vajrayāna.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 4th, 2018 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Is Mind Fundamental?
Content:
Matt J said:
Without sentient beings, there would be no color, sound, touch, taste or smell.

Grigoris said:
I disagree. I believe that mind is mainly involved in labeling phenomena when it comes to sensation. Not creating. It is involved in creating insofar as it is involved in conceptualising the reorganisation of existing forms/phenomena into different combinations. But it is not involved in creation like the Abrahamic God is in the Book of

Genesis.

So I believe light exists, but mind gives it's wavelengths names like "red" or "yellow". And even if beings were not present, there would be this thing that we call "light".

Of course your philosophising is pretty pointless though, because sentient beings have always existed.

krodha wrote:
Your position is that phenomena are established an an external environment and that we as sentient beings merely inhabit and encounter this pre-existing environment?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 2nd, 2018 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: A Dangerous Fallacy.
Content:

SunWuKong said:
really? where's the proof of that?

krodha wrote:
The only way to prove it to oneself is to awaken and recognize it.

SunWuKong said:
That's the cart before the horse. The only way to prove you are awakened is to show it.

krodha wrote:
If I said chocolate is sweet, and you inquired as to what the proof of that sweetness is, I would likewise urge you to taste it for yourself, directly and experientially, then no further proof is needed. You would then know it first hand and even if someone tried to prove otherwise, your confidence would be unassailable.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 2nd, 2018 at 10:27 AM
Title: Re: A Dangerous Fallacy.
Content:

krodha wrote:
At the end of the day mind is fundamental, and matter is a byproduct of incorrectly cognizing mind's own display...

SunWuKong said:

really? where's the proof of that?

krodha wrote:
The only way to prove it to oneself is to awaken and recognize it.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 1st, 2018 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: A Dangerous Fallacy.
Content:
Simon E. said:
I would not have mentioned it at all if I had not seen such sentiments in the mouths of purported Vajrayana students.

krodha wrote:
Vajrayāna does refer to false-aspectarian Yogācāra view for its position on how appearances manifest and are mistakenly apprehended as substantial entities. Hence consciousness in some modality of itself is fundamental.

Solipsism does not work because (i) mind is subject to the same scrutiny as everything else, and (ii) the buddhadharma allows for the conventional diversity of mindstreams.

At the end of the day mind is fundamental, and matter is a byproduct of incorrectly cognizing mind's own display... so while solipsism is an incorrect view, it is only incorrect for specific reasons.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 17th, 2018 at 4:35 AM
Title: Re: Kyab Rig
Content:
mirrormind said:
This is very helpful. I always felt there was some contradiction or a missing explanation with regard to the sequence of matter, light, yeshe, and I had in fact meant to ask this question for a long time.

Would it be possible to say a bit more about the two types of pristine consciousness and how they are understood to be different? I have heard essence, nature, and compassion used as descriptors or qualities of the basis but not as pristine consciousnesses. Could one speak of a pristine consciousness of kadag and lhundrub respectively?

krodha wrote:
You've probably heard of them referred to as the "three wisdoms" of the basis. Three ye shes [jñāna]. "Pristine consciousness" is just an alternate gloss.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 16th, 2018 at 12:28 AM
Title: Re: Do You Have A Body?
Content:
Simon E. said:
An appearance is embodied?

krodha wrote:
The body is ultimately mere appearance, but appears substantial to afflicted sentient beings.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 14th, 2018 at 3:20 PM
Title: Re: Dog thread
Content:
krodha wrote:
I don't like dogs. Ha

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 9th, 2018 at 11:29 AM
Title: Re: Goodbye
Content:
MiphamFan said:
Excerpt from a peterson speech:
And I'm tellin ya BUCKO you don't want to go there, it's a really dark place. And once you get there it's hard to get out. Solzhenitsyn talks about this, and I've read Solzhenitsyn. It's DARK STUFF BUCKO. Never mind that the CIA wrote it, it's DARK STUFF. And you don't want to go there. But I've read Solzhenitsyn, and it's not really obvious, it's really complex stuff. And DARK. And Solzhenitsyn is one of the deepest writers of the 20th century. He knew the darkness BUCKO, and. you. don't. want. to. go. there. He was a hero because he spoke the truth. It's hard to come back from that place, but he did. He cleaned his room and got the BUCKOS out of his country. And the other thing that's so interesting is that lobsters knew all this stuff. They cleaned their rooms 20 million years ago. And if you don't clean your room BUCKO it's a DARK PLACE, and trust me, you don't want to go there. I've been there, and trust me, you got to sort yourself out. And that's by no means obvious.

The clean room is the foil of God. Clean your room, bring him out of that DARK PLACE man, and that's your father saved. Got it BUCKO? You get to be top lobster, and that's by no means obvious. It's an archetype, I've read my Jung. It's a DARK PLACE man, I've read him. He went into that DARK PLACE and saved the lobster. And that's because he took the time to pet the cat BUCKO. And trust me, you don't want to go there. It's tyrannical, you don't want to go there. And it's by no means obvious. It's pathological. Trust me, I know BUCKO. I spent 30 years studying the Jungian archetype in the Concentration Camps. It's a DARK PLACE, you don't want to go down that road. And that's by no means

obvious. And NEETCHA too, he was in a DARK PLACE BUCKO. It's mind-bogglingly brilliant stuff. And by no means obvious BUCKO.

krodha wrote:
What is this from? I listened to Peterson's interview on the Joe Rogan podcast just last week and he sounded nothing like this.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 6th, 2018 at 7:17 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
Krodha, from my perspective you were trying to correct a Theravada practitioner about the true nature of reality.

krodha wrote:
Just offering other perspectives in a setting where the Theravada position is highly promulgated and said views tend to err into substantialism.

The Theravadins on Reddit are good at reciting and parroting what they've read in the suttas, but have no knowledge of Mahāyāna tenets. Some even harbor the classic Theravada fundamentalism that rejects the legitimacy of other Buddhist systems due to their narrow definition of buddhavacana. I'm never attempting to correct anyone, but if a topic is not Theravada specific and it seems worthwhile to share a different perspective I will.

Dawai Gocha said:
Then assumed I know these things because I practice dzogchen. My point was simple—just because I practice dzogchen doesn’t mean I have any special knowledge or realization. This seemed to be the antithesis of your belief.

krodha wrote:
The core tenets of the system are quite specific, however.

Dawai Gocha said:
I know these things have secret meanings and more profound context but this relates to more conventional usuage of terms. You guys didn’t comment on the dictionary definitions and Namkhai Norbu’s apparent usage, but I think it could offer clarity for others.

krodha wrote:
Ok. The use of the word is not my interest, to be completely honest. I was exploring the meaning that the term may represent in the context discussed in this particular thread… but like I said, you can obviously use the term however you like.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 6th, 2018 at 3:19 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm said:
Again, Kyle, this is too narrow. But I am not going to discuss it here other than to say one does not need to be an ārya to be said to know Dzogchen directly and experientially. You are mixing up sūtra and Dzogchen here.

krodha wrote:
I was attempting to offer an example of another distinction that is somewhat similar in nature.

In any case seems this conversation has probably ran its course.

The distinction isn't important anyway but Dawai Gocha's blatant refusal to even consider its merits is a bit strange to me.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 6th, 2018 at 2:40 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:

krodha wrote:
And the "Dzogchenpa" distinction allows both of us to maintain our points of view in a rather harmonious way.

Dawai Gocha said:
Maybe check out my second post that wasn't approved until later, it might be worth entertaining.

Seems 'dzogchenpa' can be used in both contexts. Both dictionaries define it as 'practitioners of dzogchen' and teachers have used it in this way.

krodha wrote:
The main point is again, that "Dzogchen" is the living and experiential dimension of equipoise. Those who have known Dzogchen are awakened individuals.

Even within the scope of the buddhadharma, there are "practitioners of the buddhadharma" and then there are those who have awakened, given the title "ārya." In the same way only those who have awakened to their nature have come to know "Dzogchen," and those who have not yet awakened cannot be said to know the meaning of "dzogchen."

Nevertheless they are practicing to create circumstances that are conducive to awakening. Those who have awakened and have lapsed back into their relative condition are also creating conducive circumstances to continually re-visit said equipoise, as that is the entire point.

Just as in the buddhadharma the distinction of an ārya is made, I feel it is appropriate to make the distinction we are discussing. The āryas of the world have tasted chocolate so to speak, they have an experiential, working knowledge of that taste. Those who have not tasted chocolate do not possess that knowledge.

This all started because I said "as an alleged atiyogin, you know X to be the case." You then asked what I meant by "alleged" and this is what I mean, as someone who has allegedly tasted chocolate, you possess an experiential knowledge of that taste. Likewise a yogin of ati, or a "Dzogchenpa" is someone who, if they aren't knowing it constantly, has at least awakened to know "Dzogchen."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 5:30 PM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
Yes we can have different opinions so here's mine—you're teaching dzogchen on reddit and positing some questionable views.

krodha wrote:
I've never taught Dzogchen in my life and have no interest in doing so.

Dawai Gocha said:
Saying someone practicing according to empowerment/instruction isn't practicing dzogchen just seems like confusion. This is literally how the conversation went...

Me: I meant really, it doesn't make sense. You're implying that someone practicing togyal and trekchod in an authentic dzogchen lineage, isn't practice dzogchen.

You: How do you know what they are doing? One can claim to be practicing tregcho yet merely be sitting, distracted, in something that merely resembles samatha. etc etc

krodha wrote:
Right, and I still stand by the question as it is completely reasonable.

Dawai Gocha said:
The 'dzogchenpa' distinction didn't come up until later and I think a bunch of people weren't sure about that one. I'm still not sure because we have Gelugpa, Nyingmapa, etc., so what would somebody from Dzogchen Monastery be called for example? Seems like it can have multiple contexts.

krodha wrote:
Obviously.

And the "Dzogchenpa" distinction allows both of us to maintain our points of view in a rather harmonious way.

Dawai Gocha said:
I don't think any conventional use will take away from the sanctity of its true meaning either way.

krodha wrote:
I never suggested it does.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 3:30 PM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
Actually, I use the term generally and don't believe I'm in a position to "delegate" it.

krodha wrote:
You assign it the meaning you feel is appropriate, just as I do.

Dawai Gocha said:
This was your main premise, that because the people at our retreats might lack recognition (according to you), they aren't practicing dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Right, and in this thread it was pointed out that "practicing Dzogchen" does not necessitate a knowledge of the basis, whereas being a "Dzogchenpa" does.

The definitive view of Dzogchen is found within the basis, path and result. Prior to that point one is implementing methods to recognize that nature. Dzogchen is your nature.

Dawai Gocha said:
So you go ahead and keep dozogchen for yourself brother, I'm ok with just being a practitioner.

krodha wrote:
We see things differently, and that isn't a problem. Are we not allowed different opinions on this matter? I'm merely sharing my view, not attempting to persuade you to adopt it.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 12:47 PM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?

Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
So far, I haven't seen a case made for why it matters.

krodha wrote:
It doesn't matter, ultimately.

I personally view a "Dzogchenpa" as someone who has come to know something quite specific about the nature of their own mind and phenomena.

The notion isn't something I attribute or delegate loosely. You choose to think of it more loosely. To each their own.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 12:38 PM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm said:
Yup, but let’s be sure not to turn that nature into an object too.

krodha wrote:
I try to remain mindful of that.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 11:29 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
Just don't see the point in establishing this rigid intellectual trapping of the word. They have Theravadins, Mahayanists, Tantrikas, etc., but those in dzogchen lineages can't be called dzogchenpas? Doesn't seem to make sense.

We have tulkus in our lineage and even at a few years old, I don't have a problem calling them dzogchenpas.

krodha wrote:
The point being made is that there are (i) those who actually possess a knowledge of their nature and (ii) those who don't.

Those who possess that knowledge [rig pa] have come to directly know the meaning of "Dzogchen." The same cannot be said for those who haven't.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
That you or your family are not practicing Dzogchen is not an assertion I made. I merely asked what it means to be an "atiyogin."

I feel Malcolm's distinction between a "Dzogchen practitioner" and a "Dzogchenpa" answers the question in a way that satisfies both sides of the inquiry.

Dawai Gocha said:
You asserted that by my standards anyone practicing samatha is practicing dzogchen, even after I described empowerments, instructions, etc. as part of the practice.

krodha wrote:
Sure, so then by the aforementioned criteria, someone practicing śamatha after having received empowerments, instructions etc., would then be a practitioner of Dzogchen, but not necessarily a Dzogchenpa. It was the "Dzogchenpa" aspect I was referring to before.

Dawai Gocha said:
Then you made other assertions like "I wouldn't call someone a mechanic...etc." Which doesn't make sense, you're comparing someone who's gotten countless dzogchen empowerments, instructions, etc. to someone who has never touched a car engine.

krodha wrote:
Then I am saying someone who has not recognized the nature of their mind is not a "Dzogchenpa," however they can be called a practitioner of Dzogchen.

Dawai Gocha said:
Getting instructions from an authentic guru is indeed touching the car engine.

krodha wrote:
In the way I was using the example, someone who has a direct, experiential knowledge of the nature of their mind, has "touched the car engine."

Dawai Gocha said:
In regards to the distinction Lopon made, i would ask again - would we not consider a tulku in a dzogchen lineage to be a dzogchenpa?

krodha wrote:
Depends on the tulku. Like I mentioned, some are legitimate, some are mere symptoms of a political climate.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 7:59 AM

Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Dawai Gocha said:
Krodha, I wasn't so offended but for me, saying I practice dzogchen isn't a big deal considering that's all I've been around since I was a kid. Then you're essentially saying that me and my family are not practicing dzogchen (multiple times) so I was really just pointing out the ridiculousness of that statement. I do apologize if my words seemed harsh but the exclusivity bugs me sometimes.

krodha wrote:
That you or your family are not practicing Dzogchen is not an assertion I made. I merely asked what it means to be an "atiyogin."

I feel Malcolm's distinction between a "Dzogchen practitioner" and a "Dzogchenpa" answers the question in a way that satisfies both sides of the inquiry.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 7:25 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
The guy you are arguing with does have a point; you don't know yourself for sure if someone really is resting in their nature of mind, in fact you can't even know unless you have some siddhis. But in the end, does it really matter to you? That's between the guru and student.

krodha wrote:
This was my point though, how does one know? There's really no way.

In any case this was more of an open inquiry, but this person became quite offended so things spun out a bit.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 7:17 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The first instance of recognizing said nature is the point that "practicing Dzogchen" begins, at least in my understanding.

Malcolm said:
This is when you become a Dzogchenpa, not just a Dzogchen practitioner.

krodha wrote:

Makes sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 7:15 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm said:
This is too narrow a definition. If you are practicing practices characteristic of Dzogchen, etc., then you are a Dzogchen practitioner.

For example, if you are solely a practitioner of Lamdre, you are not a Dzogchen practitioner. On the other hand, there is no difference in meaning between Dzogchen trekcho, Kagyu Mahamudra, the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, etc.

krodha wrote:
Ok. I suppose I've been under the impression that the basis, path and result are defined by Garab Dorje's three statements, and that the basis is defined as the knowledge [rig pa] of the nature of mind.

But I can understand how this makes things too narrow.

Edit: nevermind just saw your last post.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 6:49 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
Aryjna said:
ChNNR says in 'Longchenpa's Advice from the Heart' At the beginning, we may dwell in our real potentiality or real nature for five or ten seconds in a period of twenty-four hours. Then, applying the practice more and more, we may be able to remain for some minutes, then for some hours, thus becoming Dzogchen yogins.
That would probably exclude a large percentage of the people who are practicing Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
The first instance of recognizing said nature is the point that "practicing Dzogchen" begins, at least in my understanding.

The path [lam] consists of fluctuating between equipoise and post-equipoise, which is what Rinpoche is referring to.

Whether that excludes a large percentage I'm not sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
My point was this: I wouldn't call someone a mechanic if they have never touched a car engine. These individuals may be practitioners engaged in sadhānas, sure. Aspirants, certainly. But yogins of ati, I personally feel that is something different.

Even if they claim to be practicing tregcho and so on, how do I know what they are doing? One can claim to be practicing tregcho yet merely be sitting, distracted, in something that merely resembles samatha. Similarly, one can claim to be practicing thogal, yet just be sitting there, completely distracted, enjoying a light show. There is no way to tell who is applying these views accurately.

That being the case, are the individuals in question practicing Dzogchen? Outwardly it may appear that way. Inwardly though, where it truly matters, I cannot say. For all I know they may be just like someone dressed up in a police officer costume, outwardly appearing as such, yet in actuality not so.

In any case, for asking this question I've now been labeled: arrogant, pedantic, lost, a teapot filled with poison, a mess, and was told: Knowing your real name I'll also encourage others to stay clear.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 5th, 2018 at 6:32 AM
Title: What Does It Actually Mean to Practice Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I am interested to hear what the general consensus is on this, as this topic has come up recently on another forum where someone stated "My opinion is that if you're practicing dzogchen, you're a dzogchen practitioner," to which I inquired what it actually means to practice Dzogchen?

This individual was raised into a Dzogchen lineage (which is wonderful) has received "the empowerments, instructions, etc and are doing those practices according to a dzogchen masters guidance," and that is all well and good, but still I'm curious, does that make one a "Dzogchenpa?"

To this proposition they retorted "I wonder if you would come to our retreat and tell people they aren’t dzogchenpas because they don’t fit a certain criteria," which I certainly would never do, who am I to judge? The question I'm proposing is just an honest line of inquiry. If people want to call themselves "dzogchenpas" they are welcome to, yet for the sake of the discussion I am still interested what that title really means?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 1st, 2018 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Wiccan arts and the Mahayana
Content:
MatthewAngby said:
Main reason why I love Wiccan arts is because of their dancing naked in the moonlight and because they are so dark and look so scary (which I love).

krodha wrote:
Vajrayāna ganacakras used to feature such activities as well.

MatthewAngby said:
Do they still do?

krodha wrote:
Perhaps somewhere in the world.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 31st, 2018 at 5:45 PM
Title: Re: Wiccan arts and the Mahayana
Content:
MatthewAngby said:
Main reason why I love Wiccan arts is because of their dancing naked in the moonlight and because they are so dark and look so scary (which I love).

krodha wrote:
Vajrayāna ganacakras used to feature such activities as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 27th, 2018 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Monastic Tibetan Buddhists Fear Death More
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tibetans negate the continuity of a self but still uphold a causal process of transmigration that is dependent upon the degree of karmic imprints in the mindstream.

Thus if you die a regular sentient being without having made a sufficient impression on your continuum then there is reason to be concerned to a certain extent.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 23rd, 2018 at 11:03 AM
Title: Re: The Aro Authenticity Debate.

Content:
practitioner said:
I've been reading this thread wondering when he would come up. I'm curious if he now gets the same benefit of the doubt as the Aro folks?

krodha wrote:
Jax actively demeans his teachers and essentially lies about the extent of his personal and experiential knowledge of the teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 23rd, 2018 at 11:01 AM
Title: Re: The Aro Authenticity Debate.
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Some of Jax's stuff I see on FB from time to time seems pretty well spoken to me.

krodha wrote:
Used car salesmen are also known for being well spoken.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 22nd, 2018 at 6:16 AM
Title: Re: Question about removing christian/etc. baptism
Content:
javier.espinoza.t said:
Btw guys, is not the name "baptism" my business on this, but the bound made to this deva...

krodha wrote:
Even the presumption that the religion in question is connected to some sort of deva is lending a bit too much credibility in their direction, in my opinion.

I was baptized as a child and attended Sunday school before a series of instances such as the church giving my younger brother wine at communion causing him to barf all over the sanctuary area and then trying to take away his most loved and favorite teddy bear in order to donate it because "Jesus died for our sins." Unreal. My mother decided enough was enough and we never went back.

I couldn't give a shit if I was baptized or not, you really shouldn't either. It means less than nothing. My son is being raised without religion, and can decide when he's older if he wants to follow one. Hopefully he has the karma for the buddhadharma, we discuss it here and there but I don't push it on him and refuse to condition him.

Baptism is a meaningless representation of allegiance to a false system of belief.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 22nd, 2018 at 4:57 AM
Title: Re: The Aro Authenticity Debate.
Content:
krodha wrote:
I attended an Aro puja in Alameda (not too far from Pema Osel Ling) maybe 8 years ago before the local sangha disbanded, wasn't my cup of tea but nice people. The practice was done primarily in English which is unique.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 17th, 2018 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
Jyoti said:
Everyone one has a choice in their lives, some choose to follow a guru, some follow a career, some practice in solidary, some devote to study of sutra and develop their own thesis, some a mixture of this and that, I myself am a mixture of career and study. Direct introduction is important, but it is not a ritual where you have to receive repeatedly, although it is not restricted from doing so. I confessed I already know the teaching, including the meaning of thusness (presence) on reading books alone, but I took the direct introduction nonetheless.

I did not come here to learn anything, I am just a buddhist scholar who is feeling bore, because no one can discuss the definitive dharma with me. Now it seems clear to me that this dzogchen forum does not have the people I am looking for, my expectation is too high I guess, I will moved on as I did 6 six years ago, due to not finding the capable opponents.

krodha wrote:
Has it ever occurred to you that you may not know nearly as much as you think you do?

Sorry to be blunt but your view is a mess, and you would benefit from a qualified teacher and listening to what others have to say in this forum.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 3:57 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
Jyoti said:
That's right, only apply to the scriptures concern where just seeing those words, we can establish with certainty whether the scriptures are definitive. Other sources we have to verify by the meaning being communicated and not just the words.

krodha wrote:
This is quite damning for your so-called "third turning."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 3:55 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also, the vast majority of "third turning" sūtras require a great deal of interpretation. Their expositions are certainly not direct and explicit in meaning. Rather they are indirect and implicit, requiring interpretation. Which often why we see the literal minded err into substantialism and eternalism when reading "third turning" sūtras, as they lack the experience and wherewithal to unpack the rhetoric in a way that allows them to comprehend the intended meaning.

With "interpretation" as a measure for what is provisional and definitive, the so-called "second turning" again comes out on top in terms of clarity as the rhetoric is often very direct and explicit, requiring no interpretation.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 3:34 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
Jyoti said:
These are of the second turning which are considered definitive only with interpretation. The tripitaka is very systematic and strict on what is definitive and what is not. The above criterias are fixed (not subject to doubt) and there are more.

krodha wrote:
The "three turning" model became big in Tibet and East Asia, but the case for an authentic origin in the Indian corpus is dubious at best. Which is to say I would not take the three turnings so seriously.

For example, in terms of sūtrayāna I opt for the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra which sets out criteria for a provisional teaching and a definitive teaching. If I go by that criteria then many so-called "third turning" sūtras are considered provisional. Yet those who adhere rigidly to the three turning schematic would categorize the Āryākṣayamatinirdeśa as "second turning."

The text reads:

Any sūtrānta which explains in a variety of different terms a self, a sentient being, a living being, a personality, a person, an individual, one born from a human, a human, an agent, an experiencer — teaching an owner in what is ownerless — those sutras are called "of provisional meaning". Any sūtrānta which teaches emptiness, the signless, the wishless, the unconditioned, the non-arisen, the unproduced, the insubstantial, the non-existence of self, the non-existence of sentient beings, the non-existence of living

beings, the non-existence of individuals, the non-existence of an owner up to the doors of liberation, those are called "definitive meaning". This is taught in the sūtrāntas of definitive meaning but is not taught in the sūtrāntas of the provisional meaning.

Even so, the above is only applicable within the scope of sūtrayāna, which is arguably provisional in its entirety when compared to Vajrayāna.

At the end of the day I see no reason to categorize everything so strictly, if the teaching is insightful and agrees with you then that is what is important.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 3:15 PM
Title: Re: ChNN retreats?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The dates labeled "retreat" with no additional info are most likely "to be announced" at a later time.

Most DC retreats consist of Rinpoche's teaching in the morning along with an opportunity to meet with Rinpoche afterwards, and then dancing later in the afternoon. Depending on the location there may be other events during the day or there may not. It's generally a laid back scene.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 2:31 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
Jyoti said:
It seems so according to logic, reason as well as common sense, but if one had read a chinese definitive scriptures before will say otherwise, only the buddha knows better what is in his scriptures and we should follow the advice that he has stated in the sutras.

krodha wrote:
Like beauty, what is definitive in the buddhadharma is in the eye of the beholder. There is no such thing as an objectively definitive text.

That said, many so-called "definitive" texts discuss sentient beings and samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 2:10 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
Malcolm said:
In any case, the Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkara, a summary of the third turning sūtras,

beautifully states:

Jyoti said:
This is not a definitive sutra since it discusses sentient beings and samsara. My point of the citation is just to answer your two questions. Your first question is rooted in the basis of nondefinitive teaching, that's why there is no direct answer that is definitive to that, but only indirect answer that is definitive, that is, if you can read the meaning.

krodha wrote:
The idea that a "definitive" text would not reference sentient beings and/or samsara in its exposition is an absurd notion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 2:02 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
krodha wrote:
Relevant stories about Sabchu Tulku and a siddha by the name of Lama Tenje:

Here is another story about the previous Sabchu Tulku - not the child who lives nowadays in Swayambhu, but in one of his former lives. The first Sabchu was a disciple of Situ Pema Nyingje, Jamgön Kongtrül and Jamyang Khyentse. Before he died, a horrible disease struck him; his stomach became one big open sore. It started with one sore and slowly it became bigger and bigger. Finally all his intestines were lying out in his lap. The pus, liquids and blood ran out onto the floor, all the way out to the door. There were definitely bodily sensations, and he wanted to scratch it all the time, so he asked to have his hands tied. They were tied with a white scarf to stop him from scratching the wound. His disciple asked, "Oh Rinpoche! This must be so difficult, it must be really painful for you." He said, "I'm not sick at all, there is nothing wrong with me." They said, "How terrible, all the pus and blood is flowing down the floor." He answered, "There is an old monk sitting on this bed, he seems to be moving around, quite uncomfortably. He wants to scratch his belly, but for me there is nothing wrong at all. I am not sick at all. However there is someone who looks like me sitting right here. He seems to be suffering quite a bit, but I am fine." If you are stable in practice, it is like that: there is no fixation at all.

There was another lama, in Kham, by the name of Tenje, a siddha who contracted the same sickness where all his intestines were hanging out. People asked him, "How are you feeling today?" He said, "I'm fine, nothing wrong at all." They said, "But Rinpoche, look down, you have all these sores and open wounds." He replied, "Yes, it looks like there is something wrong here, but I am quite fine. I am not sick at all." The people asked, "We think you will die soon, so will you please tell us where you will be reborn so we can find the tulku?" He said, "Yes, I can take care of that. Call my disciple Tendar." The lama then told his disciple, "Carry me seven steps to the west." While Tendar was carrying his master those seven steps, the master snapped his fingers and said, "May my realization take birth in your stream of being." Afterwards, he said, while pointing at the student,

"This is my tulku, even before I pass away. Will he be okay for this monastery? Tomorrow morning at dawn, I will enact the drama of dying. I am going home to the dharmadhātu buddhafield of Akanishtha." The next morning he died while the sun was rising. His disciple Tendar later said that from the moment when the lama snapped his fingers onwards, he was totally undistracted; he never wandered from the state of rigpa. This disciple later was known as Tendar Tulku, and he had the same realization as his master - no difference whatsoever.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 15th, 2018 at 1:57 PM
Title: Re: Instant Presence and Physical Pain
Content:
krodha wrote:
You'd think after a multi-year hiatus we would get a different Jyoti.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 11th, 2018 at 11:51 AM
Title: Re: Do Admins/Mods have access to read our PMs?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Probably just means you need to delete some messages. You are only allowed 100 in your box at a time.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 9th, 2018 at 3:40 AM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
krodha wrote:
At any rate, the last time you posted here some years ago there was a huge language barrier issue, so hopefully we can remain mindful of that.

Jyoti said:
I am not aware I have change any of my language now as compare to that time. And I basically intented to use certain preferred term hoping my audience read the meaning rather than just word. In buddhism we emphasize the reliance on the meaning, and not the words, I don't care how good you may be at words, if you can't perceive the meaning, it simply mean you don't know. As a practitioner of dzogchen should have the insight to see the truth in other tradition, ultimately it is the about the teaching, not the tradition, nor the people that matters in a discussion.

krodha wrote:
I am saying we should be mindful that it is possible we can be either (i) talking past each other, or (ii) saying the same thing without realizing it.

For instance, translating jñāna as "intellect." You could be representing the intended meaning of the term correctly even though "intellect" really does fail to communicate that meaning. Or you could be misinterpreting jñāna altogether, so far I cannot tell.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 9th, 2018 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
krodha wrote:
But this is directed at you, so take it or leave it: my advice for dealing with difficult situations in everyday life would be to remain mindful of impermanence and the apparent peaks and valleys of experience. You will have difficult times, and you will have good times.

Fully expect difficult times and accept that it is part of life. Loss and difficulty is the other side of gain and easy times, so expect the ebb and flow. Be prepared and expect it, when it arises do your best to handle it effectively. What arises will fall, what comes together will fall apart, what is born will die... suffering comes from resistance and an inability to expand one's scope to see opportunity when doors close. Try to be an optimist.

Overall view this life like a dream. None of it is actually real. It is a magnificent display of color, sound and sensation. Investigate your mind, it is the root of it all.

As for contemplation, it is like a glass of water, there is no benefit for your thirst unless you drink it. And after you have you will see what color, sound and sensation really are, and how serious difficult situations really are in the grand scope.

Life is a teacher. Learn from your experiences, be thankful for this life. Forge mental fortitude in the flames of gain and loss. A small boat is tossed around by the waves, you can't fix the waves, but you can improve the size and strength of the boat.

Be well.

</life_advice>

Jyoti said:
When you expound these non-definitive teaching on a dzogchen forum, have you associate the teaching as non-definitive? What is the quality of dzogchen teaching are you trying to communicate to followers of other tradition of buddhism which are definitive?

krodha wrote:
You're barking up the wrong tree.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 9th, 2018 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The force of prajñā in instances of equipoise burns away mental obscuration, and said afflictions are not dispelled any other way.

Like a massive release of tension in one's continuum, and then in post-equipoise negative emotions are diminished, in some cases nearly altogether. Certainly altogether for those who have fully exhausted the afflictive obscuration.

The internal reference point of mind, or subject that seems to relate to objects as an entity is like a tightly bound knot that carries a great deal of tension and residual impressions in the form of negative emotions, habits and tendencies.

In instances of true contemplation when that reference point collapses and is realized to be false, that knot is undone for the duration of the period of contemplation and there is a massive release of built up tension.

This is why Norbu Rinpoche says even remaining in equipoise for the period of time it takes an ant to crawl up the length of one's nose purifies eons of karma.

Jyoti said:
Mental obscuration is subsided temporary during mental equipoise, as such the state of Rigpa has no function to anything when the mental faculty is in equipoise, except for serving the equipoise itself (for nothing) due to concentration itself.

krodha wrote:
Equipoise [mnyam bzhag] is not a state of concentration.

Jyoti said:
Furthermore, mental obscuration is not mean to be force away by any conditioned state of meditation,

krodha wrote:
Equipoise is not a conditioned state of meditation, it is resting in a direct knowledge [rig pa] of the nature of mind [sems nyid].

Jyoti said:
to rid of mental obscuration, the only way is to intellectually recognise the problem with the insight that is gained from the knowledge of the base.

krodha wrote:
Prajñā naturally eradicates kleśas, just as heat naturally evaporates water.

Jyoti said:

What one experiences in the instance of equipoise is different from what one experiences in normal, distracted mental condition,

krodha wrote:
Obviously.

Jyoti said:
If these experiences are not integrated with the intelligence/jnana, they will continue to be the basis of distraction and defilements, when one is distracted from the instant of equipoise. The merit of equipose is great, but much greater would be the merit of awakening to the bodhi. One doesn't awaken to the bodhi by subdueing the intellect/jnana in equipoise.

krodha wrote:
Equipoise is precisely "awakening to the bodhi," as you put it.

One does not subdue jñāna, one cultivates jñāna. Vijñāna is what one aims to "subdue," so to speak.

Jyoti said:
Also a common sign of new student here, did they truly received the knowledge/Rigpa? It required an intellect/jnana to hold the knowledge, it is not about some practice to get into a certain state.

krodha wrote:
Jñāna is a function of rig pa [vidyā]. If you are resting in rigpa your modality of cognition is jñāna. Just as when you are in marigpa your modality of cognition is vijñāna [rnam shes].

And it certainly is about "some practice to get into a certain state," as a beginner if you do not make effort you are doing nothing. "Effortlessness" comes much later.

At any rate, the last time you posted here some years ago there was a huge language barrier issue, so hopefully we can remain mindful of that.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 8th, 2018 at 11:52 PM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The force of prajñā in instances of equipoise burns away mental obscuration, and said afflictions are not dispelled any other way.

Like a massive release of tension in one's continuum, and then in post-equipoise negative emotions are diminished, in some cases nearly altogether. Certainly altogether for those who have fully exhausted the afflictive obscuration.

The internal reference point of mind, or subject that seems to relate to objects as an entity is like a tightly bound knot that carries a great deal of tension and residual impressions in the form of negative emotions, habits and tendencies.

In instances of true contemplation when that reference point collapses and is realized to be false, that knot is undone for the duration of the period of contemplation and there is a massive release of built up tension.

This is why Norbu Rinpoche says even remaining in equipoise for the period of time it takes an ant to crawl up the length of one's nose purifies eons of karma.

climb-up said:
I don't disagree with anything you said, and it reflects my understanding, I'm not sure how it relates to my question specifically though.

krodha wrote:
The above wasn't directed at you necessarily.

But this is directed at you, so take it or leave it: my advice for dealing with difficult situations in everyday life would be to remain mindful of impermanence and the apparent peaks and valleys of experience. You will have difficult times, and you will have good times.

Fully expect difficult times and accept that it is part of life. Loss and difficulty is the other side of gain and easy times, so expect the ebb and flow. Be prepared and expect it, when it arises do your best to handle it effectively. What arises will fall, what comes together will fall apart, what is born will die... suffering comes from resistance and an inability to expand one's scope to see opportunity when doors close. Try to be an optimist.

Overall view this life like a dream. None of it is actually real. It is a magnificent display of color, sound and sensation. Investigate your mind, it is the root of it all.

As for contemplation, it is like a glass of water, there is no benefit for your thirst unless you drink it. And after you have you will see what color, sound and sensation really are, and how serious difficult situations really are in the grand scope.

Life is a teacher. Learn from your experiences, be thankful for this life. Forge mental fortitude in the flames of gain and loss. A small boat is tossed around by the waves, you can't fix the waves, but you can improve the size and strength of the boat.

Be well.

</life_advice>

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 8th, 2018 at 11:08 PM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The force of prajñā in instances of equipoise burns away mental obscuration, and said afflictions are not dispelled any other way.

Like a massive release of tension in one's continuum, and then in post-equipoise negative emotions are diminished, in some cases nearly altogether. Certainly altogether for those who have fully exhausted the afflictive obscuration.

The internal reference point of mind, or subject that seems to relate to objects as an entity is like a tightly bound knot that carries a great deal of tension and residual impressions in the form of negative emotions, habits and tendencies.

In instances of true contemplation when that reference point collapses and is realized to be false, that knot is undone for the duration of the period of contemplation and there is a massive release of built up tension.

This is why Norbu Rinpoche says even remaining in equipoise for the period of time it takes an ant to crawl up the length of one's nose purifies eons of karma.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 7th, 2018 at 4:31 AM
Title: Re: pre-emptive contemplation in difficult situations?
Content:
climb-up said:
We all get distracted in out lives and all have times that we get completely lost and/or emotionally hijacked.
It seems like it could be a good idea to practice guruyoga, get into a state of contemplation, and then intentionally think about the type of situation that would trigger me, with the goal of being more ready to integrate contemplation into those situations.

krodha wrote:
You may not be completely aware of the implications of the state of contemplation.

But beyond that, as a beginner who is able to enter the state of contemplation, you certainly would want to simply rest in a relaxed manner so that you sustain that equipoise for as long as possible. Intentionally engaging in conceptualization will cause you to lapse back into afflicted mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 4th, 2018 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Weed is now legal in California
Content:
krodha wrote:
Soon the potency will be marked and regulated just like alcohol, and there will be a sliding scale available ranging from light to heavy effects, but until then it is a gamble and it is best to be cautious.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 8:22 AM
Title: Re: What is Dharmakaya?
Content:
krodha wrote:
From the standpoint of dharmakāya there is no thoughts or gaps, because thoughts never arose to begin with.

PuerAzaelis said:
Then why describe it as purity, stainless, etc.?

krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is pure and stainless because it has never known affliction and is primordially unconditioned.

PuerAzaelis said:
PS:

On the other hand ...

When you look into a thought's identity, without having to dissolve the thought and without having to force it out by meditation, the vividness of the thought is itself the indescribable and naked state of aware emptiness. We call this seeing the natural face of innate thought or thought dawns as dharmakaya.
Dakpo Tashi Namgyal

PPS:

And ...

In reality, the calm state is the essential condition of mind, while the wave of thought is the mind's natural clarity in function; just as there is no distinction whatever between the sun and its rays, or a stream and its ripples, so there is no distinction between the mind and thought. If one considers the calm state as something positive to be attained, and the wave of thought as something negative to be abandoned, and one remains thus caught up in the duality of accepting and rejecting, there is no way of overcoming the ordinary state of mind.
Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

krodha wrote:
The insight involved very much has to do with the actual nature of the trio of stillness, movement and their knower [gnas gyu rig gsum], so these quotes are addressing the same principle.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 5:45 AM
Title: Re: Dharmakaya in Mahayana
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's no necessity to say there is an "inherent lack of nature", use whatever terms you like as long as the intended meaning is communicated.

You just seemed to be inquiring in what context we can say dharmakāya is innate or inherent.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 5:40 AM
Title: Re: Dharmakaya in Mahayana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Sure, the point is that we aren't talking about an inherent substantial nature, but rather that a lack of nature is the authentic mode of all things, and in this sense, since it is unrecognized, it is an innate aspect of apparent things that we must recognize.

Grigoris said:
Seems oxymoronic, doesn't it? An inherent lack.

It is clumsy too.

Wouldn't it just be easier to say that beings lack an inherent nature, rather than saying they have an inherent lack of nature?

krodha wrote:
Hence our "essenceless essence" or "natureless nature."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Dharmakaya in Mahayana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha is a term used to designate the dharmakāya when obscured by adventitious affliction.

Dharmakāya is only "inherent" in the sense that it is the innate and actual nature of mind that is unrecognized and obstructed by delusion.

That nature is inseparable emptiness and clarity.

In that sense all that is being said is that the mind's lack of essence is an innate property, just as phenomena's lack of essence is an innate property.

Grigoris said:
Inherent and innate are synonyms, are they not?

krodha wrote:
Sure, the point is that we aren't talking about an inherent substantial nature, but rather that a lack of nature is the authentic mode of all things, and in this sense, since it is unrecognized, it is an innate aspect of apparent things that we must recognize.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: What is Dharmakaya?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The gap between thoughts is just stillness [gnas pa], thoughts are movement [gyu ba], and the knower is a relative cognition.

PuerAzaelis said:
If i take the rocks out of a hole, I have manufactured space.

Is that manufactured space different from the space that existed in the hole before I took the rocks out?

If yes, if there are really two separate, different kinds of space, then why the emphasis on the "gap-between-thoughts" view, which is a common view?

The dharmakaya, beyond the intellect, is ultimate reality.
Guru Rinpoche

From within the nature of originally pure stainless space,
Awareness suddenly manifests. That moment of mindfulness
Is like finding a jewel at the bottom of the ocean.
This is dharmakaya, not fabricated nor created by anyone.
Garab Dorje

krodha wrote:
From the standpoint of dharmakāya there is no thoughts or gaps, because thoughts never arose to begin with.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 3rd, 2018 at 5:18 AM
Title: Re: Dharmakaya in Mahayana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha is a term used to designate the dharmakāya when obscured by adventitious affliction.

Dharmakāya is only "inherent" in the sense that it is the innate and actual nature of mind that is unrecognized and obstructed by delusion.

That nature is inseparable emptiness and clarity.

In that sense all that is being said is that the mind's lack of essence is an innate property, just as phenomena's lack of essence is an innate property.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 2nd, 2018 at 12:30 PM
Title: Re: Weed is now legal in California
Content:
TharpaChodron said:
But marijuana is and has been everywhere in California long before this law, what are they doing that's so special? You and Dzogchunma could have just stopped by my place, no line.

krodha wrote:
Marijuana is now recreationally legal in CA, which means if you are 21 you can purchase it without a prescription, just like alcohol.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 2nd, 2018 at 10:06 AM
Title: Re: Alayavijnana As Construct
Content:
maximohudson said:
My contention therefore is that Alayavijnana is a archaic mind construct which attempts to explain how this conditioning takes place.

krodha wrote:
Of course it is a construct, and the construct works, so whether it is deemed "archaic" or not is irrelevant.

maximohudson said:
It was developed before the advent of modern scientific instruments and procedures

which allow us to know EXACTLY how connitioning works.

krodha wrote:
Modern science has no clue how conditioning works in this context, nor is it concerned with soteriology i.e., a means to uproot the species of conditioning in question.

maximohudson said:
Today we can view Alayavijnana as an early construct designed to explain something unknown. In this sense it can be compared to a geocentric model of the solar system to explain the rotation and orbit of the earth or the caves of wind the ancient Greeks believed to cause earthquakes.

krodha wrote:
The ālayavijñāna does not explain anything "unknown", it is merely a model that accounts for the cause of affliction, the means by which affliction perpetuates itself and can be exhausted in certain Buddhist systems.

Modern science is great for the empirical measurement of phenomena, but falls flat on its face when attempting to account for subjective processes and the nature of the mind in its coarse and subtle expressions.

Most modern scientists are physicalists and materialists. Inferior world views in the eyes of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 1st, 2018 at 1:30 PM
Title: Re: Dharmakaya in Mahayana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here is a collection of excerpts on dharmakāya I assembled some time ago. I wasn't going to post it because it is somewhat overkill, but so far in this thread the definition of dharmakāya has been a bit vague, and the following does help address some of the questions in the original post. Hopefully it helps someone:

Dharmakāya ultimately represents a lack of an intrinsic, or essential nature, specifically the mind's ultimate lack of substantiality, from the Ārya-trikāya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:
Son of a good family, meaning of the dharmakāya of the tathāgatas is the absence of intrinsic nature, like space.
What is an absence of intrinsic nature? It is emptiness:
By what reasoning can it be shown that sentient beings have Buddhanature? Because all sentient beings are pervaded by the emptiness of dharmakāya... 'all sentient beings are pervaded by the emptiness of dharmakāya' means that the ultimate Buddhahood is dharmakāya, dharmakāya is all-pervading emptiness, and emptiness pervades all sentient beings.
-- Gampopa
Thus we can see that dharmakāya can be said to be synonymous with emptiness,

however the dharmakāya is specifically the total realization of emptiness at the time of the result which dawns due to the accumulation of wisdom, which is why Gampopa states clearly that "ultimate buddhahood is dharmakāya". In this respect we come to understand that buddhanature [tathāgatagarbha], dharmakāya and emptiness are not different, and that dharmakāya is released from the obscuring factors that render it "tathāgatagarbha" once the total realization of emptiness occurs, as delineated in the Śrīmālādevī-siṃhanāda-sūtra:
In that respect, the dharmakāya of the tathāgatagarbha is definitely released from the sheath of afflictions. Bhagavān, the so called 'tathāgatagarbha' is tathāgata's wisdom of emptiness that cannot be seen by śravakas and pratyekabuddhas.
Huang bo elaborates on the synonymous nature of dharmakāya and emptiness:
Emptiness is the Buddha's dharmakāya, just as the dharmakāya is emptiness. People's usual understanding is that the dharmakāya pervades emptiness, and that it is contained in emptiness. However, this is erroneous, for we should understand that the dharmakāya is emptiness and that emptiness is the dharmakāya.

If one thinks that emptiness is an entity and that this emptiness is separate from the dharmakāya or that there is a dharmakāya outside of emptiness, one is holding a wrong view. In the complete absence of views about emptiness, the true dharmakāya appears. Emptiness and dharmakāya are not different. The most important thing is your empty, cognizant mind. Its natural emptiness is dharmakāya, also called empty essence.
The Ārya-dharmasaṃgīti-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra continues on the synonymity of these principles:
Whoever seeks the dharmatā of phenomena, seeks emptiness. Whoever seeks emptiness, cannot be debated by anyone. Whoever cannot be debated by anyone, abides in the Dharma of a śramaṇa. However abides in the Dharma of a śramaṇa, they do not abide anywhere; whoever does not abide anywhere, they are uncontaminated with regard to objects. Whoever is uncontaminated with regard to objects, they are without faults. Whoever is without faults, they are the dharmakāya; whoever is the dharmakāya, they are a Tathāgata; whoever is the Tathāgata, they is said to be nondual; whoever is nondual, they do not abandon samsara and do not accomplish nirvana; in other words, they are shown to be totally free of all concepts. Bhagavan, this is the Dharmasaṃgīti.
Jamgon Kongtrul continues:
The concluding practice is the conviction that the ordinary mind that was from the beginning the unity of clarity and emptiness is itself the naturally arising three kayas - its emptiness is dharmakāya.
As does Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:
The great state of dharmakāya is space-like emptiness. The expression arising out of the state of primordial purity is a spontaneous presence which includes the two form kayas - saṃbhogakāya and nirmāṇakāya. ... What that means is our essence, which is a primordially pure emptiness, is dharmakāya.
And Sakya Pandita:
The body of wisdom is adorned with thirty-two major marks and eighty minor marks, and is the saṃbhogakāya. The nature of that existing as emptiness is the dharmakāya.
For these reasons, the notion that dharmakāya is an independently established, monolithic pleroma is an untenable position. Dharmakāya has no foundation, root or

basis, as Jigme Lingpa elaborates:
I myself argue 'To comprehend the meaning of the non-arising baseless, rootless dharmakāya, although reaching and the way of reaching this present conclusion "Since I have no thesis, I alone am without a fault", as in the Prasanga Madhyamaka system, is not established by an intellectual consideration such as a belief to which one adheres, but is reached by seeing the meaning of ultimate reality of the natural great completion.'
The Kun tu bzang po thugs kyi me long continues in this theme:
This meaningful supreme wisdom kāya, ultimate, natureless [rang bzhin med], the state of the nonarising dharmakāya, the lamp of the teachings, the great light of the dharmakāya manifests to persons who are in accord with the meaning.
Therefore we should understand that the dharmakāya and the three kāyas in general, lack the self-nature that would be required to be an established ontological entity that could be synonymous with the Brahman of Vedanta, as communicated in the Platform Sutra:
As to the three bodies [kāyas], the pure dharmakāya is your nature, the perfect and complete saṃbhogakāya is your wisdom, and the thousand billion nirmāṇakāyas are your practices (i.e., saṃskāra, “mental activities”). To speak of the three bodies apart from the fundamental nature is called ‘having the bodies but being without wisdom.’ If you are enlightened to [the fact that] the three bodies have no self-natures [svabhāva], then you will understand the bodhi of the four wisdoms.
The essential nature [svabhāva] of dharmakāya is essencelessness or naturelessness [niḥsvabhāva], for truly established, i.e., "existent" svabhāvas are impossibilities. From Ārya Nāgārjuna:
Svabhāva is by definition the subject of contradictory ascriptions. If it exists, it must belong to an existent entity, which means that it must be conditioned, dependent on other entities, and possessed of causes. But a svabhāva is by definition unconditioned, not dependent on other entities, and not caused. Thus the existence of a svabhāva is impossible.
Chokyi Dragpa states clearly that dharmakāya is empty of any essence:
Empty in essence, expansive like space and free from the limits of conceptual elaboration, is the dharmakāya.
The Rig pa rang shar proclaims the same:
The essence of the dharmakāya is empty.
This means that the conflation of dharmakāya with something like the Brahman of Vedanta, a transpersonal, ontological, truly established ultimate, is unwarranted and misguided. The great Buddhist adept Bhāviveka, addresses this misconception in many of his expositions. This excerpt from his Tarkajvala is especially pertinent:
If it is asked what is difference between this dharmakāya and the paramātma [bdag pa dam pa] (synonymous with Brahman) asserted in such ways as nonconceptual, permanent and unchanging, that [paramātma] they explain as subtle because it possesses the quality of subtly, is explained as gross because it possesses the quality of grossness, as unique because it possess the quality of uniqueness and as pervading near and far because it goes everywhere. The dharmakāya on the other hand is neither subtle nor gross, is not unique, is not near and is not far because it is not a possessor of said qualities and because it does not exist in a place.
Thus we see that the misconception that dharmakāya is an entity-like "possessor" of the qualities it entails is a mistaken view.

Dharmakāya is not an entity at all, as Sthiramati explains, entities in general are untenable:
The Buddha is the dharmakāya. Since the dharmakāya is emptiness, because there are not only no imputable personal entities in emptiness, there are also no imputable phenomenal entities, there are therefore no entities at all.
Dharmakāya should be understood as a quality, and not an entity, and it is for this reason that dharmakāya cannot be said to be one or many:
For 'not one, not many...' and so on, one and many means one and many i.e., both are nondual. Many means plural. Conventionally speaking 'I prostate' to that which is the dharmakāya, neither one nor many. If it is asked 'For what reason do we say though it is not one, it is also not many?' Due to that, since it is said 'non-arisen from the beginning', that which never arose from the beginning cannot have a phase of being one or many; like space, its nature is completely uninterrupted. Since all phenomena arise in the same way, therefore, what arises where? That which becomes a form of diversity is not seen by anyone, i.e. just as grains of rice arise from rice seed, likewise, whatever arises from emptiness is not permanent nor annihilated. Why? Free of all concepts, the victors see that to be empty and illusory.
- Siddha Nāgārjuna
Now, one may object, and state that the synonymous status of dharmakāya and emptiness would render dharmakāya an inert void, but this is also incorrect. As we can see from the Rig pa rang shar, emptiness is always accompanied with wisdom (i.e., pristine consciousness):
Since there is no cause for buddhahood in the beginning, in the end it cannot be created through a condition. Emptiness possesses a core of wisdom.
And the Kālacakra Root Tantra states the same:
Wisdom is merged into emptiness: uniform in taste, unchanging and permanent.
For this reason we should not associate dharmakāya with emptiness alone, but come to know that dharmakāya possesses a core of wisdom or pristine consciousness [jñāna], which is why dharmakāya and jñānakāya both representing buddhahood, are synonyms.
Per Malcolm The Amnāyamañjarī, a commentary on the Saṃputa Tantra states:
The kāya of pristine consciousness [jñāna] is the dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 1st, 2018 at 11:15 AM
Title: Re: What is Dharmakaya?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The gap between thoughts is just stillness [gnas pa], thoughts are movement [gyu ba], and the knower is a relative cognition. It is called "rig pa" in that model but it is merely a relative and afflicted cognitive capacity. Rig pa just means to know, or "knower" in that context, but the knower is vijñāna or dualistic consciousness.

It is not the definitive species of rig pa spoken of in these traditions, at least not yet.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 31st, 2017 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: What is Dharmakaya?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is not the space between two thoughts.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 30th, 2017 at 5:07 PM
Title: Re: What is Dharmakaya?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is the nature of your mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 30th, 2017 at 3:24 PM
Title: Re: 'The observer is the observed' ---critique
Content:
krodha wrote:
You are correct in the sense that Krishnamurti is not promoting a Buddhist view in that regard.

In the buddhadharma the feeling of a separate observer is an illusory construct that results from ignorance regarding the actual nature of one's mind.

Delusion and afflictive activity (such as grasping) serve to manifest the fallacious appearance of an internal substratum that abides in time separately from perceived entities of various kinds.

Recognizing the observer to be a false construct is a cornerstone of the buddhadharma which is found in every system spanning the Śravāka suttas to the Tantras.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 27th, 2017 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: Yetis are real, but are Himalayan brown bears
Content:
krodha wrote:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche once said for a short time in his childhood he befriended and took care of an adolescent yeti.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 20th, 2017 at 6:06 AM
Title: Re: Historicity of Shakyamuni Buddha

Content:
krodha wrote:
Worrying about the historical accuracy of key religious figures is a Christian pastime.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 16th, 2017 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: What is pure and defiled according to nyingma
Content:
MatthewAngby said:
So is it possible To drink wine still if I do not lose total awareness

krodha wrote:
Yes just be mindful and don't get drunk. I personally don't drink wine at tsog, I just dip a finger and have a drop.

Some siddhas can drink excessively and never become inebriated.

Work with your capacity.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 15th, 2017 at 3:33 PM
Title: Re: What is pure and defiled according to nyingma
Content:
MatthewAngby said:
So this this is my Guess : So everything is of one taste, but we must also take into account the effects it might have on us? Is this what the sutra is trying to say?

krodha wrote:
Only buddhas are free of karmic influence.

For the rest of us, like Guru Rinpoche said, it is important that our conduct and mindfulness of karmic causality are as fine as tsampa, even if our view is as lofty as the sky.

The minute you allow your view to overtake your conduct you err into nihilism.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 15th, 2017 at 9:05 AM
Title: Re: What is pure and defiled according to nyingma
Content:
krodha wrote:
Drinking wine and eating meat is common place for Nyingmapas. I've encountered complaints from people who attended Nyingma centers that all they did was eat, drink wine and dance, an exaggeration I'm sure.

Consuming excrement etc., is more symbolic and has to do with the slowing down of natural physiological processes, or so I've been told. Yet I'm sure some fool at some point has literally consumed shit.

At any rate, in the context of the Nyingma, the sūtra excerpt you cited would be describing what is called "losing the conduct in the view" which is a nihilistic outlook that nothing matters that results from the mind clinging to ultimate truth.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 8th, 2017 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: ChNN's Lifespan?
Content:
krodha wrote:
To my knowledge all he has said about his lifespan is that he would have died long ago if it weren't for his daily Mandarava practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 29th, 2017 at 1:08 PM
Title: Re: Has the Heart Sutra Been Finally Proven as Chinese Apocrypha?
Content:
Temicco said:
... the rigid emicness in here is a bit hilarious.

krodha wrote:
If you want eticness the search option is fully functional.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 29th, 2017 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: Has the Heart Sutra Been Finally Proven as Chinese Apocrypha?
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Jayarava... tends to favour a naturalistic philosophy with I think is out of sync with the transcendent meaning of Dharma.

krodha wrote:
True, and not only that, Jayarava often heaves the view of modern science onto the adepts of the past and pities them for their "primitive" world views that "failed" to properly align with the reigning paradigm of materialism. He attempts to decipher principles like emptiness through the that narrow lens, and again blames the teachings themselves when he fails.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 29th, 2017 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: Has the Heart Sutra Been Finally Proven as Chinese Apocrypha?
Content:
Temicco said:
Whether Jayarava's ideas have merit, I don't know, but the rigid emicness in here is a bit hilarious.

I don't get the impression he's out to get the dharma, so people can relax, and learning modern Tibetan theological perspectives on the Heart Sutra won't help him with historical criticism of the text.

krodha wrote:
Have you interacted with Jayarava? He posts in forums from time to time, he's like an actual idiot.

I had a discussion with him where he completely misunderstood the two truths and butchered their meaning and intention, and then he had the audacity to blame Nāgārjuna when the principles no longer made sense due to being crippled with Jayarava's own ineptitude. It was one of the most insane conversations I've had in these forums. The entire thing tinged with this false confidence and authority in the attack on Nāgārjuna.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 29th, 2017 at 7:23 AM
Title: Re: Has the Heart Sutra Been Finally Proven as Chinese Apocrypha?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I would ignore anything Jayarava has to say, his so-called contributions to the world of Buddhist academia are essentially the ravings of an uneducated fool.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 28th, 2017 at 6:01 PM
Title: Re: Has the Heart Sutra Been Finally Proven as Chinese Apocrypha?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Malcolm said it well:

One might argue that Buddhology is just such a kind of surgery, but in general, in surgery, the surgeon has to be interested in saving the patient, and in the case of people like Jayarava, etc., I see no such interest at all. They merrily hack away at the body of Dharma, trying to remove what they perceive to problems and inconsistencies, blind to the problems and inconsistencies they themselves are introducing —— this is, in all cases, because they have not received a proper education in Dharma, and properly followed a master. There is no one more sad than a putative Dharma practitioner who

has no master.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 26th, 2017 at 11:47 PM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the forders [tirthikas], and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the forders impute to be permanent.
- Dolbupa

srivijaya said:
Cheers krodha. Would be interesting to know exactly who the Tirthikas were and what they taught, in order to contrast. The name seems to suggest a forerunner of the Jains, or to be a generic term for non-Buddhists. Do you have any more information on them?

krodha wrote:
It is a generic term for non-buddhists, specifically those who adhere to eternalist doctrines, such as Samkhya Yoga, Advaita Vedanta, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 26th, 2017 at 9:31 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:

thomaslaw said:
Do you mean you do agree the Buddha nature is similar to Brahman the universal soul?

Thomas

srivijaya said:
I think we'd all have to first agree on what 'Brahman the universal soul' actually means, then check if the Jonangpas teach that, or differentiate what they teach from such a description. It's a question to put to them, as it's rather too complex for me to wrap my changeless, truly-existing, eternal Atman around.

krodha wrote:
Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the forders [tirthikas], and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self

of persons that the forders impute to be permanent.
- Dolbupa

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 25th, 2017 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
srivijaya said:
The Jonangpas have an interesting take on it and quite a history to go with it.
For the Jonangpas, the emptiness of ultimate reality should not be characterized in the same way as the emptiness of apparent phenomena because it is prabhāsvara-saṃtāna, or "clear light mental continuum," endowed with limitless Buddha qualities. It is empty of all that is false, not empty of the limitless Buddha qualities that are its innate nature.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonang
In the Tibetan Jonang school, only the Buddha and the Buddha Nature are viewed as not intrinsically empty, but as truly real, unconditioned, and replete with eternal, changeless virtues. The Buddha Nature (tathagatagarbha) is only empty of what is impermanent and conditioned, not of its own self. The Buddha Nature is truly real, and primordially present in all beings.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9A%C5%ABnyat%C4%81#Jonang

krodha wrote:
This interpretation is strictly relegated to the Jonang, and their school was ostracized for some time because of it, almost nearly destroyed altogether.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 24th, 2017 at 2:27 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
dharmafootsteps said:
Is it appropriate to have images of the guardians and Guru Tragphur, Simhamukha on the shrine in my room, to assist with visualisation in thun practice?

krodha wrote:
Yes.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 24th, 2017 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
CT, there's quite a bit of discussion about something called 'self' or 'bdag nyid' in "The Marvelous Primordial State", which I think you would find interesting. Here is Elio

Guarisco's explanation of the term, from his discussion of the second chapter in his introduction to the book:

krodha wrote:
Either Esler has done a bit more research on the topic or Guarisco is ignoring the "contextual meaning" she refers to which "leaves no trace of doubt" regarding the synonymous nature of mahātman and anātman in this context.

dzogchungpa said:
Well, I don't really want to get entangled in a discussion about this, but as a point of information the term in question is 'bdag nyid'. 'bdag nyid chen po' is also used quite a bit and is translated there as "total self".

krodha wrote:
The suggested context means it is essentially synonymous with bdag nyid chen po.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 24th, 2017 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
CT, there's quite a bit of discussion about something called 'self' or 'bdag nyid' in "The Marvelous Primordial State", which I think you would find interesting. Here is Elio Guarisco's explanation of the term, from his discussion of the second chapter in his introduction to the book: Thus, this word need not entangle the reader in concepts related to the Buddhist negation of self.

krodha wrote:
Either Esler has done a bit more research on the topic or Guarisco is ignoring the "contextual meaning" she refers to which "leaves no trace of doubt" regarding the synonymous nature of mahātman and anātman in this context.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 24th, 2017 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
CedarTree said:
Already like it, share more

krodha wrote:
Depending upon which system of Dzogpachenpo you are using there can be between seven and nine positions one can take in relation to the basis [gzhi]. Vairocana's view of choice was bdag nyid chen po, however that is only one facet of the basis and therefore grasping at that definition as an all encompassing view which speaks for the basis

would be akin to the blind man grasping the elephants tail and proclaiming that the elephant is actually a rope. It is an incomplete view. Further, the only definitive view of the basis is held to be ka dag i.e. original purity, which is emptiness free from extremes. Ka dag as such therefore completely forbids any type of substantial self.

As stated by Dylan Esler on this issue, 'integral being' [bdag nyid chen po] is nothing more than the inseparable emptiness and clarity [stong gsal dbyer med] which is experienced upon recognizing the nature of mind [sems nyid] and does not refer to an eternal or "true" self of any kind. He states "The fact that it is explicitly described as being both empty and luminous excludes reification into a monolithic self."

The point of bdag nyid chen po is to illustrate that the nature of one's mind is not to be found elsewhere, that it is one's immediate condition, however it is the the wisdom which ensues from recognizing the non-arising of one's mind [skt. citta, tib. sems]. This term is therefore pointing to that nature, and only that nature which is completely empty and free from extremes.

Esler continues:
...the tantric and rDzogs-chen notion of integral being [skt. mahātman] should not be misconstrued to contradict the orthodox Buddhist insistence on selflessness [skt. anātman], simply because of the use of related words with different shades of meaning. As mentioned above, the terminology used is sufficiently precise to ward off misunderstanding, and that is to say nothing of the contextual meaning, which leaves no trace of doubt.
and:

It is precisely when egocentric apprehension, the mistaken moment-by-moment reification of a self [skt. ātman], falls aside that one can speak of integral being [skt. mahātman], without this notion contradicting more normative Buddhist ideas of selflessness [skt. anātman].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 23rd, 2017 at 2:20 AM
Title: Re: The "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
CedarTree said:
If I remember correctly I saw a quote where Malcolm spoke about there most definitely being a "Self" in Tibetan Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
Definitely not. The delusion of a self (and grasping to that delusion) is the root of samsara. You cannot be liberated if any delusion of self remains, no matter how subtle or grandiose.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 21st, 2017 at 1:30 PM
Title: Re: Dharma Wheel Heavy Weights
Content:
krodha wrote:
Any alleged Dzogchen or Vajrayāna practitioner who openly broadcasts their own practice, attainments etc., is someone who cannot be taken seriously, IMO.

Luckily people who talk about such things are few and far between. Seems most are with the program.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 17th, 2017 at 6:45 PM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
Bristollad said:
There is as far as the Geluk presentation is concerned, as stated before there are four. If they were not existents they would not be objects of knowledge and could not appear to the mind.

krodha wrote:
Unconditioned phenomena cannot be direct objects of knowledge (i.e., objects of mind), they do not appear to the mind.

Bristollad said:
Why do you say there are no unconditioned existents? Does uncompounded space not exist?

krodha wrote:
An unconditioned existent is an oxymoron.

Uncompounded space is a metaphor for emptiness, are you asserting that emptiness exists?

Bristollad said:
P.s. The selfless is not an entity, it is simply the largest category we can talk about, because everything is selfless.

krodha wrote:
I'm still unsure as to why you are rendering "selfless" as a noun, as if it is some sort of freestanding thing.

Moreover, stating that selflessness is something capable of being subdivided into the categories of existence and non-existence is absurd.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 17th, 2017 at 3:58 PM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
Bristollad said:
There is the selfless: divided into two, non-existents, and existents.

krodha wrote:
What is "the selfless"?

All phenomena are selfless because they lack an essential nature.

There is no entity called "the selfless" that is capable of being divided or remaining undivided.

Meditation on Emptiness p. 214 said:
A synonym of 'non-existent' is 'non-phenomenal non-product'. Non-existents are non-products because they are not produced from an aggregation of causes and conditions; they are also non-phenomena because they do not exist, unlike phenomenal non-products, such as the permanent phenomenon space, which do exist.

An existent is selfless, or non-inherently existent; its non- inherent existence is an emptiness. Synonyms of 'existent' are 'phenomenon', 'object', 'object of knowledge' and 'established base'. Thus, everything that exists is a phenomenon (dharma), so translated because all dharmas are objects of knowledge and can appear to the mind, evenpermanent phenomena such as emptiness and space.

Bristollad said:
This pretty standard Geluk presentation of tenets.

krodha wrote:
I'm not a fan of Gelug tenets. But nevertheless, if you are asserting nirvana exists, you are saying it is a conditioned dharma.

There is no such thing as an unconditioned existent.

Nirvana is the total cessation of cause for the cyclical process of rebirth in the three realms. A cessation of affliction. I don't see how you propose to assert that a cessation of that nature is an existent entity.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 17th, 2017 at 11:15 AM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
Bristollad said:
But cessations are existent phenomena...

krodha wrote:
A cessation is merely an absence of a cause, and absence of arising, etc., if cessations are existent then they are conditioned by definition. You just cited the two forms of cessation below as unconditioned dharmas, which they are, therefore they are not conditioned, and not existent.

Bristollad said:
The division of existents is into two: permanent (or static) phenomena and functioning things.

krodha wrote:
I think you mean the division of dharmas is in two: unconditioned and conditioned. Translating "dharma" as "an existent" is going to be problematic for various reasons.

Bristollad said:
Permanent phenomena are divided into four: space, analytical cessations, non-analytical cessations, and suchness

krodha wrote:
There are three forms of unconditioned dharmas, which are space and two forms of cessation. Sometimes emptiness (or suchness) is added.

Meditation on Emptiness, p.218 said:
Analytical cessations are final states of cessation of obstructions upon analysis of the nature of phenomena, which are such that those obstructions will never return. They are enumerated as true cessations, the third of the four noble truths, in terms of the individual obstructions being abandoned on the levels of the paths....{...}...A nirvana is an analytical cessation that comes into existence upon the abandonment of the last affliction. It is not the act of cessation or the act of passing beyond sorrow but a phenomena possessed in the continuum of a yogi that is the mere absence of the ceased afflictions.

krodha wrote:
At any rate, while cessations are indeed a form of unconditioned phenomena [dharma], they are not existent entities. Nirvana, being analytical cessation, is not an existent entity either.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 17th, 2017 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
krodha wrote:
Yes it would be correct to say it [nirvana] does not exist.

Grigoris said:
Not according to Madhyamaka.

krodha wrote:
Overall, nirvāṇa is a cessation and cessations are not existent entities, so I would argue the fact that nirvāṇa lacks existence goes without saying. Then there is also the undeniable point that only conditioned entities exist, and if you assert that nirvāṇa exists, you are by default stating it is conditioned, which contradicts the teachings given that we both know nirvāṇa is unconditioned. But to unpack this further for the purposes of discussion, here is Nāgārjuna offering insight into the position Madhyamaka takes on the matter:

This pair, saṃsāra and nirvāṇa, does not exist.
Thorough knowledge of saṃsāra is said to be nirvāṇa.

and Candrakīrti:

At the level of the unborn, there is no distinction of attaining nirvāṇa or not attaining nirvāṇa.
The unborn nature itself is also not there, because there is no thing which is unborn.

Madhyamaka dialectics are quite clear that an unconditioned nature is not established at all due to the fact that the alleged ultimate nature, is truly nothing more than the non-arising of the so-called "relative", and therefore is nothing in and of itself. That is the meaning of the emptiness of essence [prakṛtisūnyatā] and naturelessness [niḥsvabhāva], which are synonymous principles that that Madhyamaka undoubtedly champions.

Again from Nāgārjuna:

Since arising, abiding and perishing are not established,
the conditioned is not established;
since the conditioned is never established,
how can the unconditioned be established?

Candrakīrti again echoing these sentiments:

Since nirvāṇa is the supreme goal, it is the ultimate, beyond all suffering. This being empty of itself is the voidness of the ultimate. Indeed to counter the conviction that nirvāṇa is a real existent entity, the knower of the ultimate set forth the voidness of the ultimate.

The Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra unpacks this principle of prakṛtisūnyatā a bit further:

People still say: "The five aggregates [skandha], the twelve bases of consciousness [āyatana] and the eighteen elements [dhātu] are all empty. Only suchness [tathatā], the fundamental element [dharmadhātu], the highest culminating point of the truth

[bhūtakoṭi] are true essences [bhūtaprakṛti]." - In order to cut through this error, the Buddha simply replied "The five aggregates [skandha], but also suchness, the fundamental element and the culminating point of the truth are empty." This is called the emptiness of the essences [prakṛtisūnyatā].

And then the tantras and various adepts of Vajrayāna, along with Yogācāra texts such as the Saṃdhinirmocana are brutally explicit in their clarification that nirvāṇa (and an unconditioned nature in general) lacks existence. They truly leave no room for misinterpretation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 17th, 2017 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
Grigoris said:
It is not true for the unconditioned.

krodha wrote:
Do you mean to suggest there is an "unconditioned" that possesses some sort of existence?

Grigoris said:
Nirvana is unconditioned, right? Would it be correct to say that it does not exist?

krodha wrote:
Yes it would be correct to say it does not exist.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 16th, 2017 at 6:44 PM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns
Content:
Aryjna said:
That is true for everything anyway...

Grigoris said:
It is not true for the unconditioned.

krodha wrote:
Do you mean to suggest there is an "unconditioned" that possesses some sort of existence?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 16th, 2017 at 7:46 AM
Title: Re: Rabbit's Horns

Content:
krodha wrote:
Just as the horns on rabbits' heads,
Do not exist except in the imagination,
Phenomena are all precisely like that,
Merely imagined, having no existence.
- Dharmadhātustava

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 10th, 2017 at 5:27 AM
Title: Re: Choosing Yogacara over Madhyamaka
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Hevajra tantra says one should employ Madhyamaka in the wake of learning about Yogācāra to ensure no misconceptions of substantialism form or remain.
Also worth noting, the implications of this (post Yogācāra application of Madhyamaka) is that Madhyamaka is capable of refining Yogācāra. Which means in terms of the hierarchical structure of sūtrayāna, the tantras are treating Yogācāra as a provisional view.

Better to synthesize both views, but in the end take Madhyamaka's non-affirming and non-reductive negation to be king. If you want an example of a proper Yogācāra-Madhyamaka synthesis, look to Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 10th, 2017 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Choosing Yogacara over Madhyamaka
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Hevajra tantra says one should employ Madhyamaka in the wake of learning about Yogācāra to ensure no misconceptions of substantialism form or remain.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 9th, 2017 at 9:34 PM
Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth
Content:
Wayfarer said:
But who can provide evidence of the existence of other realms and other life-bearing planets? I am open to any evidence, but what evidence is there?

krodha wrote:
There are organisms that live in volcanic vents at the bottom of the ocean, that in and of itself demonstrates (i) that our notion of a proper "life bearing" climate is warped, and (ii) that the manifestation of life is so indiscriminately opportunistic that it will essentially

appear everywhere and anywhere it can.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 3rd, 2017 at 9:34 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
When a westerner can do the things I've seen Tibetans do then fine. Until then, stick to the undiluted source.

krodha wrote:
Tibetans are also exempt from misinterpretation and misassumptions?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 3rd, 2017 at 7:33 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
If someone wants to practice he Vajrayana this subject is important to understand. Given the common misinterpretations made by westerners I suggest asking a lama from Tibet.

He will assume you understand the answer if he gives a brief explanation. Make sure you make your questions clear, otherwise misassumptions can still be perpetuated.

krodha wrote:
I take it you are exempt from these "western" misinterpretations and misassumptions?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 3:29 PM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
Hold your teacher in high regard, but don't be naive or dumb about it. Obviously if they're out of pocket and start getting weird you should wise up and call a spade a spade.
That’s exactly not seeing your teacher as a Dharmakaya Buddha.

krodha wrote:
See your teacher as a dharmakāya Buddha when receiving teachings and transmissions. Like those teachings are coming directly from the nature of mind.

In other settings, if your teacher tries to lure you into a dark room in an attempt to diddle your pickle then exercise some keen discrimination.

Take advantage of your guru's realization and experience, but don't let said teacher take advantage of you.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 2:36 PM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
Same idea, and not that radical.
How do you feel about DJKR’s FB post in response to Sogyal R’s abuses? In it he tried to explain how to see an admittedly imperfect teacher as Buddha and he got flamed for it. I almost got run out of town for trying to discuss it in the abstract (without defending Sogyal at all). I even changed my signature because people kept thinking I was defending Sogyal instead of having trying to have a non-referenced discussion. Then you post a quote that says viewing your teacher as a high level Bodhisattva isn’t good enough. Malcolm has recently posted that those kinds of Buddha’s aren’t even human by definition. And then you say that’s not radical?

Wow. You’ve got high standards.

krodha wrote:
I'm merely reporting how a teacher is traditionally viewed in Vajrayāna. All the extra shit, politics, scandals, etc., aren't really my interest.

Hold your teacher in high regard, but don't be naive or dumb about it. Obviously if they're out of pocket and start getting weird you should wise up and call a spade a spade.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 12:40 PM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
That quote is saying that one should see ones personal teacher, that guy sitting there playing with his iPhone, as being on par with Guru Rinpoche, Milarepa, or even Sakyamuni.

You don’t find that radical? Have you checked out the DJKR thread?

krodha wrote:
The prajñāpāramitā warns not to view the tathāgata as rūpakāya, but rather understand the tathāgata is dharmakāya. Vajrayāna is saying view your guru as a tathāgata, also do not view your guru as rūpakāya, view them as dharmakāya.

Same idea, and not that radical.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 11:54 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
Kroda said:
In Vajrayāna you are to view the guru as a Buddha, specifically a dharmakāya Buddha as Khenpo Ngachung states:

Seeing one’s teacher as an ordinary pandit, a sublime Arhat, a sublime Bodhisattva, a nirmanakaya Buddha, or even a sambhogakaya Buddha will not do: you have to see him as the dharmakaya Buddha.

smcj said:
Um, you do realize that is a very radical quotation that supports my position, right?

krodha wrote:
And why is that, smcj?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 11:45 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
smcj said:
I disagree. Besides the quotes Astus just provided I'd like to quote Kalu R. from "Foundations of Tibetan Buddhism". Unfortunately I gave away my copy so I cannot give an exact quote. Perhaps someone else has a copy handy and can give correct my post. (It's from the first paragraph in the chapter devoted to Guru Yoga.) But basically he says that your general Mahayana teacher should be thought of and related to as you say, but in the Vajryana the guru is seen differently

krodha wrote:
The guru is "seen differently" because in Vajrayāna you are to view the guru as a Buddha, specifically a dharmakāya Buddha as Khenpo Ngachung states:

Seeing one’s teacher as an ordinary pandit, a sublime Arhat, a sublime Bodhisattva, a nirmanakaya Buddha, or even a sambhogakaya Buddha will not do: you have to see him as the dharmakaya Buddha.

Although the prajñāpāramitā also says a Buddha should be seen as dharmakāya. But does not say the teacher should be treated as a Buddha, to my knowledge.

Nevertheless, this does not carry the implications you are attempting to insinuate.

smcj said:
and you actually pray to him for blessings.

krodha wrote:
You supplicate, sure.

smcj said:
I do not think I am inappropriately importing this from Christianity. I think Malcolm and you are inappropriately excluding it because of your antipathy towards Christianity.

krodha wrote:
I do harbor a healthy disdain for Abrahamic monotheism, but that is not influencing my opinion in this regard.

smcj said:
I am expressing my opinion/understanding based on my relationships with my teachers and what I've read. People are free to disagree with me. Anyone that has questions about this I encourage them to seek out and ask an ethnically Tibetan lama about it. The anti-Christian prejudice that has been imported into Dharma by Westerners will just about guarantee that a western lama will give a different answer than someone raised in a culturally Tibetan environment. It's not racist statement. It's a cultural statement.

krodha wrote:
The added disclaimer at the end is a bit telling.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 10:54 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
Astus said:
" Our capacity to receive the compassion and blessings of the teacher and the Three Jewels, therefore, depends entirely on devotion and faith.
Once, a disciple called out to the master Jowo Atisa, "Jowo, give me your blessing!"
"Lax disciple," Atisa replied, "give me your devotion ... "
So absolute unwavering trust, arising from extraordinary faith and devotion, is indispensable. It opens the door to taking refuge."
(Patrul rinpoche: Words of My Perfect Teacher, p 176)

krodha wrote:
The question is whether "devotion" and "faith" in this context mean what you think they mean. You are projecting Christian-like characteristics onto these descriptions when I personally think "faith" and "devotion" simply mean genuine trust, interest, commitment, etc.

Essentially that if the buddhadharma and the teaching transmitted (along with the relationship with the teacher) are to have any actual potential one must be serious and

have integrity. You won't have success unless you are devoted and have faith in the teacher and the teachings.

But this doesn't mean some sort of bhākti like blessing-devotion and religious faith, like faith in a higher power etc., are involved.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 10:04 AM
Title: Re: enlightment in one life
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is no "primordial enlightenment."

There is only primordial purity.

Enlightenment [awakening] is an event that occurs when that primordial purity is recognized.

Malcolm said:
The distinction is basically this: in cittamatra, phenomena are mental events. The way Lonchenpa explains it is like this. Bodhicitta, awakened mind, is like space, it is the basis, but it is not established in anyway. Its potential or energy [rtsal] arises like the face of a mirror. The display of that potentiality is like the eight examples of illusion. Since the basis, its potential and display are not themselves established because they are all empty, they are nondual. These three are conventionally distinguished because of appearances. Thus, bodhicitta, potentiality and the display are neither single nor plural in terms of their essence, nevertheless, just like the reflections in the mirror cannot be said to be either the same nor different than the mirror's power to reflect, it is understood that the imputations which are the display of the potential of bodhicitta also do not exist either inside or outside of, and hence these appearances are called "nonexistent, clear appearances." Indeed, nothing at all is established in anyway.

smcj said:
(formatting mine)

https://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=21104&p=311719#p311719

krodha wrote:
What of it? Bodhicitta is the basis. Which means it is the basis for the path, i.e., it must be recognized in order to practice the authentic path.

Bodhicitta in this context means the nature of mind. Which is again, originally pure and naturally perfected.

Awakening or enlightenment occurs when that nature is recognized.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 9:58 AM
Title: Re: The concept of the teacher’s “blessings”
Content:
krodha wrote:
Malcolm wrote before:

Byin rlabs [blessing] means quite literally "conferral [rlabs] of power [byin]."

Byin is defined in Tibetan as "the ability or power to transform the minds and vision/appearances of another."

The word Byin rlabs is defined in Tibetan as "the power to remain in any subject of the Dharma of the Noble Path."

Loppön La elaborates further:

"Blessing" here just means the power of one person to inspire another to follow the path in some way. That's all. There is no Dharma called "blessing", no magical force called "blessing". If there was, the Buddha, being compassionate, would have blessed us all into nirvana long ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 6:49 AM
Title: Re: enlightment in one life
Content:
krodha wrote:
And then buddhahood is what occurs when one's enlightenment [awakening] is ripened to its fullest extent via a complete exhaustion of afflictive and adventitious obscurations.

Therefore the title of this thread should really be "buddhahood in one life" since enlightenment [awakening] in one life is simply entering the path of seeing.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: enlightment in one life
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is no "primordial enlightenment."

There is only primordial purity.

Enlightenment [awakening] is an event that occurs when that primordial purity is

recognized.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 2nd, 2017 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: enlightment in one life
Content:
florin said:
Kunjed Gyalpo collection speaks extensively about how the universe is already enlightened and how there is nothing outside of it.
You are obviously not familiar with this group of tantras.

krodha wrote:
The appearances that allegedly constitute the universe are originally pure and naturally perfected, but it would be incorrect to say the universe is itself enlightened. Especially given that the universe is a false imputation and a cognitive error.

And although the appearances that allegedly constitute the universe are originally pure and naturally perfected, so-called enlightenment or awakening [bodhi] does not occur until the nature of those appearances are recognized.

Enlightenment or awakening occurs in the mind, and not elsewhere.

The view that anything is already enlightened is expressly rejected in Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 8th, 2017 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: L ron gardner
Content:
krodha wrote:
His ignorance is astounding.

The subject of the most recent post he authored was a claim that Longchenpa promulgates the same transcendent "I" as Ramana Maharshi. His evidence was a brief section of Longchenpa's Dharmadhātu-ratna-kośa-nāma-vṛtti where he references an excerpt of the Kulayarāja tantra which explains the use of the first person singular pronoun "I" as a literary device that signifies the personified nature of mind, because the rhetorical style of the tantra is direct as opposed to indirect like Śravāka suttas and Mahāyāna sūtras.

The intention of the text is glaringly clear if you take the context into account, in that it is explaining the literary style employed in these texts and how it should be approached and understood (in order to avoid misconstruing the verbiage).

But of course in L Ron's "expert" opinion this is a literal proclamation that is suggesting there is an actual transcendent "I"... and your true nature is this universal, substantial

identity, just as the Hindu dharmas teach.

The alleged credibility of the entire argument requires fixating on a single sentence and quite literally separating said sentence from all context and other sentences surrounding it. The level of willed ignorance and crafted cherry picking involved is staggering.

It's really quite insane. This is one of numerous examples of sloppy, biased, lazy, uneducated and willful ignorance exhibited by L Ron Gardner.

If anyone has a morbid curiosity and wants to witness this slow moving train wreck in action it is happening in a Facebook group called "Dharma Connection."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 7th, 2017 at 4:50 AM
Title: Re: L ron gardner
Content:
M.G. said:
I actually have no problem with someone claiming a personal understanding of Dzogchen which differs from how it’s normally taught (although how seriously they’ll be taken without serious scholarly and yogic credentials is an interesting question) or for that matter, disagreeing with the Dzogchen teachings, so long as such disagreement is expressed honestly and without rancor.

That said, this guy’s an obvious buffoon.

krodha wrote:
When these "personal understandings" differ from the traditional view it is usually because they haven't had a genuine recognition of the nature of mind, and as a result they mistake coarse non-dual states, formless absorptions etc., which all pertain to the afflicted ālaya, as the authentic knowledge of their nature. Which it isn't.

What results is this type quasi-Buddhist crypto-Advaita that L Ron Gardner is promulgating.

Honestly though I think even that is giving him too much credit... in my opinion he is just an intellectual who reads books in English and spots words that are similar across various traditions and just assumes they all are discussing the same thing.

I'm sure he's received teachings from so-and-so guru like Adi Da Samraj, and has had some meditative experiences, but it doesn't appear to go any deeper than that.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 7th, 2017 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: L ron gardner

Content:
krodha wrote:
This Facebook quote was the best one though:
I say I have "cracked the code" and understand Dharma, including Buddhadharma and Dzogchen, on a level above anyone else writing on this stuff.
-- L Ron Gardner

Like Cone said: you can't make this up!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 4th, 2017 at 1:10 PM
Title: Re: Soul fragmentation and defragmentation as Buddism teaching?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Perhaps "grew into it like a weed" is better.

Fortyeightvows said:
Sounds a bit disparaging.

krodha wrote:
Death to false dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 4th, 2017 at 12:49 PM
Title: Re: Why Secular Buddhism is Not True
Content:
boda said:
Which bin does this belong to?

krodha wrote:
The Dalai Lama also says the truths of the buddhadharma are inaccessible to materialist science.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 4th, 2017 at 12:21 PM
Title: Re: Soul fragmentation and defragmentation as Buddism teaching?
Content:
Adamantine said:
So then this must be something that's crept into Chinese Buddhism
from Taoism?

dzogchungpa said:

Well, "crept into" sounds kind of melodramatic.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps "grew into it like a weed" is better.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 23rd, 2017 at 1:45 AM
Title: Re: dalai lama conflict science buddhism change
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Dalai Lama also said:

Buddhism draws the critical division differently— i.e., between sentience and non-sentience— because it is primarily interested in the alleviation of suffering and the quest for happiness. In Buddhism, the evolution of the cosmos and the emergence of the sentient beings within it— indeed, effectively everything within the purview of the physical and life sciences— belong within the domain of the first of the Four Noble Truths, which the Buddha taught in his initial sermon. The Four Noble Truths state that within the realm of impermanent phenomena there is suffering, suffering has an origin, the cessation of suffering is possible, and there is a path to the cessation of suffering. As I see it, science falls within the scope of the first truth in that it examines the material bases of suffering, for it covers the entire spectrum of the physical environment—“ the container”— as well as the sentient beings—“ the contained.” It is in the mental realm— the realm of psychology, consciousness, the afflictions, and karma— that we find the second of the truths, the origin of suffering. The third and fourth truths, cessation and the path, are effectively outside the domain of scientific analysis in that they pertain primarily to what might be called philosophy and religion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 16th, 2017 at 6:32 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life Transmission Webcast: 09/15/17
Content:
chimechodra said:
The page currently says "Waiting for event to go live." I'm assuming it's the same for everyone else? Or am I at the wrong place? Either way, happy that this was organized

krodha wrote:
Same for me, they took a half hour break. Will fire up again shortly with brief talk from Malcolm then lung.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 14th, 2017 at 3:19 AM
Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la
Content:

Malcolm said:
The term "ultimate reality" does not exist in Buddhist texts. This is a very misleading English gloss. The terms we have for an "ultimate" are 1) ultimate truth, i.e, paramārtha or don dam, which means "ultimate meaning" or "ultimate sense"; suchness, i.e. tatāta or de bzhin nyid; dharmatā or chos nyid refer to the ultimate essence of relative phenomena. Indeed, these terms, and others like them, are all pointing out something definitive about relative phenomena or beings.

There are terms in Buddhism that mean "reality," like gnas lugs, bhutatā, but there is no need to add the adjective "ultimate" to such terms because what is real is real. There is no relative reality as opposed to an ultimate reality. The first would be contradiction in terms, since the relative is not real, not constant, not unchanging, etc. The second is redundant since the real is constant, unchanging, etc.

There is no separate unmanifest reality which stands apart from manifest phenomena. This "nonarising" you seek is precisely the nonarising nature of dependently originated phenomena, their emptiness of arising, ceasing, and abiding.

Emptiness is the quality of things that allows them to undergo change and transformation.

Nonarising, aka, emptiness is ultimate truth and reality. Emptiness and nonarising are ultimate truths, veridical cognitions arrived at through an analysis of dependently originated phenomena. Emptiness and non-arising are real because they withstand analysis, i.e., they are the result that one finds upon analysis, they are the content of āryan cognition in equipoise.

But emptiness and nonarising are not ultimate realities because if they were, there would be nothing other than a blank void.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 14th, 2017 at 3:14 AM
Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la
Content:
Malcolm said:
Yes, of course [the Bhagavad Gita proposes a freedom from the cycle of birth and death], all Indian schools who propose liberation propose that liberation means freedom from the cycles of birth and death.

Buddha disagreed with all of these schools completely, and taught it was only through adopting right view, i.e., the four truths of nobles, that one could attain freedom from the cycle of birth and death.

He taught that they mistook various types of mental states for liberation, mental states which in some cases last millions and millions of years.

The Bhgavada Gita for example, is an example of an eternalist scripture, and it proposes the best way to achieve liberation is through pure devotion to Krishna as embodiment of Godhead, though it lists other paths as well.

Saṃkhya is described as an incorrect view because it proposes that causes and effects are merely transformations of one substance. Yoga also suffers from this view.

Jainism is clearly refuted by the Buddha. This is a no brainer. The Buddha thought that Mahathera was a complete fool.

Nyaya and Vaishesika did not exist during the time of the Buddha, but their eternalist atomism was soundly negated by later Buddhist scholars such as Bhavaviveka and so on.

The Mimamsas do not believe in liberation at all, but rather believe in appeasing the gods through rites in order to assure mundane good fortune.

Advaita also did not exist by name during the time of the Buddha, but it is refuted for proposing that all reality is ultimately one undifferentiated consciousness.

When one reads the sūtras and tantras taught by the Buddha, one can see very clearly that all these schools are refuted either directly or indirectly as wrong views.

Wrong view cannot be lead to liberation.

There is only one right view, and that is the view of dependent origination.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
Aryjna said:
It sounds quite strange, but I suppose not every Theravadin holds that view.

krodha wrote:
Not all of them, but this view is gaining strength in online circles.

Aryjna said:
Perhaps to some extent it is a view that was developed to contradict Mahayana?

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, but I think it's more likely that some Theravadins simply place great importance on following the recorded teachings of the historical Buddha very strictly and literally.

In their eyes "buddhavacana" is the words of a historical figure. For us Mahāyānis,

buddhavacana takes on a more liberal meaning, due to the fact it is ultimately considered wrong view to identify the tathāgata as name and form.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
krodha wrote:
The aforementioned trend of indeterminacy in regards to selflessness [anātman] is strange given that the entire purpose of the skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas is to provide a model that demonstrates a lack of an enduring, core essence [svabhāva], which would be required for a self.

But alas, some people need to be spoon fed.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 4:44 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:

Aryjna said:
Isn't that contradictory to the basics of buddhism, how can anyone say that the buddha did not answer whether there is a self or not.

krodha wrote:
There is one instance in a sutta where the Buddha is asked directly whether there is a self or not and he remains silent because he knows the particular disciple he is addressing would only be further confused by an answer.

There is another instance where the view "I have no self" is deemed wrong view, however this is obviously addressing the possibility of leaving selflessness as a mere intellectual position.

These individuals also state that the term "anātman" translates to "not self" rather than "selflessness", "lack of self", "no self", etc., and they use this view of "not self" to promote the possibility that the Buddha underhandedly endorsed some sort of self via omission. Like apophatic theology where something ineffable is described through negating what it is not, rather than affirming what it indeed is. They say the skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus are "not self", ergo the possibility that there is a self elsewhere is very legitimate.

Somehow these examples have been misinterpreted as "the Buddha never teaching a lack of self", and as a result we see many practitioners lost in this indeterminate no-mans-land where they even sometimes actively reject the idea of selflessness.

Aryjna said:
Thanks, do you know which sutra is the one where he remains silent?

krodha wrote:
The Ananda Sutta

http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn44/sn44.010.than.html

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 4:43 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is one instance in a sutta where the Buddha is asked directly whether there is a self or not and he remains silent because he knows the particular disciple he is addressing would only be further confused by an answer.

Somehow these examples have been misinterpreted as "the Buddha never teaching a lack of self", and as a result we see many practitioners lost in this indeterminate no-mans-land where they even sometimes actively reject the idea of selflessness.

Losal Samten said:
Do you know if these "Unanswered Questions" as they're put are the textual basis for the historical Pudgalavadins, or just the basis for this modern pudgalavada as it were?

krodha wrote:
I'm actually not sure but I assume there must be some research out there which identifies the source(s) of the Pudgalavādin's view.

Some of these "modern Pudgalavādins", as you put it, are advocating for Ātmavāda.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 2:41 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Behoves us all to remember that when the Buddha was asked 'does the self exist, or not' that he didn't answer.

krodha wrote:
This is a strange narrative some Theravadins founded that has now seeped into many corners of the internet. Has led to much indeterminate confusion.

Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu Is at the root of it as far as I can tell.

Aryjna said:
Isn't that contradictory to the basics of buddhism, how can anyone say that the buddha did not answer whether there is a self or not.

krodha wrote:
There is one instance in a sutta where the Buddha is asked directly whether there is a self or not and he remains silent because he knows the particular disciple he is addressing would only be further confused by an answer.

There is another instance where the view "I have no self" is deemed wrong view, however this is obviously addressing the possibility of leaving selflessness as a mere intellectual position.

These individuals also state that the term "anātman" translates to "not self" rather than "selflessness", "lack of self", "no self", etc., and they use this view of "not self" to promote the possibility that the Buddha underhandedly endorsed some sort of self via omission. Like apophatic theology where something ineffable is described through negating what it is not, rather than affirming what it indeed is. They say the skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus are "not self", ergo the possibility that there is a self elsewhere is very legitimate.

Somehow these examples have been misinterpreted as "the Buddha never teaching a lack of self", and as a result we see many practitioners lost in this indeterminate no-mans-land where they even sometimes actively reject the idea of selflessness.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 12th, 2017 at 1:21 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Behoves us all to remember that when the Buddha was asked 'does the self exist, or not' that he didn't answer.

krodha wrote:
This is a strange narrative some Theravadins founded that has now seeped into many corners of the internet. Has led to much indeterminate confusion.

Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu Is at the root of it as far as I can tell.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 11th, 2017 at 3:31 AM
Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?
Content:

Bubbles said:
Am I missing something? Is webcast worldwide transmission on guru yoga sufficient to start the Togal practice on our own? Thanks.

Malcolm said:
Yes. You are missing a teacher who can guide you. No, WWT is not sufficient.

Bubbles said:
Hi Malcolm,

How closely can these top teachers work with individual students? From my experience, there's not much one-on-one guidance offered by top teachers; because they're so sought after. I could be wrong. Anyway, regarding ChNN, I haven't found any specific in-person courses/retreat given on Trekcho and Thogal. So, do these Rinpoches offer personal guidance after they get to know the students, informally, not necessarily in class settings; maybe because the experiences are esoteric? Again, if anyone has a URL link to any course they have found, I'd really appreciate it.

Thank you.
Bubbles

krodha wrote:
Last time ChNN taught daytime thögal was maybe three years ago, he does it in person so you have to travel to him, there's no teaching available online.

Rinpoche technically teaches tregchö all the time, but teaches tregchö proper ala four chözhags only every now and then.

Best to be patient, save some money for travel and keep checking the schedule.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 9th, 2017 at 7:34 AM
Title: Re: Buddha nature vs Soul
Content:
smcj said:
Of course the alayavijnana, the 8th consciousness which goes from life to life, has bee accused of being akin to a soul.

krodha wrote:
You really like souls and Jesus.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 8th, 2017 at 1:31 PM
Title: Re: Thodgal

Content:
Bubbles said:
Dear Friends

I would like to learn Thodgal. I read there are gazing visual and breathing exercises. Which are best books to get instruction? Are there illustrations for the exercises?

Thank you

Kathy

krodha wrote:
It is important to receive instructions on thögal from a living teacher. Really any and everything under the Dzogchen and Vajrayāna umbrella must be learned from a teacher, instructions in a book will not suffice.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 3:00 PM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
smcj said:
Via Dzogchungpa's signature: Through Dzogchen we can really understand what God is and we don’t have to worry if there is a God or not. God always exists as our real nature, the base, for everybody.
Chögyal Namkhai Norbu
Well, either he is disingenuous, ill informed, or open minded. Given how open minded he is in general, I think that's the answer. Maybe open mindedness has something to do with his Dzogchen practice.

Like I said before, his teachings are the ultimate Refuge for those that are attached to their anti-Christian, anti-religious attitudes, yet he isn't supporting their negativity. So people either have to open their minds and let go of their negative attachments, or else they have to rationalize what he says away.

Tough choice.

krodha wrote:
It's completely irrelevant and has no bearing on anything when it comes down to it.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 12:02 PM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:
Again, I am truly sorry if I am coming across as angry or upset.

dzogchungpa said:
this You aren't coming across as angry or upset at all.

krodha wrote:
I caught some hints of salt.

dzogchungpa said:
The learned and accomplished "Dzogchenpas" of DW get kind of agitated when anyone disagrees with Malcolm and often engage in projection as a coping mechanism.

krodha wrote:
And more salt.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 9:36 AM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:
Oh man, you beat me to it.
As I opened up my browser I was thinking of all the wonderful lessons I have learned through this discussion, such as the above and:

When other religions say that they are the only way, they are wrong/misguided/fundamentalist/rigid …but Buddhism is the only way.

krodha wrote:
This list is misrepresenting the intentions of the points you are addressing, but then again you've been taking this entire thread very personally since the beginning.

The buddhadharma is "the only way" to actualize liberation as defined in the buddhadharma. If you want liberation as defined in the sanatanadharma or some other tirthika system, you must practice those dharmas. You will not actualize liberation as defined in the buddhadharma through practicing Samkhya yoga, for example. That is the context in which the buddhadharma is "the only way."

climb-up said:
Buddhas are beyond all limitations, but are only Buddhas if they act and are recognized in certain ways

krodha wrote:
Buddhas are free from limitations because they have completely exhausted all affliction.

This does not mean any saint or sage is a Buddha.

climb-up said:

on the path the Buddhahood beyond limitations, there are very strict limitations on what is appropriate to be interested in

krodha wrote:
Be interested in whatever you like. But it is important to know what should be adopted and abandoned on the path. Right view is crucial.

climb-up said:
While your teacher is more important than the Buddha, if they say something that contradicts your view it should be immediately dismissed as a clearly disingenuous ploy to appease their many followers.

krodha wrote:
In some contexts, as was clarified when this came up.

climb-up said:
Anyone disagreeing, or even questioning or wondering, clearly has wrong view.

krodha wrote:
Wrong view is wrong view as defined in the sūtras and tantras. If your view aligns with the definition of wrong view that is provided as a guideline in these teachings, then yes, it is considered wrong view, meaning it is not conducive to awakening and the path in general.

climb-up said:
If some of these people are respected teachers either conveniently ignore that, or see above.

krodha wrote:
Respect is earned through diplomacy, not tyranny. An egalitarian approach to religion is a beneficial attitude to adopt for any prominent teacher, especially if they want to introduce people to the buddhadharma.

climb-up said:
It's been pretty amazing.

krodha wrote:
It seems this discussion has gotten under your skin. It's okay to like Jesus, but you should be strong in your affinity and conviction... and not let the opinions of others affect you so much.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 4:20 AM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:

Like I said earlier in this long, meandering thread; I have no problem at all with people who are not christian, or don't think Jesus was enlightened (or don't think Jesus ever existed!), but so many blanket statements about Christianity, or Buddhism, or Buddhist teachers, or any topic of depth, simply don't apply across the board and it surprises me how quick people are to universalize their understandings.

krodha wrote:
Said people may level the same criticism in your direction. Which is to say you may be selling others short when it comes to the reasoning behind their positions on the matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:
By calling worldly beings enlightened, this encouraging wrong-view and rebirth in samsara, possibly even the lower realms!!!??? (I'm not saying your saying this, but this is the logical conclusion based on some posts here).

krodha wrote:
Following tirthika teachers and dharmas will not lead to liberation as defined in the buddhadharma.

climb-up said:
Also, being similarly smart-assed & sarcastic, are you saying that if my teacher says something that disagrees with my own userstanding I should assume that he is just saying that publicly and doesn't really mean it!?

krodha wrote:
Depends on the context. In some contexts it is quite likely.

When you are a public figure with a large following, especially in Buddhist circles, and especially dealing with westerners who were likely raised with some sort of connection to an Abrahamic monotheistic religion, it is probably not a good idea to demean that religion.

In a teaching position where you want people to feel comfortable following you it is better to compare and contrast constructively with an overall attitude of acceptance.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 3:27 AM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:
I have the same suggestion for you that I have for everyone else suggesting that to

entertain the idea that Jesus is enlightened, or even a Bodhisattva, has no understanding of Buddhism:
Contact the Dalai Lama and ChNN, maybe Tich Naht Hahn while you're at it (not totally sure of his view), and explain there total ignorance of Buddhism.
Once you have done that let me know how it went and how you put them in their place.

krodha wrote:
They are popular teachers and public figures who want to attract people to the dharma, not deter them, they are merely being diplomatic when they make comparisons of this nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 6th, 2017 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: ChNN on Jesus?
Content:
climb-up said:
I'm pretty sure that I typed nothing that would imply that at all. If that's true I can only assume you being disingenuous and argumentative.

dzogchungpa said:
Don't forget passive-aggressive.

krodha wrote:
Calling the kettle black.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 30th, 2017 at 4:04 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
BUDDHAHOOD IS NOT ATTAINED BY PURPOSEFUL ACTION

If secret rigpa, the actual buddha-dynamic, eludes us, to attain release by any purposeful action is no option. “Everything is impermanent and bound to perish”— how can a tight mesh of body, speech, and mind reach out to touch its indestructible core? In the event of failure to intuit intrinsic rigpa, which is pure being there is no chance that we can attain release in this lifetime by any deliberate physical, verbal, or mental act. Religious practice becomes a tense constraining mesh constricting and veiling rigpa, and although some small satisfaction may follow, the product is conditioned and thus certain to fade away, perishing like an earthen pot. Such practice can never attain to the indestructible reality of pure being. Whatever is deliberately created is conditioned and transient, whereas its opposite, the uncreated, is imperishable. Since it is indestructible, pure being can only be seen by nondeliberate, unintended relaxation into the natural state; goal-oriented action is a mesh of constraint leading us closer to buddhahood by not so much as a hair’s breadth. Such ambition may well be regarded as a futile

samsaric trap.

Longchenpa's words seem pretty clear to me.

krodha wrote:
When Longchenpa states:

In the event of failure to intuit intrinsic rigpa, which is pure being there is no chance that we can attain release in this lifetime by any deliberate physical, verbal, or mental act.

He means that in the context of Dzogchen, one's nature must be initially recognized, and without that recognition (and the knowledge that ensues from that recognition), there is no way that insight can be produced through "goal-oriented action." Attempting to produce that wisdom through deliberate action in the absence of genuine recognition and knowledge will only further obscure that wisdom. This statement is the same as the following found in the Kun tu bzang po che ba la rang gnas pa:

Meditation is not foremost, realization [recognition] is foremost; If realization is not entered with confidence, the meditator is merely meditating on a conceptual state, the seeker is seeking with an afflicted clinging.

This is a fundamental theme through all Dzogchen teachings, which are based on direct introduction and recognition. That is all Longchenpa is attempting to communicate.

Context is everything when it comes to Longchenpa's teaching and Dzogchen in general. That context becomes lost on many, and they err into nihilism as a result (which Longchenpa also warns against). This is why a relationship with a qualified teacher is indispensable.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 28th, 2017 at 6:34 PM
Title: Re: Kim Katami (Pema Rinpoche, the terton) dangerous?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Avoid him at all costs.

He used to post here as "Kim" I believe. It is absurd to think that he is now parading himself as a Rinpoche. Very sad. Many will be led down a wrong path due to his repugnant recklessness.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 28th, 2017 at 3:01 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:

Once again, Krodha, thank you for the lengthy reply. I understand what the teachings say in your particular path. I understand that you choose to follow this and a lot of it makes sense to me, up to a certain point.

krodha wrote:
What I am describing is arguably the nature of every path.

Anonymous X said:
My own experience confirms much of what you are saying, 'up to a certain point'. But, if I may be so bold or blunt or even stupid to say that all of it is not about the 'way things are'. It is all a subjective narrative culturally induced in us through contact with religions, philosophy, and our own fabrications about things we can never 'know' with our ordinary minds.

krodha wrote:
It is not a mere narrative, it is the nature of the path. If you have recognized your nature then you know this is how the experience unfolds in that context.

Anonymous X said:
In the words of my own teacher, in one instant, you and everything you've known are dissolved.

krodha wrote:
That is the beginning of the path, you awaken, glimpse that nature which then falls away and you return to your everyday relative condition. The point is then to create conditions that are conducive to revisiting that insight, and repeat.

Anonymous X said:
What is left is a totality without a center, with no way of feeling separate ever again from life. No referents, no teaching, no knower, no attainer.

krodha wrote:
That is great but doesn't mean shit if your knowledge of that nature is unstable.

Anonymous X said:
To me, that is real equipoise with no one who says 'this is equipoise'. But this is something that is not possible to be talked about, IMO.

krodha wrote:
We talk about it all day here, and the sūtras, śastras, tantras all discuss it at length.

When the teachings say your nature is ineffable, they simply mean the words are not the experience, much like the word "sweet" is not the actual taste of sugar. Yet we can still describe sugar as "sweet" and you know what that means, and you know it is incorrect to describe it as "salty."

Even Zen warns against such attitudes:

Since they maintain they have no need of written words, they should not speak either, because written words are merely the marks of spoken language. They also maintain that the direct way cannot be established by written words, and yet these two words, "not established" are themselves written.

When they hear others speaking, they slander them by saying that they are attached to written words. You should know that to be confused as they are may be permissible, but to slander the Buddha's Sutras is not. Do not slander the Sutras for if you do, your offense will create countless obstacles for you.
- Huineng

Not saying you are slandering the teachings, but you're guilty of the rest.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 28th, 2017 at 9:30 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
Krodha,

Thanks for taking the time to explain all this. I can say that it seems my own experience approaches what you are describing though I wouldn't use the same terms as you do. I also would not equate myself with the Buddha as I have no way of knowing what his state was.

krodha wrote:
No one suggested equating yourself with a Buddha, but if you've ever known equipoise there is no doubt that it is what every buddha, ārya, etc., are intending to introduce and attempting to communicate.

Anonymous X said:
still would not use this word equipoise as it creates the idea of a subjective state to be 'achieved' and 'desired'.

krodha wrote:
Yes, wisdom is to be achieved, one does not possess it on the outset, as Longchenpa states:

The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained.

Anonymous X said:
A span of time must be a referent if it fluctuates.

krodha wrote:

Periods of equipoise fluctuate due to the presence of afflictive conditioning and habitual tendencies which make instances of awakening unstable. This is why initial awakening is generally brief and fleeting, it is quickly consumed again by karmic conditioning. The very meaning of the path is continually returning to equipoise so that prajñā exhausts affliction and periods of equipoise extend longer and longer until one no longer regresses, as Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche explains here:

The glimpse of recognizing mind-essence [sems nyid] that in the beginning lasted only for a few seconds gradually becomes half a minute, then a minute, then half an hour, then hours, until eventually it is uninterrupted throughout the whole day. You need that kind of training.

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche stops at "throughout the whole day" in his example, but the intention is actually to make that knowledge constant, so that it even permeates sleep.

Anonymous X said:
I do get the feeling that you are pointing to 'something' that you can know or exists that is not part of what appears as 'conventional truth'. Perhaps a state of mind that many meditators strive to experience.

krodha wrote:
Equipoise is not a mind state. It is resting in a direct, experiential knowledge of the nature of mind.

Per Candrakīrti, relative and ultimate truth are in essence, different species of cognition, the former afflicted and the latter unafflicted. Both "truths" are correct and incorrect knowledge of the same appearances, like mistaking a rope in a dark room to be a snake.

Anonymous X said:
I get caught up in that myself at times and have to be mindful of engaging in that kind of thinking. Can you relate to that?

krodha wrote:
I cannot relate to that.

Anonymous X said:
Equipoise and being awakened to the way things are seem to be not the same. Equipoise still seems to be a result, an effect, a state. If vidya/jnana, which is the cessation of ignorance, and supposedly that realization of Buddha, were effected in equipoise, one instant of it would end all circular thinking which it does not as we can see in our own lives.

krodha wrote:
The nature of mind is not affected by anything, it is simply obscured, much like the sun is not affected by cloud cover.

Anonymous X said:
Further, what you are adhering to seems to be the old schism of 'gradual' vs 'sudden'. You are talking of a path and suggesting stages.

krodha wrote:
Awakening is always sudden, the removal of obscurations is always gradual (except in exceedingly rare cases), and our nature is neither sudden nor gradual.

Anonymous X said:
This is an area that always gets sticky, don't you think? I don't want to go down that route. Much too much complication there.

krodha wrote:
It isn't complicated if understood correctly.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 27th, 2017 at 3:11 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
maybe..... How can we be sure we are talking about the very same thing and describing it in the very same way? I didn't have any objection to your description.

krodha wrote:
It isn't that difficult to ascertain whether we are discussing the same thing in this instance, and my point is if we are, then that is not authentic equipoise.

Anonymous X said:
Why is equipoise brought up here?

krodha wrote:
Equipoise is brought up because unless one is resting in equipoise, one cannot truly claim to be abandoning [or exhausting] views (the theme of our previous interaction in this thread).

Equipoise is the state of all āryas and buddhas. We as sentient beings, on the path, fluctuate between equipoise and post-equipoise because we have not completely uprooted our affliction, as described by Jigme Lingpa here:

Vidyā as it is explained on the path is still accompanied by impure influences of subtle energy and mind, leading to the distorted states of ordinary mind [sems] and mental events. Because one's recognition of vidyā is thus contaminated and burdened, one can truly rest in vidyā only from time to time.

In the latter part of the last sentence: "...one can truly rest in vidyā only from time to time." the term "vidyā" can be substituted with "equipoise."

Buddhas, having eradicated all contamination, no longer fluctuate between equipoise and post-equipoise but rather have merged these two "states."

Anonymous X said:
Is this not a subjective dharma which is also a referent?

krodha wrote:
Equipoise is a term used to denote a period of time when the mind rests in a direct knowledge of dharmatā. Therefore equipoise is not a referent, but instead is a span of time when referents are no longer perceived.

Anonymous X said:
What/who is the knower of this?

krodha wrote:
The knower is the mind, which is expressed as jñāna, or we can say vidyā is the knower. Or we can simply say the knower is you, or he, she, they, him, her, etc., as the buddhadharma has no qualms with conventional designations. Either way, a period of equipoise occurs when the mind is awakened to the way things actually are.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 27th, 2017 at 12:56 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Right, you are describing a neutral and indifferent state of attention where thought is not being engaged with but rather simply observed.
Amirite?

Anonymous X said:
maybe..... How can we be sure we are talking about the very same thing and describing it in the very same way? I didn't have any objection to your description.

krodha wrote:
It isn't that difficult to ascertain whether we are discussing the same thing in this instance, and my point is if we are, then that is not authentic equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 26th, 2017 at 4:07 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
Krodha,
The letting go of views happens when the referents are understood to have no basis, no

true existent self. It is not let go of in order to accomplish anything. It is one less obstruction to deal with as 'thought subsides and one rests in neutral and indifferent, bare attention', as you say. The attention is quite alive and alert. Thoughts are not absent completely, but they are not engaged in the habitual way that the discursive mind operates. This has nothing to do with the ordinary afflicted mind. It is not about rejection, suppression, or reification, nor philosophy. If I am pushed to really describe it better, I would use the words vast, knowing without knowledge, clear and present. No problems to solve, nothing to understand or realize.

krodha wrote:
Right, you are describing a neutral and indifferent state of attention where thought is not being engaged with but rather simply observed.
Amirite?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 25th, 2017 at 11:28 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
Krodha,
The letting go of views happens when the referents are understood to have no basis, no true existent self. It is not let go of in order to accomplish anything. It is one less obstruction to deal with as 'thought subsides and one rests in neutral and indifferent, bare attention', as you say. The attention is quite alive and alert. Thoughts are not absent completely, but they are not engaged in the habitual way that the discursive mind operates. This has nothing to do with the ordinary afflicted mind. It is not about rejection, suppression, or reification, nor philosophy. If I am pushed to really describe it better, I would use the words vast, knowing without knowledge, clear and present. No problems to solve, nothing to understand or realize.

krodha wrote:
Right, you are describing a neutral and indifferent state of attention where thought is not being engaged with but rather simply observed.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 25th, 2017 at 6:00 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
You seem to equate an absence of view as a blank, wordless state. Now I see where you get this image from. I can tell you that it is not a blank, wordless state. It is alive with a presence and clarity that is quite different than what you are imagining. Wisdom begins to function without the obstruction of discursive mind. It is not that thoughts are bad. It is that they cannot comprehend what is. Attachment and identification are absent when you let go of your view, that is if you don't reify another view. I'm surprised that you don't

see this.

krodha wrote:
Again, "letting go of views" is not what Nāgārjuna means by "abandonment of views." Nāgārjuna's "abandonment of views" denotes a pacification of referents, and this exhaustion of referents results from the experiential realization that phenomena are non-arisen.

It has nothing to do with the inability of concepts or thoughts to capture "what is."

"Letting go" of views accomplishes nothing. People can let go of views all they want, but their cognition will remain afflicted because they still perceive referents. Objects are still cognized when thought subsides and one rests in neutral and indifferent, bare attention. This is why the Kun bzang smon lam states:

The vacant state of not thinking anything, is itself the cause of ignorance and confusion.

The so-called "abandonment of views" (or exhaustion of views) is something else entirely, and only occurs when one realizes non-arising and existents and non-existents no longer appear. One must experientially awaken to recognize this truth about phenomena, and this truth is not known by the everyday afflicted mind. Shantideva describes this awakening here:

When neither an existent nor a nonexistent remain before the mind, at that time since there is no other aspect [concepts] are fully pacified as there is no objective support.

A "view" requires an existent referent, or "objective support" as Shantideva puts it. If referents no longer appear then there is no support for a "view."

The authentic exhaustion of views is something radically different than the mere "rejection of reification" you are describing. Reification occurs prior to imputation due to the afflicted perception of referents, you cannot abandon imputation in order to uproot reification. Instead you must experientially realize the absence of a basis for imputation, and only then is reification undone.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 19th, 2017 at 4:09 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Anonymous X said:
Let's not be too literal. Did I say 'awaken through letting go'? I don't think I even mentioned 'awakening'.

krodha wrote:
Awakening and uprooting affliction is the name of the game.

Anonymous X said:
These are your concepts that you fashion into dogma.

krodha wrote:
Awakening and removing obscurations are my concepts? I don't think so.

Anonymous X said:
Letting go is not rejection and not nihilism.

krodha wrote:
You are downplaying "concepts" in the name of "letting go" in this very thread.

Marginalizing concepts is nothing more than attaching to an opposite extreme. It's the neo-Advaita game: rejecting concepts in the name of being "non-conceptual", in order to emulate some semblance of something misunderstood. Those who commit this error accomplish nothing, they marinate in their avidyā, thinking they're ten steps ahead of those they're attempting to contradict. Unaware that they are compromising everything and forfeiting a chance to make a substantial imprint on their continuums in this lifetime.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 19th, 2017 at 1:19 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Anonymous X said:
It could be summed up as a letting go, not a very technical term, but extremely effective in daily life that has nothing to do with mind training. It is not dissimilar from Nagarjuna's emptiness of all views.

krodha wrote:
Nāgārjuna's emptiness of views is due to an exhaustion of referents. Vastly different than giving up, or "letting go" as you term it.

Anonymous X said:
The knife cannot cut itself. This is the problem defending any system of thought. Dogma sets in. Rigor mortis of the brain.

krodha wrote:
A knife cannot cut itself, nevertheless, there is genuine awakening. And you either awaken or you don't.

Dogma can take on many forms, even nihilism, which consists of rejecting views and "systems of thought" guised as "letting go."

No one awakens through letting go and just sitting around being content with delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 19th, 2017 at 6:12 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Sherab said:
I see. You are speaking from ultimate truth perspective. That is fine. But it still does not mean that once cessation occurs, there is nothing left. From Cula-sunnata Sutta:

"Thus he regards it as empty of whatever is not there. Whatever remains, he discerns as present: 'There is this.' And so this, his entry into emptiness, accords with actuality, is undistorted in meaning, pure — superior & unsurpassed."

krodha wrote:
This sutta is describing a different type of "emptiness" (trivial emptiness). It is not the profound emptiness being discussed in this thread.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 17th, 2017 at 12:40 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Anonymous X said:
As far as I understand the samadhis of the Advaitins, nirvikalpa is not something they even strive for. It is seen as more 'experience' as it does not deal with things as they are. It is a one-sided affair that does not integrate stillness and movement. I believe this is why Ramana stressed the importance of sahaj samadhi, coming to rest in the natural state. One doesn't stay in nirvikalpa samadhi. It does not involve the nature of the person and phenomenon. I would say that neither Vajropama or sahaj samadhi should be the concern of any practitioner as these seem to occur spontaneously and without any will or effort on our part.

Where can I find a textual description of vajropama samadhi?

krodha wrote:
The Advaitins no doubt define "sahaj" differently than say, Mahāmudrā does. Sahaj for Advaitins is resting effortlessly as Brahman.

You are right though, Advaitins like Śri Atmananda Krishna Menon state that nirvikalpa samadhi is a temporary state and is not the ultimate goal.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 16th, 2017 at 2:24 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:

Anonymous X said:
This is a very important point, imo. So many make the mistake of thinking that cessation is annihilation. Annihilation would take effort, will. There is no effort or will in cessation. It is not a 'self-centred' activity of a 'do-er'.

krodha wrote:
Annihilation is the mistaken notion that an existent can become a non-existent. Rather than "effort", it only requires the presence of ignorance regarding the ultimate nature of phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 16th, 2017 at 7:28 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Sherab said:
Correct me if I am wrong. If I am right, then cessation for you is the same as annihilation because nothing is left after cessation. That is an extreme position in my view.

krodha wrote:
The issue in this thread is that you do not actually understand dependent origination, and are viewing conditioned phenomena in terms of origination and cessation.

Those who impute arising and disintegration
With relation to conditioned things,
They do not understand the movement
Of the wheel of dependent origination.
— Yuktiṣaṣṭikākārika

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 15th, 2017 at 1:43 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Anonymous X said:
It's not quite clear to me if Advaita also posits Brahman as ultimate truth.

krodha wrote:
Most definitely.

Anonymous X said:
Brahman is the ultimate reality for them and Atman is the true self of man.

krodha wrote:
And ātman is ultimately equivalent to Brahman. Hence the arguments that this equivalency [ātman = brahman] only serves to fortify one's sense of selfhood.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 15th, 2017 at 6:14 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Sherab said:
Here is why 'unconditioned' is not a suitable term to describe emptiness and therefore the ultimate:

When something is dependently arisen, it implies that the something is not unconditioned. If you assert that emptiness is dependent arising or dependent co-arising, and if you also assert that emptiness is empty as well, then you would be implying that emptiness is not unconditioned. Your reply did not address the logical problem raised.

krodha wrote:
You're asserting that conditioned entities actually originate dependently?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 14th, 2017 at 7:43 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Sherab said:
It is also easy to understand why many are confused between the Buddhist ultimate and the non-Buddhist ultimate, especially Hindu ultimate.

krodha wrote:
How is your own view different than a non-Buddhist "Hindu" ultimate?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 12th, 2017 at 7:51 AM
Title: Re: Tibetan Zen
Content:
Sherab said:
Just because the unconditioned cannot be established does not mean that it is not there.

krodha wrote:
The so-called "unconditioned" is the very nature of the allegedly conditioned.

The very non-arising of conditioned dharmas [saṃskṛtadharmas] is the unconditioned [asaṃskṛta] dharmatā. It is an epistemic realization which dispels ignorance by severing the causes and conditions for invalid cognition... not an ontological X that exists on its own (that is what Vedanta teaches).

Recognizing the true nature [satyalakṣhaṇa] of phenomena, as innately unproduced [anutpāda] is to realize that the allegedly conditioned is a misconception of ignorance, and therefore the conditioned has in fact been unconditioned from the very beginning.

Therefore it is not that there is an unconditioned nature which abides apart from conditioned phenomena. The "unconditioned" is merely knowledge of the actual nature of "conditioned" phenomena. Phenomena [dharmins] are themselves, in essence, unconditioned, their unconditioned nature is their dharmatā.

The correct understanding of phenomena, reveals that phenomena (as misperceived via ignorance) have never occurred in the way one's ignorance made them appear. As a result it is seen that there has never been anything which was bound, nor anything which required liberation.

Hence:

Outside of the saṃskṛtas [conditioned dharmas], there are no asaṃskṛta [unconditioned dharmas], and the true nature [bhūtalakṣaṇa] of the saṃskṛta is exactly asaṃskṛta. The saṃskṛtas being empty, etc. the asaṃskṛtas themselves are also empty, for the two things are not different. Besides, some people, hearing about the defects of the saṃskṛtadharmas, become attached [abhiniveśante] to the asaṃskṛtadharmas and, as a result of this attachment, develop fetters.
- Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 25th, 2017 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness nutshells
Content:
krodha wrote:
You either realize emptiness or you don't. "Practicing" consists of cultivating that insight through extended periods of equipoise after initial realization.

Which means you can't really say there is any "practice" related to emptiness unless you've had that realization to begin with.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 21st, 2017 at 4:24 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Bakmoon said:
the second wheel of the emptiness teachings of the Prajnaparamita teachings which are seen as flawed because they are subject to interpretation and argument, and finally the third wheel which explains emptiness according to the three naturelesnesses, which is proclaimed to be the best because it isn't subject to interpretation and

argument.

krodha wrote:
Correct me if I'm wrong, but the Saṃdhinirmocana itself actually does not mention or even allude to the prajñāpāramitā being the second turning, right?

The association of the prajñāpāramitā with the second turning comes from Wonhyo's own writing which serves as the basis for the modern three turning scheme.

The original excerpt from the Saṃdhinirmocana is quite vague and only lists the defining principles or key features of the second and third turnings, which are actually identical.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 21st, 2017 at 11:35 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
krodha wrote:
[ting nge dzin]

Lukeinaz said:
Krodha, thanks for taking the time with this thread. Is the above wylie correct? The translation I found says "clearly". Thanks!

krodha wrote:
Ting nge 'dzin is "samadhi" or "contemplation."

Synonym for equipoise [mnyam bzhag] or the state of tregchö in Dzogchen.

Resting in direct, experiential knowledge [rig pa] of the nature of mind [sems nyid].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 20th, 2017 at 7:39 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Malcolm said:
Emptiness is the definitive teaching of the Dharma.

rachmiel said:
Not the Third Turning Buddhanature teaching?

krodha wrote:
The legitimacy of the "three turning" scheme as it is today, or even in general, is questionable.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 18th, 2017 at 1:13 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
I would have to agree with Krodha, no reason to go about your day thinking about this.

krodha wrote:
I meant there is no reason to go about one's day negating concepts from the standpoint of our relative condition.

Anonymous X said:
There is nothing to fix or change.

krodha wrote:
There is much to fix and change. One must uproot the cause of samsara one way or another.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 18th, 2017 at 1:07 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Jesse said:
Untrue, (Depending on your teacher, and their methods.) In Zen (Thich Nhat Hahn's school), he recommends viewing the world, and everything as empty, and interconnected as part of his teachings.

krodha wrote:
Sure, my point is that there is no reason to actively negate things in everyday parlance.

Jesse said:
For example, when looking at a tree, you try to see it's selfless nature, and by seeing it's selfless nature, you also see its interconnected nature. The tree is made of water, elements from the earth, so a tree is interconnected with literally everything. You could even trace a tree back to your self if you dig far enough.

krodha wrote:
A nice thought but this is not quite the view of non-arising that the Mahāyāna intends to communicate.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 18th, 2017 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
rachmiel said:

But it can imo/ime be an effective tool for breaking (or at least denting!) the habit of believing in a reified self and in reified phenomena.

krodha wrote:
Ultimately everything without exception is non-arisen and free from the four extremes. Good to keep this in mind, but no reason to go about one's day actively negating everything.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 17th, 2017 at 1:16 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
krodha wrote:
You, me, he, she, they, them etc., name your convention. The buddhadharma allows for conventional distinctions and diversity, even if conventions are ultimately mere inferences.

This isn't neo-Advaita where we have to constantly negate conventions: "there's no one to realize X", "there's no one here", etc. Gymnastics of that nature are no doubt tiring and quite dumb to be honest.

Anonymous X said:
So are your pointed remarks.

krodha wrote:
That was intended as a broad remark, not directed at you specifically, but fair enough.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 17th, 2017 at 12:13 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
I never said it could be attained. Who could attain it?

krodha wrote:
You, me, he, she, they, them etc., name your convention. The buddhadharma allows for conventional distinctions and diversity, even if conventions are ultimately mere inferences.

This isn't neo-Advaita where we have to constantly negate conventions: "there's no one to realize X", "there's no one here", etc. Gymnastics of that nature are no doubt tiring and quite dumb to be honest.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 17th, 2017 at 1:50 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
Nihilism is denying the existence of anything. I never said this.

krodha wrote:
Nihilism in the context of these teachings is the negation of structures, conventions, models, causality, compassion, the basis, the path, the result, etc. You negate many of these things and err into nihilism as a result.

Anonymous X said:
I don't believe in models of existence and systems that purport to teach us what reality is.

krodha wrote:
You must believe in them since you spend an inordinate amount of time rejecting them. Otherwise why bother swinging a stick at a mirage, that is tantamount to what you are doing.

Anonymous X said:
Reality cannot be grasped through concepts

krodha wrote:
No one ever said "reality" (whatever that is) is supposed to be contained in concepts.

No one here has said the word "sweet" is the actual taste of sugar. Nevertheless, for those who have never tasted sugar, describing it as "salty" is inaccurate and does them a great disservice. Therefore correct concepts and understanding is important.

Anonymous X said:
but only through the ending of grasping and the separate existence of a self that underlies all perception.

krodha wrote:
"Grasping" does not cease via negation, aversion or rejection.

Grasping is quelled through cognizing the non-arising of allegedly existent referents.

Anonymous X said:
This is not nihilism.

krodha wrote:
It is, but it is okay if you don't want to accept it.

Anonymous X said:

The natural state exists but is not graspable through the discursive and grasping consciousness.

krodha wrote:
Technically it would be inaccurate to say the natural state "exists."

That said, no one here suggested dharmatā is "graspable through discursive" principles of processes. However one gets no closer to it through negation, aversion and rejection.

Convention is considered ultimately inferential... by negating convention you are taking the position that convention is ultimately referential, meaning, you believe convention actually refers to valid entities and processes that require negation. You are simply falling off the other side of the horse, like a neo-Advaitin.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 16th, 2017 at 5:47 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
I have not lapsed into nihilism as one might think by negating much of what is talked about.

krodha wrote:
The view you are generally communicating in these discussions is considered nihilism [chad par lta ba].

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 16th, 2017 at 12:48 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
The 'uncontrived' state of contemplation is not the same as 'meditation' to me.

krodha wrote:
Contemplation [ting nge dzin] is the meditation in Dzogpachenpo. If you aren't resting in contemplation you aren't really practicing Dzogchen.

But yes, contemplation is not the same as a deliberate meditation practice like śamatha.

Anonymous X said:
Uncontrived to me, means that effort has fallen away as well as all models and philosophy.

krodha wrote:
Models and philosophy are implemented on the outset and during times of post-

equipoise [rjes thob]. They are tools, one does not abandon them.

Anonymous X said:
While I agree that we must start with effort to make heads or tails out of what is told to us throughout life on all levels, there comes a point where any effort is seen as grasping.

krodha wrote:
"Grasping" comes in the form of accepting and rejecting. If you are rejecting effort then you are still grasping.

Anonymous X said:
This is not just a thought in the mind, it is a palpable feeling that the whole body is registering. The habit of grasping is very deep. You cannot train the brain to not grasp. To illustrate what I'm talking about, I used to smoke many years ago. It was an annoying habit and a dangerous one as I witnessed my mother die from lung cancer. My wife and kids also would react strongly whenever I lit up. So, I made the decision to stop. It was cold turkey. I could witness the craving in my brain for the habit, but what really bothered me was the feeling throughout my body, the anger, irritability, and sick feeling that the habit produced when it was withdrawn. That withdrawal was physical as well as mental. I never touched another cigarette again and the craving took a few months to subside. It is very similar to 'grasping' and wanting to practice something to quench a 'thirst'.

krodha wrote:
If you are on the path then you must practice. Otherwise you are erring into nihilism, which I believe you are.

Anonymous X said:
You can adapt a model to handle the mental aspect of this craving, but there is no model that is going to stop the habit that the body has learned from birth. The withdrawal of seeking leaves a kind of burning grasping that needs to burn itself out, not fed. I do believe that the natural state spontaneously burns all of this up and that there is an adaptation that the body goes through. But it is not the same as the model that has been setup to follow and practice. That model is a cultural conditioning like all others.

krodha wrote:
The prajñā experienced in equipoise "burns away" afflictions. But one does not abandon the need for practice. The practice is continually returning to equipoise, until equipoise and post-equipoise merge.

You cannot accomplish that by doing nothing.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 16th, 2017 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra, Dzogchen, Zen
Content:

CedarTree said:
I stumbled upon a teaching from Jackson Peterson who appears to be a Dzogchen teacher.

krodha wrote:
"Appears" being the operative term.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 16th, 2017 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
I don't understand the term pristine consciousness in the way that you are using it.

krodha wrote:
Pristine consciousness is jñāna [ye shes].

Anonymous X said:
To me, consciousness is always paired to the alaya.

krodha wrote:
Afflicted and dualistic consciousness [vijñāna], would indeed be associated with the ālaya in cycles where the twin basis model is used.

Anonymous X said:
But consciousness is not a stand alone object as the Advaitins seem to think of it as.

krodha wrote:
The mind is "conscious" by definition and said consciousness can either be afflicted or unafflicted depending on whether dharmatā has been recognized or not.

Anonymous X said:
The nature of mind seems to be defined in Dzogchen as 'beyond' consciousness and alaya.

krodha wrote:
The dharmatā of mind is simply the mind's innate characteristics of clarity and emptiness that are inseparable. When that nature is not recognized, then the ālaya manifests. A mind that is in recognition of its nature is expressed as jñāna, which is a species of pristine consciousness.

Anonymous X said:
Are you equating pristine consciousness and the natural state as the same? If you are, it is not my understanding of what my own teacher has said about it.

krodha wrote:

The mind is expressed as pristine consciousness [ye shes] when resting in the so-called "natural state" [gnas lugs]. I'm sure your teacher agrees.

Anonymous X said:
It also seems to me when you use the term equipose, that it is sems (mind) that is in equipose, and very subtly distinguishing its own state.

krodha wrote:
Not sure why you would think that. Periods of equipoise [mnyam bzhag] occur when one is in recognition of the nature of mind [sems nyid].

Anonymous X said:
I can't follow the thinking about vidya, jnana, and dharamata. Again, seems like the mind naming things.

krodha wrote:
And you're allergic to the mind "naming things?"

Anonymous X said:
I would also describe the natural state as simply seeing things the way things really are, but neither you nor I live like that and are simply repeating the words of others.

krodha wrote:
Neither of us have reached the point where equipoise and post-equipoise have merged, but that does not mean one of us has not known equipoise.

Anonymous X said:
This is my main critique of what practitioners mostly do. It is not a personal criticism, it is just what I observe, both in myself and others. It is a very difficult thing to 'go beyond' this. For me, effort doesn't do a thing to change this.

krodha wrote:
You had better put in a ton of effort. Deliberate mindfulness, śamatha practice, the sems dzins etc., are essential prerequisites to contemplation for most. Khenchen Palden Sherab Rinpoche and Khenpo Tsewang Dongyal Rinpoche describe the contrived mindfulness of śamatha etc., as the "practitioner chasing the meditation", whereas the uncontrived state of contemplation is "the meditation chasing the practitioner." You'd better chase that meditation.

If you aren't putting in effort you are doing nothing and will remain an afflicted sentient being.

Anonymous X said:
My own teacher said you simply give up the search when you've reached the point of exhaustion of every possibility. This seems to be the great sacrifice of giving up self, but it is not 'you' who is giving up anything. This is what I mean as deception and grasping.

krodha wrote:
Simply "giving up" will not suffice, unfortunately. I know your teacher, Lopön Tenzin Namdak does not advocate for "giving up."

In fact, he says very clearly:

On the side of the practitioner, practice and commitment are most certainly required. The Natural State in itself is totally open and clear and spacious like the sky but we, as individuals, are not totally open and unobstructed.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 15th, 2017 at 4:19 PM
Title: Re: Where does the idea of the three paths come from?
Content:
Temicco said:
i.e. path of abandoning, path of transformation, path of self-liberation. In what text(s) is this idea first discussed?

krodha wrote:
From the Zhang Zhung sNyan rgyud [per Malcolm]:

Now then, the first, the path of renunciation, gives up the ten nonvirtues and accomplishes the ten virtues. The result is asserted to be buddhahood after many lives and eons. That is the path of causal characteristics.

Second, the so called “path of transformation” of result secret mantra is transforming the outer universe into a celestial mansion, transforming the inhabitants into gods and goddesses, transforming the five samsaya substances into the five ambrosias, transforming the five aggregates into the five deities and transforming the five afflictions into the five wisdoms. This is asserted as buddhahood, being the path of result secret mantra.

However, neither the path of renunciation nor the past of transformation will be explained here. What it to be explained here now is the inseparability of cause and result in the great vehicle.

In the explanation of the so called “path of great self liberation with nothing to accept or reject” samsara and nirvana, existence and nonexistence, the duality of permanence and annihilation, the duality of happiness and suffering, the duality of attachment and aversion, the five afflictions, the eight consciousnesses, all appearances of deluded concepts of subject and object are not abandoned and are not to be abandoned. Since everything arises from the mind, in the sole unique sphere, abandonment and accepting do not exist as a duality. Therefore, everything that arises self-arises, everything that is liberated is self-liberated, therefore it is termed “the path of liberation.”

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 15th, 2017 at 4:12 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
How do you distinguish between sems and sems nyid? Is it not sems that is doing the distinguishing?

krodha wrote:
Not at the time of equipoise.

Anonymous X said:
From my understanding, sems nyid does not discriminate. There is no subject apprehending an object.

krodha wrote:
Jñāna is present at that time. Conventionally we can say vidyā knows dharmatā during equipoise.

Anonymous X said:
Sems cannot apprehend Rigpa, so it follows that all 'experiences/insights' are still part of the sems story, albeit a different one than what we normally are thinking about.

krodha wrote:
A moment of transcendent insight in the context of Dzogpachenpo is merely a cessation of afflicted mind. Pristine consciousness is present at that time.

Anonymous X said:
If the natural state cannot be apprehended, how can we speak about it? We can only speak about what it is not, so I refer back to Nagarjuna's statement about the view of emptiness and the letting go of this view, too.

krodha wrote:
The nature of mind [cittatā] is cognized by vidyā, and mind is expressed as jñāna. The so-called "natural state" is simply seeing the way things really are.

You seem to be overthinking this. And subsequently negating too much in your quest to diminish grasping at views.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 15th, 2017 at 4:27 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
rachmiel said:
Being attached to a view of something as "exalted" as emptiness is not any better than being attached to a view of anything else. (In fact, it might be worse.)

krodha wrote:
There's a difference between being "attached" to a view and implementing a view as a tool.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 15th, 2017 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
It's all nonsense, isn't it?

krodha wrote:
No, it isn't. But I get that the neo-spiritual types like to think so.

Anonymous X said:
Now you are categorizing with your sems or sems nyid?

krodha wrote:
Is this a rhetorical question? If not, how is this relevant?

Anonymous X said:
Do you have anything to really add to the discussion? If not, why bother with these kinds of remarks?

krodha wrote:
This is part of the discussion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 14th, 2017 at 11:21 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
It's all nonsense, isn't it?

krodha wrote:
No, it isn't. But I get that the neo-spiritual types like to think so.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 14th, 2017 at 4:50 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness: expedient or certain teaching?
Content:
Anonymous X said:
You can't recognize emptiness, you can only conceptualize and then the danger of re-

ification occurs. That is a circular motion. Not naming it and classifying it is living it.

krodha wrote:
Nonsense.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 10th, 2017 at 5:43 AM
Title: Re: Appearance and Mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
This sums it up:

Khenpo Gangshar said:
Perceived objects, such as form, sound, and so forth, have appeared due to mind, but they are not mind--they are the shared appearances of sentient beings and do not possess any true existence, besides being phenomena of dependent origination.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen posits a container universe like Yogācāra where the collective traces of sentient beings manifest a common reality... as opposed to positing an independently substantial external world that is accessed via the senses via intromission like western scientific materialism believes. There is no artifact-like universe out there.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 5th, 2017 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Please, say some protective mantras for me
Content:
krodha wrote:
[Mod note: off topic edited.]

Stefos said:
As I mentioned in my other thread, I'm a disabled vet with respiratory issues and gastritis and potentially now CDIFF. My feet and ankles now swell also and I'm concerned for my life as swelling feet and ankles are indicative of greater medical issues.

krodha wrote:
Thank you for your service, and I am sorry to hear that and hope your condition has an opportunity to improve quickly.

Stefos said:
Why don't you say some protective mantras and do a puja or two for me please as opposed to defending another person? I need the mantras and puja and I'd appreciate it if you did do them for me. Please stop arguing in the stead of another cause that's not the Dharma.

krodha wrote:
Arguing and debating have their place. I will send positive thoughts your way.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2017 at 2:48 PM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
krodha wrote:
You deleted your post, and I'll do you the courtesy of not quoting it, but I had written this in response and figure it can help in moving the discussion forward:

Suffering is not seen as "perfect." Suffering does indeed arise as a result of the dynamism of the basis, but it is not a part of the basis. Much like clouds that obscure the sun arise as a result of the sun's dynamism, but are not part of the sun itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2017 at 2:23 PM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
smcj said:
*Obviously this is not a Dzogchen view which sees everything as the perfection of the basis.

krodha wrote:
Not everything. The varying phenomena that appear due to non-recognition of the basis are not seen as perfect, nor even expressions of the basis.

smcj said:
You sure about that? Doesn't sound right to me, samsara and nirvana being the same and all.

At this point it would be nice if Malcolm weighed in on this.

krodha wrote:
From the seed of attachment and aversion,
the whole outer universe and inhabitants are mistakes.
- Uprooting Delusion Tantra [per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2017 at 12:09 PM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
smcj said:

*Obviously this is not a Dzogchen view which sees everything as the perfection of the basis.

krodha wrote:
Not everything. The varying phenomena that appear due to non-recognition of the basis are not seen as perfect, nor even expressions of the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2017 at 10:04 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
smcj said:
Admittedly there are different views on the subject. Ultimately what is being discussed is ineffable anyway, so If you don't like Dudjom R.'s view you don't have to accept it.

krodha wrote:
Everything is ultimately "ineffable", the taste of sugar for example. The word "sweet" does not capture the ineffable taste of sugar, yet at the same time describing that taste as "salty" would be inaccurate.

Indeed there are different views on the subject, that said, Dudjom Rinpoche's is fairly novel as far as I can tell... and given that he was comparing sūtra views to Dzogchen, I really can't imagine he had too much invested in his position on the matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 1st, 2017 at 9:04 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
smcj said:
I don't know much about Dzogchen either, but I know that Dudjom R. was an important modern teacher of Dzogchen, and he says in his Big Red Book that the Dzogchen view is equivalent to Great Madhyamaka/Shentong.

So it seems that there are multiple possible ways to skin that cat. You can pick whichever one floats your boat--to badly mix metaphors.

krodha wrote:
Trotting out the unwarranted "great Madhyamaka" title in reference to gzhan stong yet again?

One would be hard pressed to legitimately demonstrate that Dzogpachenpo and gzhan stong are commensurate. The two views are really quite far apart.

For one, gzhan stong says the kāyas of the result are fully formed at what Dzogchen would term "the time of the basis", this in and of itself demonstrates that the key

positions of both systems are irreconcilable. A fully formed result is unheard of in Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 30th, 2017 at 9:43 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
Stefos said:
Nagarjuna, was a Mahasiddha, right?

krodha wrote:
There was more than one Nāgārjuna. There is the Siddha Nāgārjuna and Ārya Nāgārjuna. The latter is the one referenced by Malcolm. Ārya Nāgārjuna would not have encountered Dzogchen teachings.

Stefos said:
For me there IS a substratum: Emptiness, Clarity and Bliss

krodha wrote:
Again BLISS IS NOT PART OF THE EQUATION.

In the scheme you are referencing there is emptiness [stong pa nyid], clarity [gsal ba] and their inseparability [dbyer med]. The trio being stong gsal dbyer med.

Emptiness means a substratum is impossible. But you don't seem like you want to listen.

Stefos said:
Is this what Sri Nagarjuna taught?

krodha wrote:
Never.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 30th, 2017 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
Stefos said:
By "substratum" I mean the original ground, which is the Dharmakaya qualified by Emptiness, Clarity & Bliss.

So, yes, there is a substratum according to that definition I believe sir.

krodha wrote:
There is no such definition.

You seem to be conflating the essence, nature and compassion of the so-called "basis", with the inseparability of emptiness and clarity which also defines said nature.

"Bliss" is not part of the equation. And none of these principles imply, suggest nor denote a "substratum" of any kind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 29th, 2017 at 2:28 PM
Title: Re: Sudden Buddhahood?
Content:
tomamundsen said:
At any point, did Ch'an masters advocate for sudden enlightenment being perfect Buddhahood? Or is it simply kensho?

krodha wrote:
I've seen people argue for the former. Seems misguided and unrealistic to me...

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 29th, 2017 at 10:44 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
Stefos said:
A prior poster stated that Emptiness proves there is no substratum.....This doesn't make sense to me.

IF everything is Empty, Then Emptiness IS the substratum of everything and IS Eternal.

krodha wrote:
Ask yourself, how can phenomena that never originated in the first place have a substratum?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 29th, 2017 at 8:06 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
smcj said:
There is a (presumably) different Nagarjuna that wrote "Dharmadhatustava" a.k.a "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" which is closer to what you're talking about.

krodha wrote:
Although not really, at all.

smcj said:

Fast forward to Tibet and there are some authors like Dolpopa that have a view they call "empty-of-other" which is Advaita-like.

krodha wrote:
Again, not really, even according to Dolbupa himself. It's really a stretch even to say it is "Advaita-like."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 29th, 2017 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: Semantics or not..Dharmakaya, Eternalism and the Self of Advaita
Content:
krodha wrote:
As the Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra states:

Outside of the saṃskṛtas [conditioned dharmas], there are no asaṃskṛta [unconditioned dharmas], and the true nature [bhūtalakṣaṇa] of the saṃskṛta is exactly asaṃskṛta. The saṃskṛtas being empty, etc. the asaṃskṛtas themselves are also empty, for the two things are not different. Besides, some people, hearing about the defects of the saṃskṛtadharmas, become attached [abhiniveśante] to the asaṃskṛtadharmas and, as a result of this attachment, develop fetters.

Going on to say that the person who rejects the saṃskṛtas [conditioned] is attached to the asaṃskṛtas [unconditioned] by attributing to them the characteristics of non-production [anutpāda], and by the very fact of this attachment those asaṃskṛtas are immediately transformed into saṃskṛtas. Which, as I have pointed out before; is equivalent to the act of turning dharmatā (the emptiness of a given entity) into a dharmin by considering it to be a separate, existent, unconditioned, free-standing nature.

It should instead be understood that the very non-arising of conditioned dharmas [saṃskṛtadharmas] is the unconditioned [saṃskṛta] dharmatā. It is an epistemic realization which dispels ignorance by severing the causes and conditions for invalid cognition... not an ontological X that exists on its own (that is what Vedanta teaches).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 17th, 2017 at 4:43 PM
Title: Re: Self and no self
Content:
Anonymous X said:
There are many sutras in the Tathagatagarbha class of sutras that discuss 'self'.

krodha wrote:
Said sūtras arguably implement the term "ātman" as a subversive rhetorical device in order to describe one facet of nirvana in the context of the four pāramitās. They are not literally describing an entity of some sort.

Anonymous X said:
Many Buddhists categorically reject this notion, but they don't understand what is really being pointed to.

krodha wrote:
A bold charge.

Anonymous X said:
Why not call the Buddha the 'True Self'?

krodha wrote:
Why not call him a pink elephant? The term "satyātman" never appears in any Indian text.

Anonymous X said:
What difference does it make what term is used to describe reality or the 'natural state'?

krodha wrote:
It makes a big difference in some cases.

Anonymous X said:
Language is not the final arbiter of understanding. Direct perception undermines all models and concepts.

krodha wrote:
However one's view arguably informs realization in some cases. This is why "right view" is first and foremost.

Anonymous X said:
It seems to me without direct perception, one is stuck in the language which actually prevents direct perception.

krodha wrote:
"Direct perception" is generally afflicted and dualistic in sentient beings due to the mistaken reification of entities that appear to arise and cease.

Anonymous X said:
The immutable is still the immutable no matter what we call it.

krodha wrote:
Are you suggesting there is some sort of actual "immutable" entity that is apprehended in numerous ways by various individuals and traditions?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 17th, 2017 at 4:23 PM

Title: Re: Self and no self
Content:
Anonymous X said:
I've read all of it. Again, I will direct you to the actual masters, those who have understood this,

krodha wrote:
Such as?

Anonymous X said:
not those who have their own interpretation of what it means to suit their pre-conceived notions.

krodha wrote:
Are you suggesting your own interpretation is exempt?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 8th, 2017 at 12:38 PM
Title: Re: Melong in Dzogchen
Content:
DGA said:
I've noticed that DC people, including ChNN, wear the melong as a pendant more or less at heart level

krodha wrote:
The location of sugatagarbha.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 23rd, 2017 at 4:48 PM
Title: Re: Sam Harris receives a (literal) pointing out instruction
Content:
Anonymous X said:
He even goes as far as calling this 'True Self'. Of course, we immediately think of Advaita and it's posit of an atman as true self. This kind of conception is not very different from each other, and the Buddha lived in a time where this kind of teaching must have been prevalent. Buddhist scholars have argued this point of 'positive' essence vehemently, both for and against this kind of thinking. How do you personally interpret this? Is it just semantics that we get lost in and both systems are talking about the 'ineffable' using different terms? What would the difference between Brahman and buddhanature really be?

krodha wrote:
The term "true self" [satyātman] actually never appears in any of the tathāgatagarbha sūtras. It's presence in select English texts is a translational gloss chosen by a couple authors to fit their own biases.

Further, the Laṅkāvatāra is explicitly clear that the tathāgatagarbha is not to be conflated with the self of the non-buddhists.

The Laṅkā also states:

O Mahāmati, with a view to casting aside the heterodox theory, you must treat the tathāgatagarbha as not self [anātman].

Bhāviveka demonstrates the proper way to view buddhanature:

The statement "The tathāgata pervades" means wisdom pervades all objects of knowledge, but it does not mean abiding in everything like Viśnu. Further, "Tathāgatagarbhin" means emptiness, signlessness and absence of aspiration exist the continuums of all sentient beings, but is not an inner personal agent pervading everyone.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 22nd, 2017 at 10:16 AM
Title: Re: Sam Harris receives a (literal) pointing out instruction
Content:
Malcolm said:
More importantly, he makes a gross error in asserting that Dzogchen and Advaita seeks to provoke the same insight. Nothing could be further from the truth.

michaelb said:
Miserable sophistry, selective quotations and distorted interpretation.

krodha wrote:
You can't be serious.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 22nd, 2017 at 10:03 AM
Title: Re: Za Rahula Almost
Content:
krodha wrote:
The snake lasso and/or the makara club. Rahula is the only statue on my little shrine.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 7th, 2017 at 4:03 AM
Title: Re: Understanding non-duality
Content:
krodha wrote:
Rinpoche uses space and the sun as examples rather than heat or wetness, but same

principle:
We speak of a space, or sky. We speak of this space as present within a vase or a room, or the sky. It is the same space. This means the zhi [gzhi] or basis for everyone is the same. The difference we explain in Hinduism or in Dzogchen is the difference between individuals. Because when we say individuals, we mean that I am not you. You are not her. We are not the same. Nor does it mean that when someone is realized, everyone is unified into them and it becomes a kind of ??. That is not what is meant.

Zhi or basis is always composed of a clarity of the individual. This is what we refer to with the example of the sun. If there were ten suns in the sky, we would distinguish ten different suns, and not say that all these ten are one sun. Thus sky and sun are two different things as a way of seeing.
— Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 26th, 2017 at 12:23 PM
Title: Re: The four contemplations and gampopa's mahamudra
Content:
krodha wrote:
In case anyone needs a refresher:

The four yogas of mahāmudrā (skt. catvāri mahāmudrā yoga, Wylie: phyag rgya chen po'i rnal 'byor bzhi):

(i) one-pointedness (skt. ekāgra, tib. rtse gcig)
(ii) simplicity (skt. niṣprapāncha, tib. spros bral) "free from complexity" or "not elaborate"
(iii) one taste (skt. samarasa, tib. ro gcig)
(iv) non-meditation (skt. abhāvanā, tib. sgom med)

The four contemplations [ting nge dzin] of Dzogchen sems sde:

(i) calm state: nepa (gnas pa)
(ii) non-movement: miyowa (mi gyo ba)
(iii) non-dual: nyamnyi (nyam nyid)
(iv) natural perfection: lhundrüp (lhun grub)

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 22nd, 2017 at 1:17 PM
Title: Re: Anonymity on Buddhist forums
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Very well, Lordman.

krodha wrote:

Fitting that the guy who has made a consistent effort to uphold his anonymity is all over this thread.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2017 at 8:06 AM
Title: Re: Recognizing rigpa
Content:
cepheidvariable said:
Does rigpa have any analogues encountered in other vehicles?

krodha wrote:
Prajñā.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2017 at 1:33 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
nowawakening said:
You simply will not convince me otherwise...
Good day.

krodha wrote:
A.k.a. "I'm a staunch perennialist."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2017 at 10:39 AM
Title: Re: (carefully) Broadcasting Dzogchen through music
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Well, I know I will get in trouble for mentioning this...

Malcolm said:
Never seems to have stopped you before...

dzogchungpa said:
You'd be surprised...

krodha wrote:
We would indeed be surprised.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 18th, 2016 at 12:50 PM
Title: Re: “You Can’t Watch Pornos in the Monastery”: Tibetan Tantra, Imagined Pleasure,

and the Virtuality of Desire
Content:
maybay said:
So what were you doing watching the entrance of a strip club?

krodha wrote:
I used to get paid to watch the entrance of a strip club. We never got any monks.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 12th, 2016 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
rachmiel said:
The HHtDL quote was in reference to the last message on the previous page:

> Asserting that empty phenomena "exist" would not be accurate.

krodha wrote:
The only places I've ever encountered the assertion "empty phenomena exist just not the way we think they do" is in statements by Gelugs. It is not a view found elsewhere.

That said, How to see yourself as you really are is an excellent book.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 11th, 2016 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
rachmiel said:
Empty (i.e. all) phenomena exist, just not in the way we think they exist.

krodha wrote:
Asserting that empty phenomena "exist" would not be accurate.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 6th, 2016 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya unconditioned and uncaused?
Content:
White Lotus said:
the buddha kaya is "this". to see enlightenment see "this". "this" is subject to cessation.

krodha wrote:
Using the term "this" in the manner you're using it is a neo-nondual / neo-Advaita thing, such jargon has no application in the context of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2016 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya unconditioned and uncaused?
Content:
White Lotus said:
"this"/dharmakaya is the totality, but also the units of reality. when we speak of buddha kaya we usually refer to the totality

conebeckham said:
I don't even really know what this means.

krodha wrote:
You aren't alone.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 4th, 2016 at 7:15 AM
Title: Re: Question about Tilopa's Six Advices
Content:
rachmiel said:
Not me. I come out of samatī every night to watch TV for a coupla hours. I guess that makes me a dabbler?

krodha wrote:
Sarcasm, I hope.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 1st, 2016 at 5:12 AM
Title: Re: Would you vote to decriminalize marijuana?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
It's been legal a few years now in Washington.

krodha wrote:
California may follow suit in November.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 1st, 2016 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: "transmission outside the scriptures"
Content:
Jeff said:
Sure they do.

krodha wrote:
Nah.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 1:10 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm said:
ChNN has zero confidence in the tulku system, as a whole.

BuddhaFollower said:
Then why did he want his son to go to the monastery he is the tulku of?

krodha wrote:
Rinpoche has said numerous times that there are genuine tulkus out there, but they are very few and far between. For the most part he regards the vast majority of so-called tulkus to be political puppets.

As for the legitimacy of his own status as a tulku, I personally don't doubt it for a second.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:54 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm said:
ChNN has zero confidence in the tulku system, as a whole.

BuddhaFollower said:
Then why did he want his son to go to the monastery he is the tulku of?

krodha wrote:
Probably because it meant a great deal to the people of that region.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 3:14 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Received lung for Dudjom Rinpoche's "Buddhahood Without Meditation" twice now

krodha wrote:
Not to be a pedant, but I believe you mean Dudjom Lingpa.

Buddhahood Without Meditation is the title for the book which is a translation of his

Rang bZhin rDzogs pa Chen po'i Rang Zhel mNgon du Byed pa'i gDams pa ma sGom Sangs rGyas bZhugs so.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
HandsomeMonkeyking said:
Is there a list with the lungs one received during the last Shitro retreat?

I got myself the book 'Guru Arya Tara and Her Twenty-One Praises' and wondered if I can do all the Mantras and practises that I like out of that book.

krodha wrote:
List here:

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=4052&start=3800#p3537031

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Come hell or high water I'll be in Tenerife in December. Hope to see some of you there.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Well I'm open to having misspoke. In the end all we can do is acknowledge that Rinpoche's students are big boys and girls who are capable of making the right decision for themselves, and hope they will do so.

Malcolm said:
This is a very common thing in the community -- using personal communications with ChNN in the attempt to condition others.

krodha wrote:
Thanks, I wasn't aware it's common, luckily no one does this at our ling in Berkekey.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
.

Even if you don't plan to apply the teachings immediately, it is still good to receive it so you can when you are ready.

florin said:
As disappointing as it may seem, people shouldnt go if they are not ready .
I am afraid to say , rinpoche's advice does not allow for any interpretation.
I asked him a question about readiness and whether people can go to receive the teachings even if they are not ready but only practice yangti when they are ready and he wasnt very pleased.
No means no.
That's it.

krodha wrote:
Well I'm open to having misspoke. In the end all we can do is acknowledge that Rinpoche's students are big boys and girls who are capable of making the right decision for themselves, and hope they will do so.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 3:30 PM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body in Hindhuism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Generally not. Unless one has done extensive practice with the visions and can remain lucid in sleep there is not much hope for the bardo.

Sherab Dorje said:
You can focus on the aspect of inability/unlikelihood, I will focus on the ability/likelihood!

krodha wrote:
It isn't a matter of "focusing" on either. If you haven't trained to recognize the bardo of dharmatā then I really can't see how it is "likely."

It is a nice thought that we will "likely" awaken in the bardo, but in systems like Dzogchen there are actually signs that indicate the "likelyhood" you are advocating for. If those indicators are absent then the prospect of awakening in the bardo really becomes a gamble that isn't stacked in your favor.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
Jhanadakini

Could someone please PM me the link to the correct practice book for the Jhanadakini practice the Master gave transmission for?

Thank you very much.
Is it Longsal volume 7?

krodha wrote:
From the VC forum:

Mantrik said:
From Shang Shung Publications:

Transmissions given by Chögyal Namkhai Norbu, 26-31 August 2016 Shitro (including the mantra of Changhcub Dorje's Shitro):

http://www.shangshungpublications.org/practices/2016_08_31_practices.html

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body in Hindhuism
Content:
BuddhaFollower said:
For most people, even most Buddhists, the bardo of dharmata passes in a fingersnap.

Many people view Jigme Lingpa as a top authority so I'll just cite him:

"At that time, to the extent that one is familiar with togal practice, these appearances will be supportive aspects of awareness enduring for extended periods of time. For those who are unfamiliar, they will disappear as swiftly as a shooting star." Jigme Lingpa's Yeshe Lama

Sherab Dorje said:
And regardless of this fact, some still recognise their natural state during this finger snap...

krodha wrote:
Generally not. Unless one has done extensive practice with the visions and can remain lucid in sleep there is not much hope for the bardo.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 4:15 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
Sure, but the direct experience it signifies is not a concept.

Sherab Dorje said:
And how can you know that given that in our current state EVERYTHING is a concept?

krodha wrote:
When these teachings state "everything is a concept" they are not saying everything is an imputation. "Concept" (in the context you are using it) is used to denote all fabrications that the deluded mind serves to manifest such as ideas, emotions, the five poisons, acceptance, rejection etc.

This does not mean raw appearances like color or sound are imputations.

Sherab Dorje said:
Now you're bringing up how sentient beings experience appearances as influenced by their respective karmic dispositions. You're all over the map.
You are saying there are appearances and there are experiences of appearances? Are you positing an objectively existent external reality?

krodha wrote:
An objectively existent external reality is ultimately a misconception. But our reality appears that way, and due to our karma and ignorance, we as sentient beings experience the container universe as a concrete, external reality.

Sherab Dorje said:
The "objective reality" we experience is the container universe that is projected by the like traces of sentient beings.
Which is exactly what I am saying: There is no sweetness outside of the karmically tainted experience/sensation of sweetness.

krodha wrote:
This is so extremely beside the point of what was originally being discussed, and irrelevant.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 3:54 PM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
The salient point is the word "sweet" doesn't put a sweet taste in your mouth. That is something you cannot deny.

Sherab Dorje said:
There is no such thing as a sweet taste.

krodha wrote:
You do realize we can talk like normal human beings, no? You've tasted candy, tasted cookies, you know what "sweet" tastes like. That is all we are talking about. You keep attempting to steer this discussion in some unnecessary analytical, pedantic direction that is irrelevant to the original point of the conversation.

Sherab Dorje said:
There is a sensation when an object of taste comes into contact with the organ of taste.

krodha wrote:
That is great, but irrelevant to the simple point I was making.

Sherab Dorje said:
Sweet is a concept.

krodha wrote:
Sure, but the direct experience it signifies is not a concept.

Sherab Dorje said:
This is what you are failing to understand (and why we are still engaging in discussion).

krodha wrote:
I'm not failing to understand anything.

Sherab Dorje said:
Direct experiences, [visual, auditory, olfactory, tactile, etc.] sensations and so on, require zero conceptualization.
Sensation does not require conceptualisation, but the experience of sensation (sweetness) does.

krodha wrote:
You're thinking about this way too hard my friend. It doesn't need to be difficult.

Sherab Dorje said:
A bare and direct experience, like the appearance of color, the feeling of heat, the sound of thunder, require zero conceptualization to appear.
Color, heat (or cold), thunder, etc... are concepts.

krodha wrote:
Correct, but the appearances they represent are not concepts.

Sherab Dorje said:
Imputation occurs after the fact and has no influence on said appearances themselves.

Imputation influences the mind, which fails to recognize the actual nature of those appearances.
You just contradicted yourself.

krodha wrote:
I didn't. You just don't understand what I'm saying and are seeing issues where there are none.

Sherab Dorje said:
The very fact that imputation effects sensation means that the appearance is influenced/conditioned, otherwise all objects would be conceived of identically by all sentient beings.

krodha wrote:
Now you're bringing up how sentient beings experience appearances as influenced by their respective karmic dispositions. You're all over the map.

That has nothing to do with imputation.

Sherab Dorje said:
They are not. Imputation effects appearance, imputation is the essence of sentience.

krodha wrote:
Imputation affects the mind, and how appearances are cognized... it does not affect appearances themselves.

And imputation sure as hell is not the essence of sentience.

Sherab Dorje said:
For ignorant beings sensation always leads to conceptualisation/imputation unless the sensation is too weak to effect the mental continuum. As such (when we look at the total of the process of sensation for ignorant sentient beings) all appearances/objects are nothing other than mental constructs of the individual sentient beings.

Unless, of course, you propose that there is an objectively existing reality.

krodha wrote:
The "objective reality" we experience is the container universe that is projected by the like traces of sentient beings.

This is why the teachings state that phenomena are not your mind, nor are they other than mind.

At any rate, this discussion is all over the place and borderline nonsensical. 1am here, goodnight world.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 2:46 PM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
That is absolutely true. Can you put the experiential taste of sugar in another person's mouth simply by describing it to them? Obviously not.

Sherab Dorje said:
And in describing it you will be engaging in conceptualisation.

krodha wrote:
And?

Sherab Dorje said:
Just like in experiencing it yourself (past mere sensation) you will also engage in conceptualisation.

krodha wrote:
The salient point is the word "sweet" doesn't put a sweet taste in your mouth. That is something you cannot deny.

Sherab Dorje said:
Thus there is no such thing as a non-conceptual experience or understanding.

krodha wrote:
Nonsense.

Sherab Dorje said:
All experience and understanding requires conceptualisation.

krodha wrote:
Direct experiences, [visual, auditory, olfactory, tactile, etc.] sensations and so on, require zero conceptualization.

Sherab Dorje said:
All sensations worthy of attention are conceptualised.

krodha wrote:
A bare and direct experience, like the appearance of color, the feeling of heat, the sound of thunder, require zero conceptualization to appear.

Imputation occurs after the fact and has no influence on said appearances themselves. Imputation influences the mind, which fails to recognize the actual nature of those appearances and engages in conceptual proliferation in the wake of direct experience.

Sherab Dorje said:

Abhidharma 101. Do you agree or disagree?

krodha wrote:
Clearly I disagree. As for whether it is "Abhidharma 101"... cite your source. I doubt it. You seem to be arguing for no reason at this point.

Sherab Dorje said:
1. I am not arguing I am discussing.

2. If you picked your terms more carefully, or expressed your ideas more clearly, from the beginning, then we wouldn't be having this discussion at all.

krodha wrote:
I express my ideas just fine.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 11:25 PM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
You said:
krodha wrote:
Which is no different than saying "even the Buddha couldn't effectively communicate the experiential taste of sugar." Which is true, one must experience that taste for themselves to understand it non-conceptually, same goes for the basis.

Sherab Dorje said:
Which is just not true.

krodha wrote:
That is absolutely true. Can you put the experiential taste of sugar in another person's mouth simply by describing it to them? Obviously not.

Sherab Dorje said:
In understanding there is an object of understanding, the subject doing the understanding and the act of understanding (conceptualisation). If you said non-conceptual realisation then maybe you would be onto something, but even then (as you pointed out yourself re equipoise and post-equipoise) once the process is over...

krodha wrote:
Correct, the so-called "object" of understanding in realization is dharmatā, which is simply what is revealed when there is a cessation of ignorance [avidyā].

Conventionally we say you as a subject have that recognition or realization. However ultimately there is simply a cessation that occurs to reveal the true nature of mind and/or phenomena.

You seem to be arguing for no reason at this point.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 6:14 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
In all seriousness, I'm working on my vajra passive-aggression. Please bear with me.

krodha wrote:
My case in point.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 5:41 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
You still haven't answered Malcolm as to what your name is.

dzogchungpa said:
What are you, a cop?

krodha wrote:
People are interested to know what your deal is.

The vast majority of your contributions to these forums involve snide, off-handed, passive-aggressive remarks paraded as humor.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
The point is once you have gone from a sensation, to the label "heat", then you have crossed over into conceptualisation. There is nothing controversial about that.

krodha wrote:
Right, nothing wrong with that.

Sherab Dorje said:
Go ask one of the Abhidharma crowd if you don't believe me. Or better still: go ask your teacher.

krodha wrote:
Ask them about what? This is a non-issue as far as I can tell. Perhaps you are confused as to the nature of the point I was making, that seems to be the case.

Sherab Dorje said:
The experience of seeing the nature of mind is non-conceptual, but once the experience is over...

krodha wrote:
Once equipoise is over one is in post-equipoise. Nothing controversial about that either.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 3:56 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
Which is no different than saying "even the Buddha couldn't effectively communicate the experiential taste of sugar." Which is true, one must experience that taste for themselves to understand it non-conceptually, same goes for the basis.

Sherab Dorje said:
Understanding is always conceptual. Sensation can be non-conceptual, understanding though...

krodha wrote:
Tasting something directly and experientially is non-conceptual. Just as seeing the color blue is non-conceptual. Feeling the heat of a flame is non-conceptual. Recognizing the nature of mind is non-conceptual in that way.

The point being made is that you cannot effectively communicate those non-conceptual experiences with words. The word "heat" does not produce the tactile sensation of heat or provide an intimate understanding of what heat feels like. You must experientially feel heat to truly know it. Same goes for recognizing the nature of mind. That is the only point being made, which shouldn't be controversial at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 3:51 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Now, now, krodha, I'm sure I don't need to remind you, of all people, of DW's strict "No meta-discussion" policy.

krodha wrote:
You still haven't answered Malcolm as to what your name is.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Easy, big guy.

krodha wrote:
Weird response, per usual.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 3:18 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
As Jigme Lingpa famously quipped:
"Even the Buddha couldn't explain the ground."

I'm paraphrasing here.

krodha wrote:
Which is no different than saying "even the Buddha couldn't effectively communicate the experiential taste of sugar." Which is true, one must experience that taste for themselves to understand it non-conceptually, same goes for the basis.

Nevertheless, one would be incorrect when describing sugar as "salty", and there are incorrect ways to understand and communicate the basis as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 12:01 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that
Content:
Kim said:
Bullcrap. "Create an obstacle"? How religious one has to be to believe this stuff!? Seriously... All that talk about samaya and creating obstacles. Gimme a break. That's the real tragedy.

krodha wrote:
The irony.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that
Content:
Kim said:
As a general remark, I'm starting to feel that dzogchen is a bit mystified here at DW.

krodha wrote:
Care to elaborate? Or cite some examples?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Sitting next to a buddha and not knowing it
Content:
krodha wrote:
Clothing, robes and how adepts and teachers do or don't dress seems to be a reoccurring theme in your posts. Perhaps something to look at.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 5:16 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that
Content:
krodha wrote:
Kim, perhaps try splitting your responses up into multiple posts.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 6:04 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Vasana said:
I know there is a retreat at the end of this year but I can't decide if it's the most suitable route of practice for me right now.

But if the transmission is fairly rare it seems like an opportunity not to waste.

krodha wrote:
It is rare, you should make an effort to go if you have the chance.

Even if you don't plan to apply the teachings immediately, it is still good to receive it so you can when you are ready.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 6:01 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Vasana said:
Does anyone know on average how often Rinpoche teaches Yang-Ti ?

...

I understand the webcast is closed but can members still view it and recieve transmission or is it not filmed at all?

Kilaya. said:
Once a year, usually, and it's not broadcasted.

heart said:
It was several years since he did it the last time, 2011 if I am correct.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Next time is this coming December at Dzamling Gar.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:23 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
boda said:
I clearly stated that "I found it interesting," fellow forummer. If you pay more attention to what people write they won't have to spell everything out for you.

krodha wrote:
I suppose I'm surprised you find an uneducated assertion so interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 4:06 PM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
boda said:
I wouldn't expect you to realize it but I entered this discussion to address the following statement by davidbrainerd. I found it interesting.
davidbrainerd said:
It cannot be demonstrated to be a fact of existence or any other kind of fact. It would be easier to demonstrate an eternal self than everything is emptiness.

boda said:
So perhaps now you can see why I've inquired about your demonstrable knowledge. But seeing how this apparently makes you uncomfortable we'll let it go.

krodha wrote:
Why would you waste your time entering this discussion to address that statement?

In case you haven't noticed, many of the posts authored by that forummer are quite colorful and not exactly what one would consider well informed.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 6:29 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
boda said:
I asked if you've observed this and consider it a fact. Significantly (in regard to the OP), it appears as though you have not, and that being the case you cannot claim it to be fact.

krodha wrote:
I state with great confidence that it is a fact, and that conclusion is not based upon inferential speculation or conjecture.

Apart from saying that, I have no interest in discussing my personal insights, experiences or what I've "observed." This isn't amateur hour. There are plenty of other forums you can go to if you want to listen to alleged practitioners sit around and openly broadcast their experiences to strangers.

boda said:
The cure for grasping is letting go.

krodha wrote:
Sadly this is not the case. "Letting go" does not purify your perception, uproot ignorance from the mind or exhaust kleśas.

Letting go is a nice preliminary attitude and practice, but there is no awakening involved with merely "letting go."

boda said:
It's concerning that you believe insight into emptiness is the only cure. What about moral discipline and the rest?!

krodha wrote:
Moral discipline is a nice provisional practice.

boda said:
Trying to convince yourself that impermanent phenomena are not real won't help matters, other than provide a meaningful practice perhaps.

krodha wrote:
There is no "trying to convince myself" of anything. Just as there is no need to "convince"

oneself that sugar is sweet upon tasting it, or that water is wet after having it dumped over your head.

The issue here is that you are attempting to critique things you've never experienced.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 4:08 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Not grasping" from the standpoint of afflicted mind is just another form of grasping. At best it is deluded indifference... but still pure affliction hands down.

The point of the buddhadharma is to uproot the cause for the misperception of conditioned entities that can be "grasped" or "not grasped" altogether. Once that ignorance has been severed then grasping is undone completely.

Until that species of insight dawns, any sort of practice that consists of allegedly "not grasping" is just a provisional and inferential discipline that is implemented for the purposes of reworking certain habits. But still wholly deluded.

A.k.a. faking it til you make it.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
To reveal that phenomena have been unoriginated and unconditioned from the very beginning.

boda said:
You can observe this and consider it a fact?

krodha wrote:
Yes, non-arising can be experientially realized. That is what bodhi is.

boda said:
Insight into emptiness is not a cure for grasping, unfortunately.

krodha wrote:
Insight into emptiness is the only cure for grasping.

Unless one has directly and experientially realized non-arising, conditioned phenomena continue to appear as a result of ignorance. Ergo existent phenomena are perceived and

accepting and rejecting occur, the three poisons in action.

The fact that you would claim insight into emptiness is "not a cure for grasping" is quite concerning.

boda said:
Dualism, essentially. Dualism is problematic only because we can't grasp impermanent things.

krodha wrote:
This statement is nonsense. You suffer precisely because you grasp at conditioned, impermanent phenomena to be real.

If you knew that said phenomena was not actually real, via insight into the non-arising of said phenomena, then the foundation for grasping would be severed at the root.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 4:40 PM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here is the sutta where Śākyamuni states he is not a human being:

http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an04/an04.036.than.html

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 4:35 PM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
But no, pointing out that a self is a byproduct of delusion is not "nihilism" just as pointing out that a rope lying in a dark room is not a snake (in order to help someone who mistakes it for a snake) is not nihilism.

vinegar said:
Persons are not a product of delusion, buddhas are persons.

krodha wrote:
Persons are absolutely, hands down, byproducts of delusion. Buddha's are also manifestations of our delusion. Both sentient beings and Buddhas are illusory from the standpoint of ultimate truth.

As for a Buddha being a "person", technically, a Buddha is not what we would call a "sentient being." From the standpoint of our afflicted, karmic perception we see Buddha's as a person (just as we perceive other sentient beings), but this is not what

appears to a Buddha.

I cannot recall which sutta states this, but there is a text where Buddha Śākyamuni is asked whether he is a person, or a human being, etc., and he says he is not.

vinegar said:
There is nothing wrong with being a person, and a denial of functioning persons is nihilism

krodha wrote:
The denial of persons on the conventional level is nihilism, sure... but no one here has made a denial of that nature. So I'm not sure what you're arguing against.

Your campaign to reject any statement that even remotely resembles a downplaying of personhood, selves, etc., is a common theme in your posts. Perhaps something to look at.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 12:24 PM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
When something is "empty", doesn't that mean it is empty of inherent existence ?

krodha wrote:
This is primarily the Gelug definition.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
That it can not exist without depending on something else ?

krodha wrote:
Dependent existence [parabhāva], i.e., "things that cannot exist without depending on something else" is actually a view that does not accord with emptiness... and is in fact a guise for svabhāva, which is the antithesis of emptiness.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
A tree is empty because it is dependant on causes and conditions for it to arise : Seed, soil, sunlight, air,water, etc.

krodha wrote:
This would be a coarse and materialist example of dependent existence, but it does not really correspond to emptiness.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
Form is emptiness (dependant on causes and conditions)
Emptiness is form

krodha wrote:
This saying is meant to communicate that emptiness should not be sought as something separate from form, appearance, matter, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 11:34 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
boda said:
What do you believe the "intention" of emptiness is??

krodha wrote:
To reveal that phenomena have been unoriginated and unconditioned from the very beginning.

boda said:
I would not call it intention, but the teaching suggests that grasping is unwise, essentially.

krodha wrote:
Sure, yet without insight into emptiness, grasping is unavoidable because the perception of conditioned entities that can be accepted and rejected is all one knows.

boda said:
And yes, emptiness means phenomena are free from the extremes of existence and non-existence, including any combination of the two.
This qualifies as goofy (harmlessly eccentric) in my estimation.

krodha wrote:
Freedom from the four extremes is a staple view of Mahāyāna. Certainly nothing I have fabricated, in a "harmlessly eccentric" manner or otherwise.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 10:48 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
It more accurately means that phenomena are (i) non-arisen, (ii) free from extremes, (iii) dependently originated or (iv) lacking inherency.

All of which are synonyms.

boda said:
Of course emptiness means all sorts of goofy things to people, but the essential

observable fact is impermanence.

Free from extremes?

krodha wrote:
None of those definitions are "goofy things" and all are standard.

Impermanence is really not a definition that captures the meaning or intention of emptiness at all.

And yes, emptiness means phenomena are free from the extremes of existence and non-existence, including any combination of the two.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 7:46 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
boda said:
Actually emptiness is expressed in everything and in every instant. Emptiness does not mean "mere nothingness." It merely means that all things are impermanent, essentially. We all observe this all the time..

krodha wrote:
Emptiness means more than just "impermanence".

It more accurately means that phenomena are (i) non-arisen, (ii) free from extremes, (iii) dependently originated or (iv) lacking inherency.

All of which are synonyms.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 6:52 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
krodha wrote:
Of course we can say in a conventional sense that John Doe or Mary Smith are deluded. We do not deny conventional selves. But the idea that those names have actual referents is absolutely denied.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc
Content:
Kaccāni said:

The notion of a self is an illusion.

vinegar said:
Nope, a negation of a self, a person, is nihilism.

krodha wrote:
Holding to the view that there is no self of any stripe, even conventionally, and allowing that view to corrupt one's path and view in general is nihilism.

But no, pointing out that a self is a byproduct of delusion is not "nihilism" just as pointing out that a rope lying in a dark room is not a snake (in order to help someone who mistakes it for a snake) is not nihilism.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 2:33 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
krodha wrote:
The buddhadharma promotes monism? Feel free to give an example.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
The Ati Buddha ?

That's all there is .

http://www.buddhistgeeks.com/2010/05/maha-ati-natural-liberation-through-primordial-awareness/

krodha wrote:
The adibuddha is simply the first being to attain buddhahood in a given time cycle. The principle does not suggest a monist view.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 11:59 PM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
Yes...so much confusion...you are/you aren't, blah, blah., blah...so many contradictions & misleading disinformation (IMO)
Not everyone is a scholar or a genius to figure out what is the Ultimate truth or all the correct answers....
I find the best way is to just give up and walk away...and to not know, is to know....easy peasy....then let it all fall into place naturally/eventually...

krodha wrote:

No doubt a counterproductive attitude.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 11:31 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
PierreDeSuis said:
Well then in your view what is it that prevents liberation after awakening?

krodha wrote:
Afflictive karmic traces have not been fully exhausted, and ignorance has not been fully uprooted.

Essentially the twin obscurations (afflictive and cognitive) remain in tact.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 4:07 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
PierreDeSuis said:
I think this is a very common idea. I kind of wish it were true.

krodha wrote:
Luckily for you, you don't have to wish.

PierreDeSuis said:
Any teacher of Mahamudra would be wise to avoid this idea of liberation as 'uninterrupted extension'.

krodha wrote:
An unwise suggestion.

PierreDeSuis said:
If Loch Kelly really is a competent Mahamudra teacher then you should ask him about this very issue of what constitutes liberation.

krodha wrote:
Well, he isn't competent, nor qualified... so the issue resolves itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 8:47 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:

There's also a lot of BS , under the umbrella of Buddhism

krodha wrote:
Such as?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 8:45 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
What did Buddha teach about putting other religious beliefs down ?

krodha wrote:
Who is putting other religious beliefs down? Delineating what terms mean from system to system does not mean traditions are being criticized or put down.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
What does logic tell you if the big bang is true ?

krodha wrote:
Not sure how this is relevant to the topic.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
If this is all an illusion, then what's the difference between anything ?

krodha wrote:
The buddhadharma does not negate conventional differences.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dzogchen is buddhadharma.

Kunga Lhadzom said:
Ok...then "the rest" teaches BS, and Dzogchen/Buddhadharma teaches non-duality....

krodha wrote:
"Non-dual" in the buddhadharma means something different than it does in sanatanadharma and other tirthīka systems.

In Dzogchen and Buddhism, "non-dual" means that all phenomena are free from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence.

It can also mean that conditioned phenomena [dharmas] are neither the same nor different than their unconditioned, non-arisen nature [dharmatā]. Hence dharmas and dharmatā are "non-dual."

But in Buddhism "non-dual" does not suggest monism like it does in non-Buddhist systems.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 6:10 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
Would Dzogchen fall under "the rest" catagory ?

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen is buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
no, perenialism would say its dumb for them to argue because they're all saying the same thing, which they are not. But they are all talking about the same thing: the nature of reality. Each one describes it according to its perspective, but the nature of reality is beyond all attempts to delineate it once and for all with one or another system of concepts.

krodha wrote:
The definition of perrennialism.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 12:49 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
davidbrainerd said:
Just replace Brahman with emptiness, and viola.

krodha wrote:
Utter nonsense.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
isn't it comforting to know that the nature of reality is not beholden to Buddhists, Vedantins (and everyone else) arguing about which poetic metaphor best describes it?

krodha wrote:
A comforting thought for perennialists, perhaps.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 11:19 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
May I point out that this thread and its, admittedly not truly established, referent seem to be somewhat different at this point?

krodha wrote:
It's for the better.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
krodha wrote:
That said, obviously discussing the taste of sugar implies "ideas" regarding that taste, but the taste itself is not an idea.

Astus said:
"If a word and its referent are not different,
[The word] fire would burn one’s mouth;
If they’re different there’ll be no comprehension.
This you, the speaker of truth, have stated."
(Nagarjuna: http://www.tibetanclassics.org/html-assets/WorldTranscendentHym.pdf, v 7)

krodha wrote:
Right, I wasn't advocating for a truly established referent.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 3:53 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
krodha wrote:

That said, obviously discussing the taste of sugar implies "ideas" regarding that taste, but the taste itself is not an idea.

Sherab Dorje said:
Are you sure?

krodha wrote:
Are you unsure of this?

When you think "sweet" or even say the word "sweet" does a sweet taste suddenly manifest?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 11:27 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Totally dishonest reading, he never implied any "self" at all, outside of a few Tathagatagarbha sutras.

krodha wrote:
And even the tathāgatagarbha sūtras needn't be interpreted literally in that regard.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 11:01 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
davidbrainerd said:
Well I don't know about you personally, but the concept that everything is mere emptiness is certainly nihilism

krodha wrote:
It might appear that way to someone who doesn't understand emptiness... but in truth it is anything but nihilism, which is an extreme that emptiness negates.

davidbrainerd said:
and the concept that there is no spiritual reality is certainly materialism

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what a "spiritual reality" is but it is certainly nothing I've ever addressed, much less rejected.

davidbrainerd said:
(even if the material is still being said to be merely emptiness).

krodha wrote:
You mean material is empty, yes that is true.

davidbrainerd said:
And I find it odd that the "everything is emptiness" and "there is no self, there is no soul" crowd can bring themselves to call Buddhism a "spiritual" path, since they don't believe in any kind of spirit, spiritual realm, or spiritual reality.

krodha wrote:
Well, the primary issue here is that you don't understand that which you are criticizing. Which makes for a bit of a mess. That coupled with your clear aversion for such principles does not appear to bode well for you understanding them properly anytime soon. And that being the case you can choose to educate yourself or continue to bandy about your misconceptions. I hope for your own sake you pursue the former... and if not for the sake of yourself, for this forum at the very least.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
davidbrainerd said:
(2) achieving liberation by reducing, getting rid of origination of the impermanent aggregates, by removing the cause (your craving) most obviously leaves you with the permanent you.

krodha wrote:
"The permanent you" is not a Buddhist notion.

davidbrainerd said:
The whole point of anatta is clearly to let go of all that is not you to be left with only your true youness.

krodha wrote:
Anātman is not apophatic theology and is not an underhanded endorsement for some sort of "true youness."

davidbrainerd said:
Buddha is always talking about letting go of what is not you and what is not yours, like in Mn22, never does he say "there is no self" or "there is no you",

krodha wrote:
Correct, because a conventional self is not denied.

davidbrainerd said:
and then you have those Mahayana sutras that teach Buddha Nature as a self.

krodha wrote:
They do so nominally. Certainly not literally. The "ātman" featured in such texts is a mere rhetorical device. The Buddha even states that such teachings are not for the immature and small-minded because they will be misunderstood.

davidbrainerd said:
Also you have the Dhammapada's statement (vs 323) to the effect "you do not ride elephants to nirvana; you ride your own well-tamed self."

krodha wrote:
Which just means you rely upon yourself. "Self" being used as a pronoun.

davidbrainerd said:
And also the other one in ch 12 "the self is the only refuge of the self."

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't trust that translation or the other you cited in the least. They sound quite loaded and indicative of someone seeking to affirm a specific eternalist narrative.

davidbrainerd said:
Buddha's teaching was MUCH closer to Jainism than what modern materialistic secular nihilist orthodoxy will allow.

krodha wrote:
Not really. Although if you think I've advocated for materialism, nihilism or anything along those lines you are sadly confused.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 7:25 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
Simon E. said:
What makes you not a Buddhist? According to Dzongkar Khyentse Rinpoche;

1) If you believe that anything, any aspect or concept is permanent.

davidbrainerd said:
So you have to believe enlightenment is impermanent, i.e. Buddha can become unenlightened again, or you're not a Buddhist? Aaaa. This point fails.

krodha wrote:
The so-called "permanence" of liberation is not the same as the alleged permanence of a sort of ontological entity such as a soul or an irreducible, universal pleroma etc.

The latter is what Rinpoche is objecting to. While the former is simply the end result of a subtractive process that exhausts a specific cause.

When you completely exhaust the cause by which something originates (or appears to originate) then the resultant cessation is "permanent." Permanence of that nature does not suggest an entity, but rather a cessation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 7:12 AM
Title: Re: Nagarjuna and Tantra - a Vajrayana point of view
Content:
krodha wrote:
This is why Buddhist logic is superior to something like Neo-Advaita, which constantly has to preface every statement made with an assurance that any action suggested lacks an agent. A tiresome and absurd commitment, no doubt.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: Nagarjuna and Tantra - a Vajrayana point of view
Content:
anjali said:
Hmm. That doesn't sound quite right. Don't Buddhas exhibit non-deliberate spontaneous action? In which case, there is no agent, agency or volitional action for a Buddha, even in the conventional sense (although it may appear that Buddhas exhibit volitional action from a sentient being's POV). Maybe I'm misunderstanding what you mean by "in a conventional sense"?

krodha wrote:
I mean nominally. We can say X Buddha performed X action, or chose to travel to X location, and so on, but this means we are merely suggesting volition and agency on the level of convention, for the purpose of communication.

In terms of Buddhist thought, it is usually a given that conventional appearances and designations are mere inferences that do not refer to (or indicate) anything real.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 12:28 AM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
krodha wrote:
Liberation vs. awakening is not some sort of "idea"... and certainly not a notion I have fabricated.

Sherab Dorje said:
If you are not talking from experience, then you are talking about ideas. Actually, even if you are talking from experience you are talking about ideas.

krodha wrote:
With awakening and liberation, the latter is merely an uninterrupted extension of the former, ergo if one has experienced the former, the latter is equally known to be plausible and legitimate.

That said, obviously discussing the taste of sugar implies "ideas" regarding that taste, but the taste itself is not an idea.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 12:14 AM
Title: Re: Nagarjuna and Tantra - a Vajrayana point of view
Content:
paganfear said:
Agreed but agency requires an agent and it seems that Buddhas and Bodisattvas in the Vajrayana sense have agency.

krodha wrote:
They have volition [cetanā] and so on in a conventional sense. But this does not require a truly existent agent.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 2:07 PM
Title: Re: Nagarjuna and Tantra - a Vajrayana point of view
Content:
paganfear said:
...but then it seems to me that he would actually be at odds with various fundamental elements of Vajrayana philosophy.

krodha wrote:
In what regard?

paganfear said:
That said, I've also read extracts attributed to Nagarjuna where he appears to reference esoteric knowledge and mantra.

krodha wrote:
There was most likely two Nāgārjunas. Ārya Nāgārjuna who authored the MMK, and then the Siddha Nāgārjuna who authored works such as the Bodhicittavivarana, Dharmadhātustava etc.

paganfear said:
I'm very interested to hear the opinions of both Vajrayana practitioners and Mahayana practitioners and feel the best way to do this is have two threads running simultaneously, one in each forum, to prevent a potential early stalemate between

posters from the different camps.

krodha wrote:
There's no conflict if both the intention of Nāgārjuna and Vajrayāna are understood correctly.

paganfear said:
2. Is his deconstructive approach not both incompatible with and opposed to Vajrayana's use of mantra, prayers, ritual, the belief in a primordial Buddha (substratum),

krodha wrote:
The so-called "primordial Buddha" is not a "substratum". Vajrayāna does not promote a substratum apart from the ālayavijñāna which is afflicted and meant to be purified.

paganfear said:
the belief in returning entities with agency

krodha wrote:
All Buddhist systems accept rebirth conventionally. And rebirth does not require an agent.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 5:18 AM
Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I went to the thing he did there last year: http://www.vajrayana.org/events/35/
and it rocked my world.

krodha wrote:
Unparalleled vibrations.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 2:57 AM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
t means that instead of getting caught up in the illusion and talking about IDEAS like: liberation/awakening,

krodha wrote:
Liberation vs. awakening is not some sort of "idea"... and certainly not a notion I have fabricated.

Liberation means being liberated from cyclic existence via completely exhausting the cause for the arising of cyclic existence.

Awakening is simply the first instance of recognizing dharmatā.

If you're going to assert that one must be liberated in order to define liberation per the suttas, sūtras, śāstras and tantras (and discuss said definition of liberation), then this entire forum might as well shut down.

As for awakening, you asked me that last week in the other thread. I didn't answer. I don't like broadcasting my experiences or talking about myself.

Sherab Dorje said:
suffering, sentient beings, etc...

krodha wrote:
Like I said if we can't discuss suffering and sentient beings in this forum dedicated to the buddhadharma then we might as well close shop.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 2:18 AM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
If you can show me your "being", then I will show you my "liberation".

krodha wrote:
What does that even mean, Greg?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 1:12 AM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
krodha wrote:
When a sentient being awakens or is liberated, that incident occurs for them and not anyone else.

Sherab Dorje said:
You are speaking from experience, right?

krodha wrote:
Speaking from experience that I'm not liberated even though other masters have been? Certainly. That is your experience as well.

As for awakening, that is different than liberation. Yet still, when one is awakened, all

beings are not awakened. The entire notion is absurd.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 3:50 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Matylda said:
When a sentient being awakens or is liberated, that incident occurs for them and not anyone else.

This is what you may believe in

krodha wrote:
If by "what you may believe in" you mean to say what is taught in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism then yes, that is the view I stand by.

Matylda said:
but it is NOT what zen masters taught..

krodha wrote:
Perhaps not what some Zen masters taught. But I wouldn't know, and nor do I really care since I don't practice Zen, nor does it interest me particularly. Plus this is the Mahāmudrā sub-forum.

Matylda said:
therefore considering the source of information I would say that this kind of faith is invalid. Otherwise we should agree that all the gret zen masters of the last 1500 were deeply mistaken.

krodha wrote:
They very well may be if that is what they believe. But, that's not my business.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 3:11 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Matylda said:
yes of course.. it is not literal in its meaning.. but only in the course of practice, experience and realisation one may understand under realised teacher..

krodha wrote:
Even with practice and experience, if one truly believes that all sentient beings awaken and/or are liberated at the same time as one's personal awakening or liberation, they are deluded and tragically confused.

Matylda said:
otherwise it may be very misguiding. Yes it is very late zen story but arousen from the very firm experience of realised ones.

krodha wrote:
Though obviously this was not their experience, ergo said statement cannot be interpreted literally.

When a sentient being awakens or is liberated, that incident occurs for them and not anyone else.

Otherwise when the first Buddha was liberated all beings would have been liberated and there would be no samsāra and no need for the buddhadharma whatsoever.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 2:40 PM
Title: Re: The Nature of Language
Content:
Tao said:
>Language is, by its very nature, dualistic.

Language (talked and thought) is the origin of dualism in mind.

krodha wrote:
In a sense, although if we want to be pedants—as many around here including myself like to be from time to time — we must acknowledge that Dzogchen is quite specific when it comes to how ignorance and duality arise. And language (imputation) is one of the very last parts of that process.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 11:57 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
who's mistake?

krodha wrote:
Said error occurs in accordance with causes and conditions, which do not require a "who."

Yet if you need a "who" to assign error to you can say "you", "your mind" etc., insert applicable conventional designation as desired.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 11:23 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
I guess he would prefer that the Youthful Vase Body had never busted out. What? Is he saying it was a mistake? What kind of nature of reality makes mistakes?

krodha wrote:
Any and every expression of ignorance is a mistake.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dzongsar Jamyang Khyentse Rinpoche's explanation for "all emotions are pain":

The Tibetan word for emotion in this context is zagche, which means “contaminated” or “stained,” in the sense of being permeated by confusion or duality.

Certain emotions, such as aggression or jealousy, we naturally regard as pain. But what about love and affection, kindness and devotion, those nice, light and lovely emotions? We don’t think of them as painful; nevertheless, they imply duality, and this means that, in the end, they are a source of pain.

The dualistic mind includes almost every thought we have. Why is this painful? Because it is mistaken. Every dualistic mind is a mistaken mind, a mind that doesn’t understand the nature of things. So how are we to understand duality? It is subject and object: ourselves on the one hand and our experience on the other. This kind of dualistic perception is mistaken, as we can see in the case of different persons perceiving the same object in different ways. A man might think a certain woman is beautiful and that is his truth. But if that were some kind of absolute, independent kind of truth, then everyone else also would have to see her as beautiful as well. Clearly, this is not a truth that is independent of everything else. It is dependent on your mind; it is your own projection.

The dualistic mind creates a lot of expectations—a lot of hope, a lot of fear. Whenever there is a dualistic mind, there is hope and fear. Hope is perfect, systematized pain. We tend to think that hope is not painful, but actually it’s a big pain. As for the pain of fear, that’s not something we need to explain.

The Buddha said, “Understand suffering.” That is the first Noble Truth. Many of us mistake pain for pleasure—the pleasure we now have is actually the very cause of the pain that we are going to get sooner or later. Another Buddhist way of explaining this is to say that when a big pain becomes smaller, we call it pleasure. That’s what we call

happiness.

Moreover, emotion does not have some kind of inherently real existence. When thirsty people see a mirage of water, they have a feeling of relief: “Great, there’s some water!” But as they get closer, the mirage disappears. That is an important aspect of emotion: emotion is something that does not have an independent existence.

This is why Buddhists conclude that all emotions are painful. It is because they are impermanent and dualistic that they are uncertain and always accompanied by hopes and fears. But ultimately, they don’t have, and never have had, an inherently existent nature, so, in a way, they are not worth much. Everything we create through our emotions is, in the end, completely futile and painful. This is why Buddhists do shamatha and vipashyana meditation—this helps to loosen the grip that our emotions have on us, and the obsessions we have because of them.

Question: Is compassion an emotion?

People like us have dualistic compassion, whereas the Buddha’s compassion does not involve subject and object. From a buddha’s point of view, compassion could never involve subject and object. This is what is called mahakaruna—great compassion.

I’m having difficulty accepting that all emotions are pain.

Okay, if you want a more philosophical expression, you can drop the word “emotion” and simply say, “All that is dualistic is pain.” But I like using the word “emotion” because it provokes us.

http://www.lionsroar.com/buddhism-nutshell-four-seals-dharma/

http://www.lionsroar.com/what-makes-you-a-buddhist/

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 11:25 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
chimechodra said:
Yes, but for someone who is studying with another teacher who also has impeccable lineage credentials and is someone with whom they have a connection with, it would make sense for them to practice the path according to their instructions first and foremost. What they read in an interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche online can be helpful, but should not take primacy over the personalized intimate instructions of the lama, especially if they have zero connection with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche or his specific lineage.

krodha wrote:
Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche's comments are fairly universal to Dzogchen in general. No

matter the teacher, they aren't going to deviate from the model he is discussing [i.e., basis, path, result].

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 11:20 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Right, I'm trying to suss out why focusing on the knower is put forth as some unique property of "uncommon" Dzogchen, since it's found elsewhere,

krodha wrote:
Where else is it found?

Johnny Dangerous said:
maybe it's a context thing.

krodha wrote:
Most likely the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 7:47 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
...it confounds me a bit as to the dichotomy between "common" and "uncommon" Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
"Common" was defined as semde and longde.

"Uncommon" is mennagde, and the instructions regarding focusing on the knower pertain to the nyingtig cycle within mennagde.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 7:19 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Interesting, but this instruction to "recognize the recognizer" is found in a bunch of places, including (I think) what here would be termed "common" paths...

krodha wrote:
Although ultimately "recognizing the recognizer" is a provisional step and not the main

point. Leaving it there would render the exercise incomplete.

The purpose of placing the attention on "that which recognizes" is to gain insight into the nature of that noetic capacity.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
Wayfarer said:
That's an interesting word, would you care to elaborate?

krodha wrote:
Some so-called "teachers" out there like Jax teach their students to relate to Dzogchen in the very manner that is being criticized by Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche.

Some people jokingly refer to his teachings as "Jaxchen" because he surely isn't teaching Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 12th, 2016 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:
Wayfarer said:
This passage resonates with me:
the great danger is when you just leave naked knowing as an intellectual understanding, that “In Dzogchen there is no thing to meditate upon. There is no thing to view. There is nothing to carry out as an action.” That becomes a nihilistic concept and is completely detrimental to progress, because the final point of the teaching is conceptlessness, being beyond intellectual thinking. Yet, what has happened is that you have created an intellectual idea of Dzogchen and hold on to that idea very tightly. This is a major mistake but it can happen. So, it is very important to bring the instruction into personal experience through the oral guidance of a teacher. Otherwise, simply to have the idea: I am meditating on Dzogchen, is to completely miss the point.

krodha wrote:
The definition of Jaxchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
Vasana said:
This has been a very useful thread, thanks guys.

Krodha, could you explain how the four contemplations of Semde (nepa, miyowa, nyamnyid, and lhundrub) fit in to the context of distingushing between relative 'Rigpa' and 'rang byung rig pa'?

Afaik,you are saying relative Rigpa is present during the noticing of nepa and miyowa and that the experience of genuine Nyamnid is the onset of 'rang byung rigpa' if it's not tainted with dualistic vijñāna . Is that correct?

krodha wrote:
Yes that would be right. Recognition of the nature of mind occurs at mnyam nyid.

Vasana said:
How does the natural state differ from a brief moment of equipose? Is the natural state not also present in that brief moment of equipose to some degree?

krodha wrote:
An instance of equipoise [mnyam bzhag] is an instance of resting in the natural state. As mentioned by Malcolm, this is what makes Dzogchen special: there are practices that can bring about a clear recognition of dharmatā even prior to realizing emptiness.

The term gnas lugs really means something like "the way things really are" or "the actual way of things", so a knowledge of the actual way of things is what "natural state" is meant to convey. When resting in equipoise one is resting in a direct knowledge of the way things really are.

Vasana said:
I thought Tregchö was stabilizing the natural continuity of that same equipose and that realizing the experience of Lhundrub in Semde is in escence the basis of Tregchö since ka-dag and lhundrub are non-dual?

krodha wrote:
Lhun grub in sems sde is simply remaining in the continuity of that which is revealed at the time of mnyam myid. Which is again, resting in the so-called natural state.

Tregchö is indeed a means to cut through delusion to reveal our nature, and the state of tregchö is equipoise, is the natural state, is contemplation.

Tregchö is a means to realize ka dag, but to fully realize non-dual ka dag and lhun grub (i.e., ka dag chen po) one needs practices that manipulate the channels and cause visions to appear.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 8:15 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:

krodha wrote:
The editing window expired, will need to ask one of the mods to delete that section.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
I don't want to continue this discussion publicly because there is restricted material. I would prefer if you deleted that part.

krodha wrote:
Which part?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Sorry but need to continue the discussion here my pm box is full and I don't have time to go through and decide what to delete and keep at the moment.

MiphamFan said:
I am not talking about the gnas gyu shes pa, you are just assuming that I don't know the difference between that and rigpa.

Why don't you ask ChNN if he is just teaching people gnas gyu shes pa instead of rig pa when he teaches using gnas pa?
krodha wrote:
I don't have to ask him, he clearly states in the text "Introduction to the Practice of Contemplation" that the rigpa he is referring to in that context, is the gnas gyu shes pa associated with the gnas gyu rig gsum.

In the definitive view there is no movement or stillness because thoughts are recognized to be non-arisen.

MiphamFan said:
No he doesn't, read page 28-29.

krodha wrote:
The section on page 28-29 you are referring to is discussing the event of realizing the non-duality of gnas gyu rig gsum. That recognition would indeed give way to the definitive view.

His entire exposition is meant to get you to that point. But it does not start there, that is

why he states on page 50:

When you have achieved released Shine [zhi gnas] and remain in the continuation of this state, you have finally become a Dzogchen practitioner.

Prior to that point, one is merely working with relative states of mind. The relative knowing of the mind discussed in the beginning is simply the clarity of mind, i.e., the dualistic consciousness skandha that perceives objects such as stillness and movement.

MiphamFan said:
Gnas gyu shes pa is nothing other than dran pa, according to Nyoshul Khenpo.
Now, Jigme Lingpa unfolds the practice in more detail. As we have explained, the mind may be still, there may be thought movement, or there may be the noticing of stillness and movement. These are the only three things that can occur in the mind. Sometimes our mind is still for a while, and sometimes there will be the movements of thoughts such as desire or anger; there will be neutral, positive, or negative thoughts. At this time, the “knower” (rig mkhan) of stillness and movement is what is known as “mindfulness” (dran pa).
In the text you quote, ChNN refers to this as dran shes.

krodha wrote:
Correct, and that is the relative rigpa that we start with as beginners, however it is not the definitive view. The rigpa or "shes pa" that knows stillness [gnas pa] and movement [gyu ba] is still a relative knowing, it has not yet recognized the nature of mind or phenomena.

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche discusses the difference I am pointing out very clearly:

In the case of stillness [gnas pa], occurrence [gyu ba] and noticing [rig pa], the word rigpa is used for noticing. Self-existing awareness [rang byung rig pa] is also called rigpa. The word is the same but the meaning is different. The difference between these two practices is as vast as the distance between sky and earth.

Tsoknyi Rinpoche elaborates on his father's point:

This early stage of knowing or noticing whether there is stillness or thought occurrence is also called rigpa. However, it is not the same meaning of rigpa as the Dzogchen sense of self-existing awareness [rang byung rig pa].

Great masters traditionally give something called pointing-out instruction, which literally means bringing one face to face with one's true nature. What is this nature that is being introduced? A practitioner of shamatha who has cultivated a sense of stillness to the extent that there is no longer any dividing point between thought occurrence and simply resting experiences a certain quality of knowing or presence of mind. This knowing is what the practitioner is brought face to face with - or rather, the very identity of this knowing as being rootless and groundless, insubstantial. By recognizing this, one

is introduced to self-existing awareness, rangjung rigpa.

So here Tsoknyi Rinpoche is clear that there must be a recognition of the nature of the mind, or the mind's capacity to "know", in order for the true rigpa that is taken as the path [lam] to manifest. Prior to that one is merely working with a relative and afflicted knowing.

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche continues:

Being able to notice its thought-occurrence [gyu ba] and stillness [gnas pa] doesn't mean one knows the real nature of this mind. It is simply the ability to detect when there are thoughts and when there is not the presence and absence of thought. This is called 'knowing the character of the mind'. It is not knowing buddha nature.

Nyoshul Khenpo is describing that relative rigpa, which is a mere "presence" [dran pa] it is not wisdom [shes rab], because it does not know its state.

MiphamFan said:
The rigpa ChNN is teaching is recognition of the natural state, which underlies both stillness and movement:
You must understand that fundamentally all three states
are at the same level: the state of calm, nepa, is movement,
the state of movement itself, gyuwa, is calm, and rigpa is
pure recognition of your own state, that is present in both.

krodha wrote:
Yes, he is aiming at having the recognition of our state occur, but that is not what the rigpa he is initially discussing is. He even states on page 26 that the rigpa he is discussing is defined as "The recognition of the presence of this wave (of stillness and movement)." And in that same paragraph cites "nge-gyu-rig" a.k.a. gnas gyu rig, as in gnas gyu rig gsum, making the rigpa he is discussing, the gnas gyu shes pa.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 6:26 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
She directly quotes JLA there.

krodha wrote:
Is it Mutsuk Marro? I also trust her knowledge.

In any case. The vijñāna skandha in its afflicted dualistic form is not active in equipoise.

And from what I know thoughts do not arise in equipoise, the force of shes rab does not allow it. They begin to manifest once again in post-equipoise [rjes thob].

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 6:17 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
Thoughts can still arise in rigpa, they just do not condition the natural state. As long as we have a consciousness aggregate, we still have thoughts.

krodha wrote:
If you are resting in contemplation, the consciousness aggregate [vijñāna] is expressed as primordial wisdom or pristine consciousness [jñāna], and so the "consciousness aggregate" is not active for as long as that equipoise persists.

Also, the so-called "natural state" [gnas lugs] is technically only apparent once the aspirant has realized emptiness, so unless one has realized ka dag via tregchö or third vision, the natural state is not something they are truly familiar with.

In any case, I stand by my assertions. My opinion on the matter is not based on what I've read. And that being the case I don't really care if people agree or not.

MiphamFan said:
You should read Admin's posts in the "Body and Universe" thread on JLA's forum.

krodha wrote:
I trust JLA's knowledge, not sure about the Admin.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
These are just words, you know.

krodha wrote:
Sure, however what they are describing is not.

treehuggingoctopus said:
Some will say that in the definitive view there is both movement and stillness but they are non-dual

krodha wrote:
Correct, this is another way of saying that thoughts are non-arisen. In the definitive view stillness, movement and knowing are non-dual.

treehuggingoctopus said:
others that there is movement or stillness but they are seen as non-arisen, etc.

krodha wrote:
The non-arisen part would be correct, but this would rob the stillness and movement of validity. And in truth there are other factors at play that prevent movement (thought) from appearing altogether. That coupled with the fact that wisdom recognizes the nature of thought, make it nearly impossible to say there is simultaneously stillness, movement and a credible knowledge of their non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
I am not talking about the gnas gyu shes pa, you are just assuming that I don't know the difference between that and rigpa.

Why don't you ask ChNN if he is just teaching people gnas gyu shes pa instead of rig pa when he teaches using gnas pa?

krodha wrote:
I don't have to ask him, he clearly states in the text "Introduction to the Practice of Contemplation" that the rigpa he is referring to in that context, is the gnas gyu shes pa associated with the gnas gyu rig gsum.

In the definitive view there is no movement or stillness because thoughts are recognized to be non-arisen.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
That's exactly what I said.

He says the space between thoughts is gnas pa, not Dharmakaya as some people claim.

Elsewhere, for example, in Semde teachings, he teaches how to rest in rigpa with the experience of gnas pa.

Your original post claims that he says one cannot access rigpa in gnas pa, which is wrong.

krodha wrote:

It is not wrong. There are different uses of the term "rig pa". The rigpa that knows stillness (lack of thought) and movement (thought) is called gnas gyu shes pa, which is just a synonym for the clarity of mind. It is not the definitive rigpa that is synonymous with wisdom [shes rab].

When rigpa is presented as resting with stillness that is the relative rigpa of the gnas gyu rig gsum or "the trio of stillness, movement and knowing". In that context "rigpa" is simply being used to indicate "knowing"... but that species of rigpa is not wisdom.

Resting with that rigpa is a stepping stone and a necessary practice for most, but it is not the actual view.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 4:47 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
MiphamFan said:
What he says exactly is that he remembered coming across a translation which said that Dharmakaya is the space between thoughts and one should lengthen that span. He said that is very wrong.

Space between thoughts in itself is just experience of non-thought (what he calls experience of emptiness), one can of course also rest in rigpa in that experience, but that is not dharmakaya. It is more important to learn to rest in rigpa even when thoughts arise because thoughts arise all the time.

krodha wrote:
There are different uses of the term "rig pa". The definitive rigpa that indicates a knowledge of our nature would still be absent if we are encountering movement [gyu ba] and stillness [gnas pa]. The relative rigpa that knows those appearances is called gnas gyu shes pa and it is not the definitive rigpa that Dzogchen is pointing to. It simply represents the mere "knowing" faculty of the mind, but it is deluded. Here is the excerpt where Norbu Rinpoche discusses the space between thoughts:

Also, some teachers explain we have the experience of emptiness [gnas pa] between one thought and the next thought. Particularly if you are practicing shine [zhi gnas] and becoming familiar with it, you can remain for a long time without thought. Then a thought arises. In general there is always and empty space between thoughts. That is the same as the experience of emptiness [gnas pa], that condition is emptiness [stillness, non-thought], and many people say 'The space between thoughts represents dharmakāya. That's why you do shine. You make that space larger and larger; if you make that dimension without thoughts larger then you are in dharmakāya and you can attain realization'. That is a wrong teaching, it really means dancing on the books of teachings without having any experience of real practice.

That is not instant presence [skt. vidyā, tib. rig pa]. If you are not in instant presence

there is no possibility of realization. If you make that kind of emptiness larger and larger, maybe after your death it will make the cause for obtaining the dimension of samsara called no form [formless realm], a part of the deva realm. This is a higher state of the devas, they live for thousands of years without having any form. That's the fruit of that kind of practice, but when it finishes they go to hell, because all their merits are consumed. So that is samsara, not realization. You must not go in that direction.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 4:14 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
Kim said:
Whenever it is said that innermost awareness (which refers to rigpa in DL's quote) can be found between two thoughts, it is oversimplification. For a beginner or a seeker that is fine but to be exact it is not the case, as substrate consciousness is thoughtless. I believe this is the very reason why DL and Dodrubchen Rinpoche were of the opinion that making distinction between mind and awareness is difficult. Thoughts on this?

krodha wrote:
ChNN says the same thing: those who believe their nature is accessible in the space between two thoughts are individuals who are "dancing on books" without any real experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 7:56 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
conebeckham said:
Unlike, say, your blog, which reflects a complete lack of understanding of Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Yeah, terrible.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 1:34 AM
Title: Re: Ch. NN able to maintain only 3 seconds of natural state during daily life?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've heard Norbu Rinpoche make this point once or twice, but never with the specific time of "three seconds". Rinpoche simply said that even he is not able to remain in contemplation [ting nge dzin] at all times, so those who boast that they are resting in the natural state (a synonym for contemplation) at all times are not being honest with themselves and others, either purposefully or simply due to ignorance of what contemplation, or equipoise, actually entails.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Unity of Buddhas
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is "one" because the nature of my mind and the nature of your mind are not different, and the buddhahood that results from a total realization of that wisdom is not different.

But it is also not the same, in that we're sharing a single continuum or something. The idea of a transpersonal continuum is where one goes wrong with understanding unity in terms of dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 9:38 AM
Title: Re: Unity of Buddhas
Content:
tomamundsen said:
That website you are referencing, "What Buddhists Believe," is known to be authored by someone who maintains some fringe views on Mahayana Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
Their understanding and interpretation is "fringe" because they treat Buddhism like Advaita and dharmakāya like Brahman. That is where they are off in their comprehension.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 2:14 PM
Title: Re: Does practicing 4 visions in a lucid dream trigger something akin to bardo of dharmata?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Something akin" to the bardo of dharmatā will be encountered whether dreaming or awake.

These are things you should be asking your teacher about though.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 1:10 AM
Title: Re: How to drop effort
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:

Sure, that's great. It's a practical question though, not a puzzle or exercise in theory, since so many Dzogchen and Mahamudra teachings/teachers talk about this, clearly it is something important, i'm just wondering how people actually expereince this, and what their advice is.

Great stuff so far.

krodha wrote:
Effort is only abandoned while resting in the equipoise that results from a direct recognition of one's nature.

There is a saying, which states that the practitioner must chase the meditation until the meditation chases the practitioner. Until a level of familiarization is reached where the meditation chases the practitioner, effort is necessary (primarily on the outset and at times of post-equipoise). The more that instances of equipoise occur, the more the reality of effortlessness is experienced.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2016 at 10:21 AM
Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Whereas non-duality suggests 'a unity which is not an entity' - not 'one as opposed to two' but 'one' in the sense of being that from which multiplicity arises.

krodha wrote:
Though not in the context of Buddhism.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 27th, 2016 at 11:32 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
If you need Ju Mipham's words then you don't have the capacity for Tsongkhapa's Prasangika. Best then is to leave the Gelug forum. No problem, you understand? Just leave.

krodha wrote:
Bizarre logic and behavior.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia
Content:

BuddhaFollower said:
So what is the correct definition of Adi-Buddha?

krodha wrote:
Per Malcolm:

The so called adibuddha has an origin. He is called the adibuddha (first buddha) because he is the first sapient being to attain buddhahood in this world cycle, not because there is some primordial buddha who hangs out in eternal time without a beginning.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 12:34 AM
Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia
Content:
smcj said:
It's Wiki. You don't like it? Change it.

Boomerang said:
I don't know if I have the credentials for that. I was curious to know if the article is 100% wrong, or 50%, 25%...

krodha wrote:
An ape with a computer and internet connection has the credentials to edit Wikipedia.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 7:46 AM
Title: Re: Luke Wilson tells Jimmy Fallon he looks like Chögyam Trungpa
Content:
David N. Snyder said:
Is Luke Wilson a Buddhist? Or does he just like that book?

krodha wrote:
He randomly came across the book and bought it on a whim because the thinks the cover photo of Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche resembles Jimmy Fallon.

Seems he read some of it in the time between buying it and giving it to Jimmy.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2016 at 10:23 PM
Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style
Content:
krodha wrote:
My skepticism comes from critiques like this one, posted by Mutsuk on the vc forums.

The translation clearly contains errors that compromise the intended meaning of the original exposition, and I don't see how said errors can be explained away with the proposition that an ambitious "freestyle" rendering of the original text was the ultimate goal:

Mutsuk Marro said:
Dowman really does not understand an inch of correct classical tibetan grammar. Let’s take the first line of the opening quatrain of the Yeshe Lama homage (just after the single-line homage to Kuntuzangpo/Ö Mingyurwa). The Tibetan says :

gang gi rang bzhin nam mkha’i dbyings ltar chos nyid bsam gyi mi khyab pas

No big deal at all in terms of figuring out the grammatical meaning. Literally :

— gang gi = grammatical artifice (see below)
— rang bzhin : nature
— nam mkha’i = sky + genitive case (= of the sky)
— dbyings = space
— ltar = like
— chos nyid = reality (dharmatâ)
— bsam gyis mi khyab pas = inconceivable ; lit. not grasped by thoughts.

Dowman renders that as :

The nature of every experience is like the vault of the sky,

Grammatically, « gang gi+whatever » is a classical construction which refers either to what comes before (in the present case the short homage to Kuntuzangpo/Ö Mingyurwa, that was understood by Sangye Khandro, although her rendering does not follow the structure of the text which is a first initial homage followed by a first quatrain of homage) or to the main object of the homage which is the same Kuntuzangpo appearing as the Primordial Protector in the last line of the quatrain. That is very classical. Dowman thinks that gang gi refers to « every » something and has to add « experience » to make some(?) sense while « experience » is nowhere to be found in this line.

Then the « vault of the sky » : the tibetan says : nam mkha’i dbyings which is literally the space (dbyings) of the sky (nam mkha’) simply or lazily rendered in some dictionaries as « space » when it’s actually a little more than space. In any case there is no trace of a vault in the original.

The worst in all that is that he links « inconceivable reality » (chos nyid bsam gyis mi khyab pas) to the next line, not either understanding the grammar of that next line.

So the line — which could be rendered as « (You) whose nature similar to celestial space is the inconceivable reality » or anything similar provided 3 elements are taken into account : 1. you know that the line (and the whole quatrain) is addressed to someone (in this case Kuntuzangpo, which means you understand the grammatical role

of gang-gi), 2. you understand that this someone has a nature which is space-like, and 3. you understand that this someone is (or has a) reality which cannot be grasped by thought — is rendered by Dowman as something which has practically no link to the original.

Indeed, I don't see any of these 3 sense-bearing or meaningful (in the sense of full of a precise meaning) elements in Dowman translation. And without exaggerating, it is like this throughout the work.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2016 at 10:30 AM
Title: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style
Content:
krodha wrote:
The following is a message Dowman wrote to Lama Tony Duff, after Duff challenged the accuracy of Dowman's translations:

Dear Tony, me ole fruit, rather than slag you off as they do in the the asuric bar-rooms of the lha ma yin, I would like to bring to your notice the English that most of speak, which is a flexible, fluid, impressionistic language, and the English that most of us try to write, which has at least seven levels of ambiguity, each level of meaning invoked by nuances of word choice and juxtaposition. Dzogchen texts likewise have levels and levels, and individual syllables and words cannot be pinned down fascistically with a single english meaning. To the contrary, context requires that a wide variety of synonyms and close synonyms are at hand to express the subtleties of the mystical verbal expression of Dzogchen.

So there seem to be at least two quite distinct ways of translation; the mechanistic literal method that provides a mirror image of grammar and syntax and uses the same equivalent word in every context, and the interpretive free method that seeks to invoke a cloudburst of invocative meaning in poetic english prose. The former requires a rationalistic code, similar to the one that you have designed, which the reader needs to become familiar with to gain full benefit; the latter hopes to stir a congruous impression that stimulates equal sentiments. Just look at Cleary's translations of Chan and Taoist texts from the Chinese – they demonstrates the interpretive method at full throttle.

There is little point in detraction of one methodology by the other – they are as dissimilar as chalk and cheese – and, ok, sometimes neither of us gets it spot on. But although we may talk to different audiences don't we both have the same aim?
You may note that I have left this group – I don't see much Dzogchen or self-release going on here, more like Trumpish politics...

How does everyone feel about this idea of "two quite distinct ways of translation"? I personally do not see the point of an "interpretive free method", as in the case of Dowman's efforts, this allegedly intentional "loose style" often seems to lose the meaning the original text intends to convey. Curious to hear what others think.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 15th, 2016 at 4:08 AM
Title: Re: Questions for hoseholders
Content:
Kunga Lhadzom said:
Can the MOD'S please correct the title of this thread ...."hoseholders" sounds perverted....

krodha wrote:
I laughed when I saw that and was surprised it took this long for someone to mention it.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 3:15 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2
Content:
mossy said:
the night before the california primary, the media calls it for hillary and declares her the nominee before the "super delegates" vote. this is why i am glad we don't use "super delegates" in our primaries. no democrat will have the required amount of pledged delegates by the time the convention rolls around. so technically she IS NOT the nominee till the "super delegates" vote. i don't know how this is acceptable to democrats, the corruption is undeniable. if old bernie stays in the convention will be fireworks, can't wait.

krodha wrote:
Statement from the Sanders campaign:

It is unfortunate that the media, in a rush to judgement, are ignoring the Democratic National Committee's clear statement that it is wrong to count the votes of superdelegates before they actually vote at the convention this summer.

Secretary Clinton does not have and will not have the requisite number of pledged delegates to secure the nomination. She will be dependent on superdelegates who do not vote until July 25 and who can change their minds between now and then. They include more than 400 superdelegates who endorsed Secretary Clinton 10 months before the first caucuses and primaries and long before any other candidate was in the race.

Our job from now until the convention is to convince those superdelegates that Bernie is by far the strongest candidate against Donald Trump.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
thats the way its supposed to be but theres reams of buddhists running around who think emptiness is the ultimate reality.

krodha wrote:
Seems you think emptiness just means one decides not to have a view about phenomena or things in general.

If this is the case you are incorrect.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 3:51 PM
Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
Emptiness is a metaphysical view which can be useful as a metaphysical therapy (think of it as a metaphysical "auto destruct"), but eventually must be abandoned lest it make you "incurable".

krodha wrote:
Emptiness only becomes an "incurable" principle if one fails to experientially realize emptiness and instead clings to emptiness in an inferential or intellectual manner.

Meaning if one grasps at enumerated ultimate truth without realizing the visceral awakening of unenumerated ultimate truth. One would then be "incurable".

gad rgyangs said:
Dependent arising, on the other hand, is a physical, not a metaphysical,

krodha wrote:
It can apply to either context.

gad rgyangs said:
theory which arose in the past and has long been replaced by other theories (most recently by relativity, quantum physics etc), which will themselves eventually be replaced by other theories.

krodha wrote:
What? This makes no sense at all and demonstrates a lack of understanding regarding dependent origination.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 8:24 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
This pair, samsara and nirvana, do not exist.
However thorough knowledge of samsara is nirvana.
this can only mean that thorough knowledge that the proliferations "samsara" and "nirvana" are nothing but proliferations is release from proliferations.

krodha wrote:
It means nirvāna is a total cessation of cause for the arising of samsara (the cause of samsara being ignorance [avidyā]).

Avidyā is uprooted via a recognition of the nature of samsara. With said recognition comes a knowledge of the nature of samsara, hence "a thorough knowledge of samsara is nirvāna".

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also having issues.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: vidyadhara of longevity and immortal embryo
Content:
krodha wrote:
Four vidyādhara levels:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Four_vidyadhara_levels

Seems you might be talking about a tshe dbang rig 'dzin or a "Vidyādhara with Power over Life".

It says that according to Longchenpa, this type of Vidyādhara is a yogin who has reached the path of seeing [first bhūmi].

From the link, Khenpo Ngachung states:

Those who have the ability to purify the ordinary body with the fire of concentration and transform it into a subtle body acquire the power of immortal life and are called vidyadharas with power over life.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 10:30 AM
Title: Bhaviveka on Samkhya and Vedanta: New Book In The Works
Content:
krodha wrote:
New book due out in January 2017:

Bhaviveka on Samkhya and Vedanta: The Samkhya and Vedanta Chapters of the Madhyamakahrdayakarika and Tarkajvala

Synopsis:
For anyone interested in an epoch of almost unrivaled intellectual activity and debate in India, the sixth-century Madhyamakahrdayakārikā along with its auto-commentary, the Tarkajvālā, is an indispensable resource. This partly doxographical treatise, composed by the Madhyamaka philosopher Bhāviveka, is the earliest and most substantial work to present and critically examine Śrāvaka, Yogācāra, Sāmkhya, Vaiśesika, Vedānta, and Mīmāmsā in great detail. Bhāviveka's text is of unique value in its attempt to identify a Madhyamaka approach to other schools of philosophy as well as in furnishing us with valuable information regarding early Indic systematic philosophy, including what appear to be extracts from original sources that are otherwise unavailable. Most probably it served as a Madhyamaka debate manual for those engaged in discussion with representatives of opposing philosophical schools. Bhāviveka's treatment of Sāmkhya and Vedānta is of particular importance because of the scarcity of sources pertaining to the early formation and development of these systems of philosophy. The present book includes a critical edition and English translation of the Sāmkhya and Vedānta chapters of the Madhyamakahrdayakārikā and Tarkajvālā along with a historical introduction.
About the Author:
Olle Qvarnström is Professor in the Centre for Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Lund, Sweden.

https://www.amazon.com/Bhaviveka-Samkhya-Vedanta-Madhyamakahrdayakarika-Tarkajvala/dp/0674088492

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion
Content:
Malcolm said:
My Bad, it was Dorje Pizza that was being given the smack down, not Jax (but he has the same idea...)

krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc did gave Jax a brutal smack down in Jax's yahoo group some years ago. Maybe you are remembering that.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 2:45 AM
Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion
Content:
tingdzin said:
I too would like to hear some documentation of the claim that Lopon Tenzin Namdak disapproves of Tenzin Wangyal's books.

krodha wrote:
Fairly certain the main documentation is Jean-Luc's blog post(s) regarding the khyab rig issue.

Khyab rig, the pervading knowledge and it's real meaning:
https://khyungmkhar.blogspot.com/2012/06/khyab-rig-pervading-knowledge-and-its.html?m=1

Khyab rig, revisited:
https://khyungmkhar.blogspot.com/2012/07/khyab-rig-revisited.html?m=1

Khyab rig continued:
https://khyungmkhar.blogspot.com/2012/07/khyab-rig-continued.html?m=1

Khyab rig, the final word from Drenpa Namkha:
https://khyungmkhar.blogspot.com/2012/07/khyab-rig-final-word-from-drenpa-namkha.html?m=1

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 2:07 AM
Title: Re: Fear or apparitions?
Content:
krodha wrote:
What do the apparitions do? Out of curiosity.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 4:15 AM
Title: Re: ye shes and jalus
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
What is a good english translation of the word Yeshe?
Timeless awareness is a bit repetitive.

krodha wrote:
Wisdom. Primordial wisdom. Pristine consciousness.

Ye shes is jñāna in Sanskrit.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 4:48 AM
Title: Re: Bardo of death may be a problem for becoming lucid
Content:
krodha wrote:
Though not pure land, I know in Bönpo Dzogchen for example, there are specific "landmarks" in one's practice that must be reached, otherwise there is not much hope of maintaining lucidity in the bardo of death or recognizing the bardo of dharmatā.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?
Content:
florin said:
No.The text addresses those who dont understand.And those who dont understand are practitioners like us. Those practitioners are represented by Sattvavajra.
Therefore we have 3 sections.
1.Developing prajna through study
2.Developing prajna through reflection
3.Developing prajna through meditation.
So again whoever tells you that it is only about the basis in itself without any instructions aimed at practittioners that want to practically apply the principles of section 1 and 2 is mistaken.

krodha wrote:
The point is that the absence of cultivation, progress, stages, accumulations, applications, purifications, paths etc., is only partially representative of Dzogpachenpo.

Like when Mipham delineates between the mode of reality [gnas tshul] and the mode of appearances [snang tshul].

In the context of gnas tshul there is no cultivation, progress, stages, accumulations, applications, purifications, paths. But in the context of snang tshul there is cultivation, progress, stages, accumulations, applications, purifications, paths.

There must be a balance in view, otherwise we cling to the idea of our nature and err into nihilism in negating cultivation, progress, stages, accumulations, applications, purifications, paths.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?
Content:

florin said:
For now this is what i want to do.I feel great inspiration reading and studying these texts and my understanding of dzogchen has somewhat improved.Anybody who is familiar with them knows concretely the depth and the vast scope of these texts.

krodha wrote:
Then wouldn't you agree that it is important to note that the kun byed rgyal po is merely one facet and not the entire picture?

And moreover, because the text in question really only addresses the basis... the apparent absence of cultivation, progress, stages, accumulations, applications, purifications, paths etc., in the teachings of the kun byed rgyal po is only because the basis does not require these things.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 12:25 AM
Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?
Content:
florin said:
Well sometime i use the language people understand.
But words like "cultivation", " progress" "travel through stages", " accumulations", "applications" , "purifications", "paths" etc....have no place in the teachings of KG.

krodha wrote:
And why limit yourself to only the teachings of the kun byed rgyal po? Which as pointed out before, only addresses the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?
Content:

Malcolm said:
Rongzom states:

If is asked, "Do characteristics exist or not in appearances?," [...]

tomamundsen said:
Where is this from? Looks like a worthwhile read...

krodha wrote:
The text is called The Black Snake.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 3:08 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2
Content:
krodha wrote:
Sanders' statement on the primaries today:

I congratulate Secretary Clinton on her victories tonight, and I look forward to issue-oriented campaigns in the 14 contests to come.

“I am proud that we were able to win a resounding victory tonight in Rhode Island, the one state with an open primary where independents had a say in the outcome. Democrats should recognize that the ticket with the best chance of winning this November must attract support from independents as well as Democrats. I am proud of my campaign’s record in that regard.

“The people in every state in this country should have the right to determine who they want as president and what the agenda of the Democratic Party should be. That’s why we are in this race until the last vote is cast. That is why this campaign is going to the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia with as many delegates as possible to fight for a progressive party platform that calls for a $15 an hour minimum wage, an end to our disastrous trade policies, a Medicare-for-all health care system, breaking up Wall Street financial institutions, ending fracking in our country, making public colleges and universities tuition free and passing a carbon tax so we can effectively address the planetary crisis of climate change.”

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 12:53 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2
Content:
krodha wrote:
Bernie isn't out of this race right yet, especially if he slays in California, which he very well might.

That said I also have no interest in giving Hillary or Trump my vote, so count me out of this poll as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Clarity
Content:
krodha wrote:
This description from Tsoknyi Rinpoche is fairly clear:

Sometimes I say emptiness in the clarity and sometimes emptiness in the appearance. These mean exactly the same thing because emptiness is emptiness in each case and because the clarity part and the appearance part come down to the same meaning. Clarity is the knower and appearances are what it knows.

Now, when we do not know this emptiness and appearance we stay in duality and staying in duality we are confused. The definition of confusion is: "Not directly seeing the actuality of things."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 3:21 AM
Title: Re: The Perfectly Imperfect Beyond Perfection/Imperfection (Zen) Buddha
Content:
jundo cohen said:
"Buddhahood" in most of the Zen traditions is something one already has and is but simply may not realize, not something we become.

krodha wrote:
You mean all sentient beings possess an innately unconditioned Buddha nature. That isn't a view exclusive to zen.

That said, no Buddhist view says sentient beings already possess "buddhahood".

Buddha nature and buddhahood are two different things.

jundo cohen said:
One might say that this is an "otherworldly" kind of immanent Buddhahood,

krodha wrote:
It isn't. The idea of Buddha nature is standard fare for Mahāyāna systems.

jundo cohen said:
We are perfect Buddhas all along,

krodha wrote:
True, but meaningless unless we discover that perfect nature and become familiar with it through practice.

jundo cohen said:
Because of this, attaining the "Bhumis" was not treated in quite the same way as in other corners of the Mahayana. There is nothing to attain that has not been attained all along, no need of improvement because nothing lacking.

krodha wrote:
This is the same for all Mahāyāna. The bhūmis aren't "attainments".

What is lacking is a knowledge of your nature.

jundo cohen said:
Even the "perfection of Buddhahood" might be a kind of "perfection of Emptiness" which transcends small human judgments and distinctions of "perfection vs. imperfection". Even all the seeming imperfections of Samsara are now witnessed as shining inherently in the light of Buddha, and the "imperfections" truly are not just "imperfections" when newly seen as the Perfection and Purity of Buddha that sweeps in all small human measures of "perfection vs. imperfection, pure vs. impure, etc".

krodha wrote:
The people you "teach" must eat that rhetoric up. I'm not impressed.

jundo cohen said:
It is late here, but I will provide some more detailed sources and quotes.

krodha wrote:
To be blunt, I wouldn't bother. You aren't bringing anything original or novel to the table that deviates from the standard Mahāyāna view at all. I don't think you understand the nuances involved with my argument.

jundo cohen said:
Oh, and Shikantaza is not about attaining Jhana, but just sitting in and as the total completion of Buddha.

Gassho, Jundo

krodha wrote:
"Jñāna" not "jhana".

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 3:00 AM
Title: Re: The Perfectly Imperfect Beyond Perfection/Imperfection (Zen) Buddha
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
The whole "Awakening to instant buddhahood" (which is not just a Zen concept) seems to overlook the fact that the person that seems to us to just "get it" out of the blue, has probably spent immeasurable previous lives practicing and struggling to reach this outcome in this present life.

krodha wrote:
In addition to this point, which I agree is overlooked, it is said that there hasn't been a practitioner like that for centuries.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 12:47 PM
Title: Re: Was denied recorded teachings, thoughts and emotions run wild
Content:
krodha wrote:
Honestly, that is a bit strange they wouldn't share the recordings with you. Especially since you've been attending the meetings in person.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 1:47 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
you cant mix and match: you can either say the mind and the willow tree in the garden both exist, or you can say that they both don't exist, but you cant say there is a thing called "mind" which has certain qualities, but the thing called "the willow tree in the garden" does not have those same qualities and is only a projection. thats simply blatant mindism, AKA reification. Im not saying the willow tree in the garden has a mind or rigpa, just that it has the same qualities (empty and spontaneously present) as your posited minds. And the basis of both of them, and everything else, is what is called gzhi in Dzogchen parlance. This gzhi is not the mind, nor is it the willow tree. It is not emptiness, clarity, or in the inseparability of emptiness and clarity. It is no "thing", nor is it "nothing", but when an empty and clear mind discovers it, that mental event is called rigpa.

krodha wrote:
You view the gzhi like a Vedantic purusa.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas
Content:
krodha wrote:
Awakening to instant buddhahood is essentially unheard of

Astus said:
from http://global.sotozen-net.or.jp/eng/library/key_terms/pdf/key_terms04.pdf:

the Sotoshu doctrine is to realize (joto) shikantaza (just sitting) and sokushin zebutsu (the mind itself is Buddha).
In “Gakudo Yojinshu” (“Points to Watch in Practicing the Way”), joto is explained by Dogen Zenji as follows:

Joto (realizing) is to directly realize Buddhahood with this body-mind. In other words, it is not to change the former state of body-mind into some other special state but just to

follow the realization of the other (one’s teacher). It is called jikige (right here) or joto.

The fundamental Sotoshu teaching is that of realizing Buddhahood through shikantaza and sokushin zebutsu in each moment. Therefore sokushin zebutsu, as well as shikantaza, is a very important term and a basic teaching for Soto Zen Buddhists.

krodha wrote:
This is just a colorful way to state that "buddhahood" as such, is an inborn quality, within one's "body-mind", and isn't to be acquired elsewhere. Pretty standard fare.

In my opinion, that passage isn't saying that one awakens to fully omniscient buddhahood in one fell swoop. Just that the reality of what buddhahood entails is directly encountered through awakening [bodhi].

But we may have to agree to disagree.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas
Content:
krodha wrote:
The bodhisattva path begins with the direct realization championed by Dogen.

Astus said:
Where is that assertion from? Dogen is fairly clear that zazen is complete enlightenment.

"The zazen I speak of is not meditation practice. It is simply the dharma gate of joyful ease, the practice-realization of totally culminated enlightenment."
(https://web.stanford.edu/group/scbs/sztp3/translations/gongyo_seiten/translations/part_3/fukan_zazengi.html)

krodha wrote:
Right, this just means zazen is technically resting in equipoise — a direct knowledge of dharmatā.

The first instance of bodhi is a complete awakening, but it is not fully omniscient buddhahood.

This idea that sentient beings are able to miraculously awaken to fully omniscient buddhahood in one fell swoop just because they practice zen is wholly unrealistic. The path does not dictate the capacity of the practitioner.

Awakening to instant buddhahood is essentially unheard of. I'm not sure where the idea that this is the case for zen practitioners, or any practitioners for that matter, originated from. A misreading of the principle texts, I would argue.

"Practice-realization" is simply resting in jñāna, which is unsteady and intermittent until the time of buddhahood.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 10:07 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Speaking from experience doesn't require speaking about experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 9:59 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
OK good. so when you are perceiving the inseparability of emptiness and clarity, do you have the concurrent understanding "this is all there is"?

krodha wrote:
I'm not about to sit on an online public forum and discuss personal insights.

If you gave questions about experiences, insights and realizations you should ask a qualified teacher.

In this thread we've been discussing view, which is fine. Discussing experiences and insights is something different entirely.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 9:49 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
have you experienced any of this or are you just playing with words?

krodha wrote:
I don't speak about things I haven't experienced.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 9:29 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
the inseparability of clarity and emptiness is not the basis, it is the roadsign pointing to

the basis.

krodha wrote:
Stong gsal dbyer med is the definition of the basis.

The basis is the unrecognized nature of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 9:16 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
krodha wrote:
The "experience of emptiness" [gnas pa], (which is ChNN's terminology) is just a calm mind with no movement of thought. It is a relative state that can be achieved through śamatha practice and so on.

The "realization of emptiness" [stong pa nyid], that marks the first bhūmi is something completely different.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 8:10 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
krodha wrote:
The three types of phenomena that manifest on the path are non-thought or gnas pa (what Rinpoche has translated as "emptiness"), clarity and bliss.

He is warning not to grasp at that phenomena, or mistake it for something definitive, because doing so will cause one to deviate from the path.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
ChNNR sez:
those who are interested in the Ati Dzogpa Chenpo teaching and follow its principle must first of all train earnestly in separating nature of the mind, or instant presence, from mind. The principal reason for the need for this separation is to avoid the deviation and error that can occur when most practitioners apply the practice on the path, i.e. that of mistaking experiences such as emptiness or clarity for our real nature.
So: our real nature is beyond emptiness and clarity. That is the basis, and direct knowledge of that is rigpa.

krodha wrote:
When ChNN says "emptiness" in that context he means gnas pa, which is "non-thought", "stillness" etc.

He doesn't mean emptiness as in śūnyatā [stong pa nyid].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:03 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
you cannot impute something which neither exists nor does not exist.

krodha wrote:
Right, because there is no such thing.

gad rgyangs said:
you can, however, impute multiple minds or bases,

krodha wrote:
Correct, which the system of Dzogchen does.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
"mind" is an imputation, a conceptual proliferation.

krodha wrote:
As is everything, including the basis. Which is why we can state that there is a nominal diversity of minds and bases.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 1:39 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
Malcolm said:
We don't need to discuss these things in terms of the two truths, because there is no separation between the two truths anyway.

krodha wrote:
Though I think bringing up conventional diversity was apt in the sense that gad rgyangs is struggling with the idea of universals and particulars.

Despite the fact that the two truths have no place in Dzogchen, it is still true that particulars are allowed a conventional/nominal status, while simultaneously being completely unreal.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 9:37 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
im not a fan of the two truths metaphor in general, but i find it particularly unhelpful when discussing the Dzogchen view.

krodha wrote:
Since the two truths are merely species of cognition, they map to avidyā [relative] and vidyā [ultimate].

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 8:09 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
if you pick one side of a duality, that is called "dualism vision".

krodha wrote:
Dualistic or "karmic" vision is simply the afflicted perception of conditioned entities that results from ignorance [ma rig pa].

But dualities and diversities are accepted conventionally in Dzogchen... and the only reason they are not accepted ultimately is because conditioned entities are byproducts of delusion that are fundamentally unreal.

gad rgyangs said:
"Universal" and "particular" are such a duality

krodha wrote:
Particulars are allowed a conventional status, while universals are not.

gad rgyangs said:
as is "sameness" and "difference"

krodha wrote:
Again, the basis is not the "same" because there is a conventional diversity of minds. The basis is not "different" because it is expressed the same way in each conventional instance.

Like the heat of a flame, or the wetness of water.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 7:42 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
Dzogchen talks about the kun gzhi, but I dont think that is what Malcolm is referring to. He is referring to the concept that the basis is universal for all sentient beings, which he rejects, and insists that each sentient being has its own basis.

krodha wrote:
Right, each sentient being has its own basis.

gad rgyangs said:
As I already said, you can accept or reject both concepts but picking one over the other falls into one or the other of the two limitations that ChNNR mentions in the quote I posted.

krodha wrote:
An individual basis does not fall into either of the two cited limitations [sameness or difference] for the reasons I stated above.

A universal basis is rejected, outright.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
krodha wrote:
The only time the term "universal basis" ever appears in Dzogchen, is as a translation of kun gzhi, which is the conditioned, afflicted basis of delusion which stores traces, and is synonymous with ignorance [ma rig pa].

But that is something entirely different from the idea of an unconditioned, universal a.k.a. transpersonal basis that you are advocating for.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 6:37 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
Conversely, you can say that the universal basis and the individual's basis are non-dual.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what "universal basis" you are referring to, since there is no such thing in Dzogchen, or any Buddhist system for that matter.

gad rgyangs said:
Finally, you can say they are both language and culture bound metaphors pointing to the nature of reality which is beyond all description.

krodha wrote:
This is akin to stating that the word "sweet" doesn't capture the direct, non-conceptual experience of the taste of sugar. It is a point that goes without saying and has no bearing on the topic being discussed.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 6:29 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
you can say "there is no universal basis" as long as you also say "there is no individual basis"

krodha wrote:
Individual bases are accepted conventionally.

A universal basis is not accepted at all, even conventionally.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 6:20 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
in Longsal 4 he says ... [Edit]

krodha wrote:
Right, our natures are not different because they are expressed identically in each unique instance, yet at the same time they are not the same because there is a conventional diversity of minds, each endowed with their own dharmatā.

This is because the basis, or nature of mind is a generic characteristic, like heat. Heat is not different because it is expressed identically in each instance of fire. Yet it is not the same because each distinct instance of heat is a separate and unique expression.

This is why dharmakāya is free from being one or many [and free from sameness and difference].

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 6:05 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
Of course, but when you say (earlier in the thread) "There is no universal basis in Dzogchen", you are reducing the view to psychology. Its not that there is a "universal basis" in addition to our own bases, it is that there is only one basis, and it is beyond all characterization. You can say it is "nature of mind" if you want to be metaphorical, but then you can also say its the willow tree in the garden. Both make about as much (and as little) sense. As ChNNR says, the nature of the individual is the same as the nature of the universe. He does not say there is only the nature of the individual and no nature of the universe, as that would be solipsism.

If you say that you have your own basis and I have my own, and everybody has their own, then you are left having to explain what is the relationship between these "bases" and, in fact, you need to explain what is the "basis of these bases?", otherwise you have a bunch of self-existent monads floating around each with its own basis. Surely that is not what you are proposing?

krodha wrote:
Each mind has its own basis [nature].

There is no such thing as a singular, transpersonal, universal basis in Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas
Content:
Astus said:
So, in terms of goal, they likely agree. In terms of method, however, there is the difference between the gradual stages of the bodhisattva taught by Nagarjuna, and the direct realisation taught by Dogen.

krodha wrote:
The bodhisattva path begins with the direct realization championed by Dogen.

The bhūmis and paths simply convey a decrease in karmic obscuration and an increase in omniscience. Something a Zen adherent would also experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:00 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:
conebeckham said:
So, all experiences can be adequately linguistically expressed?

Herbie said:
yes.
conebeckham said:
Please adequately express the taste of honey to me,

Herbie said:
"tastes like honey"

krodha wrote:
Herbie, this is absurd logic.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
If rationality is the only capacity needed, perfect!

krodha wrote:
You've demonstrated that your definition of "rationality" is truly anything but rational.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
Theoretically, but this thread shows something different.

krodha wrote:
No thanks to you.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)
Content:
jundo cohen said:
I put forth possible questions from the whole universe, all of reality and then some. So, you choose from all that. I leave it to you. Please correct me.

krodha wrote:

You haven't put forth any sort of statement to be debated.

jundo cohen said:
You said on another thread that you thought I would be "systematically dismantled".

krodha wrote:
Yes, absolutely.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)
Content:
jundo cohen said:
Hmmm. No takers? I did not think that debating a little Zen fellow would be that scary!

krodha wrote:
You'll have to put forth an argument if you want anyone to engage.

Believe it or not people around here do not seek out debate, debate simply arises because incorrect views need correction and more often than not, those who require correction generally have no interest in going quietly.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 3:58 PM
Title: Re: Non Duality, its Function and Practice.
Content:
jundo cohen said:
...I intend to open a thread here in the "Open Forum" regarding which aspects of peoples explanations of Tibetan practice I consider to be "gibberish" and "pseudo-Buddhism "

krodha wrote:
You'd be systematically dismantled in such a brutal manner... would be hard to watch.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 11:59 AM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow
Content:
Caodemarte said:
Similarly, if you separate "ignorance" and "wisdom" into rigid separate, opposed, real categories (except by acknowledging that you are doing so artificially and conventionally for ease of speaking) you are not following a Mahayana Buddhist path.

krodha wrote:

This is inaccurate.

Ignorance is an absence of wisdom, and vice versa. Even experientially, the mode of ignorance is vastly different than the mode of wisdom.

Separating ignorance and wisdom is not a view that contradicts Mahāyāna, or any Buddhist system for that matter, in any way.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 11:50 AM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow
Content:
jundo cohen said:
As Dogen famously wrote ...
...And yet, if there is a hairsbreadth deviation, it is like the gap between heaven and earth.

krodha wrote:
The operative sentence.

jundo cohen said:
... Saving All Sentient Beings though Beings Numberless (and, anyway, what "Sentient Beings" in need of saving??)

krodha wrote:
The rest of what you wrote is just regurgitating basic insights from the prajñāpāramitā, but not even well... as you seem to err towards nihilism.

Negating ignorance and the need to remove obscurations is simply grasping at ultimate truth, which is cause for a nihilist view.

Errors and deviations in view that beginners make.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Lukeinaz said:
Sure, it's probably the object to be negated for a child that thinks there is actually a moon in the puddle.

krodha wrote:
Due to our ignorance, we are actually much like children who think there is actually a moon in the puddle. However for us, this error applies to all phenomena.

Lukeinaz said:
Krodha, do reflections not appear to you?

krodha wrote:
An appearance manifests, yet I know there is no existent dharma present there. In the same way appearances manifest for a Buddha, yet a Buddha knows there are no dharmas present anywhere.

Lukeinaz said:
I am definitely missing the point so could you please fill me in.

krodha wrote:
The point of evoking the example of a reflection is to demonstrate how an appearance can manifest yet at no time actually create or serve to establish an actual entity. The appearances that constitute our so-called reality are the same way, yet we fail to recognize this.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
conebeckham said:
He is arguing that there is a reflection of the moon in water.
He's not taking the position that the reflection is the moon--merely that reflections, in water or in mirrors, exist because they are percieved and cognized.

krodha wrote:
Yes, a nonsensical position in my opinion... as fixating on the reflection itself completely misses the point.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Tsongkhapafan said:
You must be kidding! Ask any person 'do reflections exist?' and they will say 'yes'. Why? Because they apprehend them with their valid cognizers. This is the very definition of existing, an object of valid cognition.

krodha wrote:
So according to you there is actually a moon in the water. Again, you'd be hard pressed to find anyone who would agree.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 8:31 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Tsongkhapafan said:
Of course reflections exist. Cone and Malcolm don't think that they do though...

krodha wrote:
You'd be hard pressed to find anyone (apart from yourself it seems) who believes reflections exist.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 3:13 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
Either you dwell in irrationality of Nagarjuna or you apply Tsongkhapa's rationality.

krodha wrote:
You can't be serious.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow
Content:
krodha wrote:
The point being made is that people are kidding themselves if they think they are resting in equipoise at all times, as only Buddhas do so.

Anders said:
actually, 7th stage bodhisattvas are in fulltime in that department.

krodha wrote:
From my understanding, 7th stage bodhisattvas have eradicated the afflictive obscuration and therefore have influence over birth. But that does not necessarily mean they are in non-regressive equipoise.

That being said I've also read of vidyādharas who have completely intermingled equipoise and post-equipoise, so I'm open to being incorrect that only Buddhas rest in equipoise at all times.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:
Matt J said:
What about the viewless view?

There are plenty of such discussions of philosophy in Zen. Even by modern Soto Zen masters, such as Tenshin Reb Anderson, Steve Hagen, and Taigen Dan Leighton.

krodha wrote:
The "viewless" view is equipoise.

The point being made is that people are kidding themselves if they think they are resting in equipoise at all times, as only Buddhas do so.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 4:35 PM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
...the first and only philosopher who transformed the inconsistent writings of Nagarjuna and others into a rational philosophy

krodha wrote:
You can't be serious.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:44 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Awakening [bodhi] is sudden in every system.

The real controversy and question is regarding sudden, omniscient buddhahood.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:41 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
krodha wrote:
If Hongzhou wants to pretend otherwise... not my problem.

tomamundsen said:
Eh, but the Ch'an forum is a place for people to discuss stuff like Hongzhou Ch'an. Generally on this Ch'an sub-forum, these are valid Buddhist teachings.

krodha wrote:
That's true, I'm just curious as to whether these allegedly unrealistic expectations and requirements set forth for aligning with such a system are legitimate.

There are Indian and Tibetan systems which also promote the "immediate", "no path" structure, but when it comes down to it they aren't literally saying they produce instant and omniscient Buddhas.

Does Hongzhou really claim this? Or are they being misunderstood?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
krodha wrote:
*Double post

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:02 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
Temicco said:
With bodhi comes recognition of the emptiness of obscurations;

krodha wrote:
That is not how it works, unfortunately.

Temicco said:
How so? You'd be hard-pressed to find any Hongzhou source saying that there's anything to do after bodhi. How are you saying it works?

krodha wrote:
In the end it doesn't really matter what Hongzhou says. If they want to pretend they have a thriving lineage of what Tibetans refer to as "cig car ba" that's on them... nice fantasy.

The condition of sentient beings is what it is, the cause for arising and cessation of obscurations is what it is.

If Hongzhou wants to pretend otherwise... not my problem.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:

Temicco said:
With bodhi comes recognition of the emptiness of obscurations;

krodha wrote:
That is not how it works, unfortunately.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
Temicco said:
But in Hongzhou Chan, it's asserted that no matter what your path is, awakening is always complete and in a flash.

krodha wrote:
Awakening [bodhi] occurs in a flash in every system. Bodhi is not buddhahood.

Temicco said:
They thus do say that it's incredibly rare. In what way is there still affliction to exhaust or more work to do?

krodha wrote:
Bodhi just means one has awakened to recognize dharmatā, but is not a removal of the two obscurations.

Temicco said:
I know of no Hongzhou text that supports that idea. The school leaves no room for people of lower or middling capacities;

krodha wrote:
Then it isn't a school at all, but rather just a club for cig car ba's. Not very realistic or reasonable.

Temicco said:
it's the one school I know of which doesn't even really support expedient means. Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi or bust

krodha wrote:
There hasn't been a practitioner of that ability for centuries... and that being the case I'm not sure how Hongzhou can pretend they have a lineage (this is, if your definition is accurate, which it most likely isn't).

You might very well be misunderstanding Hongzhou.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 1:16 AM
Title: Re: Path to Buddhahood in Chan/Zen
Content:
Temicco said:
I would have to disagree with the last few posts -- this isn't Dzogchen we're talking about. I'm principally aware of Hongzhou teachings, so perhaps there are other Chan doctrines which differ, but there is no post-enlightenment work in Hongzhou Chan. Huangbo repeatedly asserts that a single tacit understanding is all that is needed -- "in a single flash you attain to full realization." Linji says that "if you can attain true insight, clear and complete, then, indeed, that is all." There is no residual karma to exhaust; recognition of the nature of mind entails not only ending production of karma but also understanding karma's groundlessness. And besides, having things to do (i.e. post-enlightenment practice) seems antithetical to the teachings.

krodha wrote:
There's always more to do after initial awakening, always affliction to exhaust, etc... those who awaken directly to fully omniscient buddhahood are rarer than stars in the daytime.

Whether the system is Hongzhou Chan or any other doesn't matter. The system does not dictate the capacity of the individual or how ripe they are in terms of awakening. One cannot say that just because someone practices X path they therefore do not have residual karma to exhaust and so on... it doesn't work that way.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: Does the World Vanish?
Content:
krodha wrote:
This is also spoken of in the lower tenet systems, though not as explicitly of course. Take Nāgārjuna for example:

The object of knowledge in dream is not seen when one awakes. Similarly the world disappears to him who is awakened from the darkness of ignorance. The creation of illusion is nothing but illusion. When everything is compound there is nothing which can be regarded as a real thing. Such is the nature of all things. As the figments of a dream dissolve upon waking, so the confusion of Samsara fades away in enlightenment.
- Mahāyānaviṁśikā

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 9:31 AM
Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.
Content:
krodha wrote:

This:
Malcolm said:
One might argue that Buddhology is just such a kind of surgery, but in general, in surgery, the surgeon has to be interested in saving the patient, and in the case of people like Jayarava, etc., I see no such interest at all. They merrily hack away at the body of Dharma, trying to remove what they perceive to problems and inconsistencies, blind to the problems and inconsistencies they themselves are introducing —— this is, in all cases, because they have not received a proper education in Dharma, and properly followed a master. There is no one more sad than a putative Dharma practitioner who has no master.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.
Content:
Jeff H said:
I spent some time reading Jayavara's article today, and I'd like to respond specifically to that. It helps me clarify my own thoughts on karma.

krodha wrote:
We already thoroughly established the last time you visited this forum that you don't understand Nāgārjuna, don't understand the two truths, don't understand pratītyasamutpāda, and therefore don't understand karma.

Jeff H said:
I was not here for the previous exchange that Krodha refers to, but I think Jayavara poses an interesting point here which deserves some discussion.

krodha wrote:
The gist of it involved Jayarava deciding that the two truths were untenable (in some whimsical fantasy he is living in) and then proceeding to blame Nāgārjuna once his expositions no longer make sense due to Jayavara's own butchering.

Jayarava gets roasted in the thread, which can be found here:

http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=102&t=18846

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 8:07 AM
Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.
Content:
Wayfarer said:
As I said above, and in this I agree with Jeff H, where I think belief in karma is deleterious is when it is used to rationalise misfortune or assign blame. It easily morphs into fatalism and indifference ('oh, it's their karma').

krodha wrote:
Karma, even in the context you are referencing, wouldn't correspond to the idea of fatalism because the role of intention [cetanā] is not negated.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 11:33 PM
Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.
Content:
Jayarava said:
Nāgārjuna notices this problem, but solves it by asserting that none of the components of the equation (actor, action, consequence) have any reality so that karma is an illusion, like a city of Gandharvas.

krodha wrote:
We already thoroughly established the last time you visited this forum that you don't understand Nāgārjuna, don't understand the two truths, don't understand pratītyasamutpāda, and therefore don't understand karma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:
conebeckham said:
When someone says homosexuality is a "lifestyle choice," I'm sorry, but I just stop taking anything they say seriously.

krodha wrote:
Agreed.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:16 AM
Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Was it holotropic?

krodha wrote:
There's a high probability you might be on some psychotropics asking a question like that.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Possibly of interest: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shit_stick

krodha wrote:
I was at your boo Pema Khandro's spot the other night for a friend's memorial service.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 6:23 AM
Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
smcj said:
Have you taken a look at it? It's not Madhyamaka.

krodha wrote:
It is Mahāmudrā.

And even then, does not deviate from the intention of Madhyamaka.

smcj said:
I've been trying to make the point lately that terms mean whatever the author in question wants them to mean

krodha wrote:
Words and principles can take on different meanings depending on context, sure. Still tathāgatagarbha does not indicate a gzhan stong view in contexts other than gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 5:02 AM
Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
smcj said:
As I said, there is controversy regarding the authorship. However it is not conceded by all parties to be two different authors.

krodha wrote:
Which doesn't matter. If some people want to believe that Ācarya Nāgārjuna was hundreds of years old that's on them, but doesn't make rational sense when it comes down to it.

smcj said:
The Karmapas have been Shentongpas. They may have each put their individual spin on it, but they were variations on a theme. Plus Brunnhölzl makes it clear that the

Tathagatagarbha is Shentong in the quoted text.

krodha wrote:
The point is that the Dharmadhatustāva is not a gzhan stong text, if gzhan stong pas want to put their spin on it and interpret it as such, that's fine, but their interpretation is not indicative of the intention of the text. Also, tathāgatagarbha does not equal gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
smcj said:
In the aforementioned Nagarjuna text... it is interpreted in a Shentong way.

krodha wrote:
You're really reaching there.

smcj said:
Not according to the translator Brunnhölzl. It's completely different than Nagarjuna's other works, hence the school of thought that someone else actually wrote it.

krodha wrote:
That is because the Siddha Nāgārjuna wrote it... not Ācarya Nāgārjuna.

Still, it has nothing to do with gzhan stong and is pretty standard fare as far as views on emptiness and the nature of mind/reality go.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...
Content:
smcj said:
In the aforementioned Nagarjuna text... it is interpreted in a Shentong way.

krodha wrote:
You're really reaching there.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 9:00 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
The only reconciliation is in experiential equipoise.

...which is beyond words completely, rendering any way of presenting it as defective. So it becomes a matter of preferred approximation, doesn't it?

krodha wrote:
Which again, is not the point. And yet this goes for anything, even describing the taste of sugar.

In the end the issue I took was the suggestion that because wisdom is considered to be truly established in gzhan stong, that it is ok to then approach and view other principles such as tathāgatagarbha, dharmadhātu, cittatā, etc., as also truly established regardless of context.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 8:44 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Imperialistic intentions rooted in perennialist aspirations are what's controversial.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 8:42 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
If Shentong doesn't sit well with somebody, that's ok. It should not even be controversial on the level of discussion.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong isn't controversial at all.

It is what it is, in its own context.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The point isn't whether these teachers have gzhan stong interests in the context of sūtra, which is the only context it is relevant.

Gzhan stong has nothing to do with Dzogchen, and approaching Dzogchen from the standpoint of gzhan stong and trying to filter it through that position will only obfuscate Dzogchen, same goes for gzhan stong.

A lot of people feel the need to establish some sort of perennialism with views, even within the buddhadharma, and this makes for problems. Gzhan stong should be allowed to be gzhan stong, Dzogchen allowed to be Dzogchen, there's no need to import one into the other, or reconcile the two.

The only reconciliation is in experiential equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 8:17 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
conebeckham said:
You should look up the Karmai Nyingthink, Krodha.

krodha wrote:
The Karmai Nyingthig is the Karma Kagyu Dzogchen cycle? Like the Yang Zab is to Driking?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
I think perhaps if the discussion were narrowed down to specifically the Karma Kagyu view as pertains to Dzogchen, then I think it would probably be appropriate.

krodha wrote:
Last time I checked the Karma Kagyu has nothing to do with Dzogchen. And the only Kagyu sect that has Dzogchen, the Drikung, tows the standard line as far as view. They do not step outside of the traditional Dzogchen presentation.

conebeckham said:
You should look up the Karmai Nyingthink, Krodha. Dzogchen has been a part of Karma Kagyu lineage since at least the 3rd Karmapa's time, when this Nyingthig lineage was revealed. And, frankly, Karma Pakshi was definitely familiar with Dzogchen, and even Milarepa knew a thing or two about Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Yet do they warp the view of Dzogchen and filter it through a gzhan stong lens, like smcj is suggesting?

In the end it is smcj's gzhan stong imperialism that is the issue.

The concept of context appears to be lost on him.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 7:56 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The idea that the nature of mind and dhatu (spacious expanse or element), dhatu and awareness, clarity and emptiness, bliss and emptiness, dharmata, and tathāgatagarbha have absolute and true existence is not a controversial position given that such a position has no doctrinal basis whatsoever and is merely a colorful theory of your own design.

conebeckham said:
Not really. There was a whole school of Buddhist thinkers who argued for the absolute existence of mind. But you knew that, right?

krodha wrote:
I know that the fact that parikalpita ends up as an existent principle in Yogācāra is true, but I'm not sure if that is the intention of Yogācāra, or moreso a consequence of their model.

I get that gzhan stong states that the three kayas are truly existent and fully formed from the very beginning, an absurd view in my opinion, but this does not mean one can take that view and project it onto other principles, that was my point. That doing so would be reckless and an error not doubt.

Not even I am doing that. I don't agree with gzhan stong, but I would never project Dzogchen or Prasanga onto gzhan stong... smcj was suggesting that doing the reverse is acceptable.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
I think perhaps if the discussion were narrowed down to specifically the Karma Kagyu view as pertains to Dzogchen, then I think it would probably be appropriate.

krodha wrote:
Last time I checked the Karma Kagyu has nothing to do with Dzogchen. And the only Kagyu sect that does have Dzogchen, the Drikung, tows the standard line as far as view. They do not step outside of the traditional Dzogchen presentation.

smcj said:
Also Dudjom R.'s presentation of Dzogchen is the "Great Madhyamaka" view.

krodha wrote:
No, it isn't.

Again, gzhan stong is not "great Madhyamaka" I get that you like to call it that because it makes you feel more secure in your allegiance to gzhan stong, but gzhan stong is not mahamadhyamaka, as has been demonstrated numerous times.

Secondly, Dudjom Rinpoche may have preferred gzhan stong in the context of sutra, but he never conflated it with Dzogchen.

smcj said:
Other teachers and schools will disagree.

krodha wrote:
Not likely since it is a non-issue from the very start.

smcj said:
However if practitioners from various schools and views can all accomplish the result, then how important is it to subscribe to a view on this at all?

krodha wrote:
That isn't the point.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 7:42 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
On the next page he gives a list of synonyms: non-dual Wisdom Mind, the Clear Light (prabhasvara) Nature of Mind and dhatu (spacious expanse or element), dhatu and awareness, clarity and emptiness, bliss and emptiness, dharmata, and tathagatagarbha. So I guess you could say that since all those terms refer to the same thing, that they are all considered to have "absolute and true existence".

krodha wrote:
One can conclude many things, however that particular conclusion would no doubt be reckless and disastrous.

smcj said:
I'd prefer to characterize it as controversial.

krodha wrote:
The idea that the nature of mind and dhatu (spacious expanse or element), dhatu and awareness, clarity and emptiness, bliss and emptiness, dharmata, and tathāgatagarbha have absolute and true existence is not a controversial position given

that such a position has no doctrinal basis whatsoever and is merely a colorful theory of your own design.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
On the next page he gives a list of synonyms: non-dual Wisdom Mind, the Clear Light (prabhasvara) Nature of Mind and dhatu (spacious expanse or element), dhatu and awareness, clarity and emptiness, bliss and emptiness, dharmata, and tathagatagarbha. So I guess you could say that since all those terms refer to the same thing, that they are all considered to have "absolute and true existence".

krodha wrote:
One can conclude many things, however that particular conclusion would no doubt be reckless and disastrous.

smcj said:
Anyway Khenpo Tsultrim's presentation is pretty much the current Karma Kagyu position. Plus Khenpo Tsultrim relates it to Dzogchen too.

krodha wrote:
Given that he clearly sings a different tune when he teaches Dzogpachenpo, as he should, your suggestion that his gzhan stong position applies to Dzogchen is unfounded.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:
smcj said:
It's a Karma Kagyu term used in their Shentong teachings.

krodha wrote:
Wisdom-mind is just another term for wisdom [tib. ye shes, skt. jñāna]. All Buddhist traditions teach of jñāna, it isn't a "gzhan stong thing" or a "karma kagyu thing" anymore than it is part and parcel to any and every other system.

Wisdom isn't being contested, but rather its status as "existent".

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 4:04 AM
Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?
Content:

smcj said:
However, as a Shenotongpa, I can say that the "Wisdom Mind" exists since it is not subject to Madhyamaka deconconstruction.

Right?

krodha wrote:
If your so-called "wisdom mind" exists then it is conditioned by definition, and therefore isn't much of a "wisdom mind".

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 10:56 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
rachmiel said:
While much attention has been devoted to explaining the nature of the ultimate truth in view of its special soteriological role, less has been paid to understanding the nature of conventional truth, which is often described as "deceptive," "illusion," or "truth for fools. But conventional truth is nonetheless truth.
Thanks for bringing this to my attention, Wayfarer. The Cowherds, eh? They should start a band ...

krodha wrote:
A conventional truth is something that can be relied upon to appear consistent as long as it is not investigated. When investigated it cannot withstand scrutiny, because it is merely inferential. Not sure how one would conclude that such a thing is "nonetheless truth".

Water moons, mirages and images in dreams are not found to be true when investigated, conventional inferences are likewise not true when investigated.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 10:23 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
rachmiel said:
I understand. But I am wary of dismissing conventional truth as somehow "less than" ultimate truth. I don't think that's what Buddha had in mind when he came up with the two truths.

krodha wrote:
The "two truths" are relative and ultimate. Conventional truth is a subset of relative truth, but is not technically one of the two truths. The two truths are species of cognition.

Conventional truth is simply the nominal titles that are attributed to alleged "things".

Conventions can also be things like gestures, customs, ethics, esthetic tastes, norms and standards, rules, laws, fashion, language as a whole, teachings and traditions, etc. but even in the context of the two truths, relative truth is merely the appearance of conditioned entities which are byproducts of ignorance, and conventions are secondary designations that are then imputed onto those allegedly conditioned entities.

rachmiel said:
Here's how I see it, based on my emptiness studies:

Things exist, both conventionally and ultimately.

krodha wrote:
Again, a "conventional truth" is something that appears to be valid yet cannot withstand ultimate analysis. If something cannot bear ultimate analysis, meaning: it cannot be found when sought, then the idea that such a thing "exists" in any sense of the notion is nothing short of a fantasy.

And since so-called "ultimate truth" is a cognition of the non-arising of the allegedly conditioned entities which manifest due to our delusion, the idea that something exists ultimately is also untenable.

rachmiel said:
Conventionally things appear to exist from their own side, i.e. inherently.

krodha wrote:
What you mean to say is that from the standpoint of so-called relative truth, conditioned entities appear to be established, i.e., existent. And therefore the conventional designations that are imputed onto said entities are mistaken as referring to truly established persons, places, things, etc. Meaning, the designation "car" appears to actually refer to an object.

rachmiel said:
Ultimately, things exist interdependently, i.e. not inherently.

krodha wrote:
Per Nāgārjuna, "interdependence" a.k.a. "dependent existence" [parabhava] is merely a guise for true or inherent existence [svabhava].

Ultimately things are free from extremes, they are not "interdependent".

rachmiel said:
I'm inclined to avoid using the term "real" because it's so loaded and means different things to different people. "Things" or "existents" are also loaded, but less so, for me in any case.

krodha wrote:
"Real" is fairly straightforward. When you perceive an object and believe it to be actually

existent i.e., "actually there", then you believe it to be real. Like a person who mistakes a rope in a dark room to be a snake, they mistakenly believe there is a snake present there, and that snake is real. When they eventually realize that the snake is a rope, they realize that the snake was unreal from the very beginning. That is what "real" and "unreal" mean in the context of Buddhism.

rachmiel said:
The trick, as I see it, is to not see conventional and ultimate truth as incompatible

krodha wrote:
Ultimate truth is the inability to find the objects that conventions infer the existence of. When the imputation "car" is realized to not actually refer to anything, because there is truly no car there, and never has been, that is "ultimate truth".

rachmiel said:
rather two ways of looking at the same thing, and finally perhaps ... as one way.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what this "same thing" would be, the two truths are certainly not two ways to look at a common referent.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 5:24 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
rachmiel said:
I don't think he was saying that conventional existents aren't real, rather that they exist conventionally, i.e. that they are impermanent and dependently arisen.

krodha wrote:
The very definition of a "conventional truth" in Buddhism is something that appears to be valid as long as it is not subjected to keen scrutiny, i.e., something that seems legitimate but cannot ultimately bear analysis (seems and appears being the operative terms). Which means so-called conventional existents are never real.

To a deluded mind, a conventional truth appears to be a substantial referent, however from the standpoint of wisdom that same convention is known to be a mere insubstantial inference.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 3:34 AM
Title: Re: China announces list of “verified living Tibetan Buddhas
Content:
krodha wrote:
In what can only be described as an odd, if not cynical, move by the self-avowed atheist

government of China, a new list of “verified living Buddhas” or tulkus, reincarnated Buddhist masters, has been published in Chinese and Tibetan languages at http://hf.tibet.cn/.

dzogchungpa said:
Did Berkeley's favorite tulku, Pema Khandro Rinpoche, make the cut?

krodha wrote:
I get that you're being humorous, again that's all well and good and I'm all for it... but in all seriousness I'm not sure why you'd want to associate her name with China's garbage propaganda list, even for the sake of levity. Keep in mind that some people may not understand the politics behind this list, and do not realize that it is an example of the Chinese Government's oppression over the Tibetan people and their desperation to tarnish Tibetan Buddhism via dilution.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
rachmiel said:
Nagarjuna does not afaik assert that there are no existents, rather that we misunderstand HOW existents actually exist (interdependently). I'm calling "how existents actually exist" reality.

krodha wrote:
For Nāgārjuna, so-called "existents" do not even exist interdependently. As pointed out elsewhere, there is no "inter" in pratītyasamutpāda [dependent co-origination].

What originates dependently does not ultimately originate at all, per Mañjuśrī, Nāgārjuna, Candrakīrti, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 2:06 AM
Title: China announces list of “verified living Tibetan Buddhas”
Content:
krodha wrote:
In power grab from the Dalai Lama, China announces list of “verified living Buddhas” for Tibetan Buddhism:

http://www.patheos.com/blogs/americanbuddhist/2016/01/in-power-grab-from-the-dalai-lama-china-announces-list-of-verified-living-buddhas-for-tibetan-buddhism.html

In what can only be described as an odd, if not cynical, move by the self-avowed atheist government of China, a new list of “verified living Buddhas” or tulkus, reincarnated Buddhist masters, has been published in Chinese and Tibetan languages at

http://hf.tibet.cn/. The purported role of the site is to inform citizens about the “real” high lamas and teachers, complete with ID numbers and monastery listings. The site, known as Rinpocheonline, is said to list 870 authentic Rinpoche’s (an honorific title meaning ‘precious one’ given to tulkus).

Vice president of China’s Buddhist Association, President of the Tibetan Branch of China’s Buddhist Association and 7th Drukhang Rinpoche Drukhang Thubten Khedrup, said that the query system going online is an important step for China’s Buddhist Association to promote religious education and further standardize matters related to reincarnation of Rinpoches.

He further added, in recent years some fraudsters have been posing as Rinpoches in Tibet and inland China, harming the interests of believers and ruining the reputation of Tibetan Buddhism. Now that there is a Rinpoche query system, net users can check to see if a Rinpoche is genuine or not, which will help protect the legitimate rights and interests of Tibetan Buddhism. It will also help promote community awareness of Tibetan Buddhism and Rinpoche groups.

- via Online query system launched, 870 Rinpoches can be verified: http://eng.tibet.cn/news/1453104700898.shtml

Russia Today posted an article quoting one Rinpoche from the list praising the initiative:

“As a living buddha, I feel genuinely happy about it,” said the 7th Drukhang living buddha Drukhang Thubten Khedrup, vice president of the Buddhist Association of China (BAC) at the launch ceremony.

However, critics rightly point out that it is yet another step by the central government toward attempting to control Tibetan Buddhism, which is soaring in popularity throughout China today, and to assert its right to choose the next Dalai Lama. The BBC reports:

However, the spiritual cataloguing scheme has already been criticised as a means of further controlling Tibetan affairs. “This living Buddha database and the whole policy toward reincarnation is clearly a pre-emptive move by the government to control what happens after this Dalai Lama,” Amnesty International’s Nicholas Bequelin told Time magazine in December 2015, when the list was first announced. It’s also seen as a means of confirming state choices for other religious appointments.

Tenzin Gyatso, the 14th and current Dalai Lama, is – according to Buddhist belief – a reincarnation of a past lama who decided to be reborn again to continue his work. He has been based in India since fleeing Tibet after the unsuccessful 1959 uprising. In 1995, both he and Beijing appointed different boys as Panchen Lama, the second most important role in Tibetan Buddhism. Now aged 25, China feted the lama on the 20th anniversary of his enthronement in December, presenting him as the one, official holder of the role.

China’s government last November reasserted its “right” to choose the next Dalai Lama, saying that reincarnation “has never been purely a religious matter or to do with the Dalai Lama’s individual rights; it is first and foremost an important political matter in Tibet and an important manifestation of the Chinese central government’s sovereignty over Tibet” and that “whoever has the name of Dalai Lama will control political power in Tibet... For this reason, since historical times, the central government has never given up, and will never give up, the right to decide the reincarnation affairs of the Dalai Lama.”

Meanwhile the Dalai Lama, who celebrated his 80th birthday in 2015, has continuously maintained that his reincarnation is his own personal right.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 1:44 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
Bakmoon said:
Could you explain what you mean here in some more detail? Are you saying that there is a noumena beyond phenomenal existence which produces phenomena, but that this noumena is itself unknowable?

rachmiel said:
Yes. I'm borrowing the terms (phenomena, noumena) from Kant, but it's obviously not HIS idea ... many others have said more or less the same thing. Plato, for example: All we can see/know are the shadows on the cave walls, not that which casts the shadows. What I'm saying, in essence, is that we do not create reality from scratch. We co-create it by detecting shadows of "what's really out there" and then interpreting these shadows as this or that.

Malcolm said:
This definitely does not correspond with Madhyamaka view. In Madhyamaka view, there is no reality.

krodha wrote:
Not that I personally buy into the idea proposed above, but for the sake of discussion: what Buddhist view would even correspond to this idea of a noumenon "beyond phenomenal" appearances? True aspectarian?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 8:35 AM
Title: Re: Removing Obscurations
Content:
krodha wrote:
The emotional obscuration is sustained by kleśas, which can only be exhausted by the force of prajñā.

Astus said:
All obscurations are eliminated by wisdom.

krodha wrote:
The point is that only Buddhas are free of the knowledge obscuration. Only Buddhas see dharmakāya.

Astus said:
there are different causes, and hence cessation of different causes to be rid of either obscuration.
"In general, whatever is an afflictive obscuration is necessarily a cognitive obscuration, but cognitive obscurations are not necessarily afflictive obscurations."
(Groundless Paths, p 575)

krodha wrote:
Again, the point is that you can eradicate kleśas and be free of the emotional obscuration, but the knowledge obscuration will remain until buddhahood.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 6:06 AM
Title: Re: Removing Obscurations
Content:
Malcolm said:
See the Abhisamaya-ālamkara, etc.

Astus said:
Then it is the mistake of the grasper-grasped, the not seeing of the emptiness of appearances, just as already defined. Therefore once attachment is relinquished, no more obscurations remain of either kind.

krodha wrote:
The emotional obscuration is sustained by kleśas, which can only be exhausted by the force of prajñā. Bodhisattvas on the stages can be free of the emotional obscuration, but the knowledge obscuration is not uprooted til buddhahood.

The kleśas are not involved with the knowledge obscuration. So there are different causes, and hence cessation of different causes to be rid of either obscuration.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 8:38 AM
Title: Re: What is faith?
Content:
smcj said:
That's why the practices don't work for us.

krodha wrote:
Since this seems to be a reoccurring theme in your posts as of late, I must ask, why would you assume that practices do not work for westerners?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 8:28 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
conebeckham said:
http://www.elizabethmattisnamgyel.com/tag/shentong/

Having a direct experience trumps all philosophical constructs.

smcj said:
Thats' the real Karma/Shangpa Kagyu position on all this.

conebeckham said:
Indeed. And, I venture to guess, the Nyingma position as well.

krodha wrote:
And Buddhism in general for the most part.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 4:52 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
smcj said:
Here's another story from the old days.

Deshung R. (a very highly regarded Sakya master) was at our center. At one of his teaching there was a man that claimed to be part of a Nyingma family lineage from southern Russia and thus a Dharma teacher. (I have no opinion on his claim.) So even though he claimed to be a Vajrayana teacher he could not speak Tibetan. He had some students and asked the translator to ask Rinpoche something to the effect of, "Some etherial being (I don't remember if it was a mamo or rakshasas or whatever) is messing with my student's minds. What should I do to drive him off?" The translator refused to translate it, saying, "They aren't real. They're just upaya. They are of the nature of emptiness. They are the same nature of your own mind." etc. He gave all the normal dialogue that you here western Buddhists tell each other, so that they can dismiss any idea of etherial figures as fantasy. But the Russian insisted, so the translator finally said, "Oh, alright." But much to his surprise when he asked Rinpoche about it, Rinpoche said, "Ah yes, he's been making trouble with my student's minds too. In order to get rid of him you need to do such-and-such puja on these certain days of the month" and gave very specific instructions on how to deal with this creature.

Just saying'...

krodha wrote:
This and the other example you gave above regarding supplication to the dharmapālas are examples of trust in the testimony of reliable persons and witnesses [śabda pramāṇa].

We have "faith" in the testimony of realized or experienced yogins who have had contact with these beings, or have visited places such as purelands and so on. Which can be referred to as "faith" in a very loose sense, but is arguably something more along the lines of trust and confidence in the information provided by realized or experienced individuals.

Just as when you are lost in a new city, you can have trust and confidence in the directions and information that you receive from a resident who knows the lay of the land. You have "faith" in their directions in the sense that you can trust the information provided. This is different than blind faith, and different from the species of faith that you appear to be advocating for.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 2:54 AM
Title: Re: Kuntu Zangpo
Content:
Mother's Lap said:
Samantabhadra never reified the display as other, his ignorance was merely neither knowing it nor not knowing it as self-display.

http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=37861#p37861

krodha wrote:
Going by Malcolm's definition in the thread you have linked, Samantabhadra did indeed initially mistake his own display as other.

The definition of innate ignorance:

Malcolm said:
When the basis arises out of the basis, i.e. when the five lights of wisdom are stirred by vāyu after the shell of the youthful vase body is rent there is a neutral awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan] that does not recognize itself. That simple non-recognition is the innate ignorance.

krodha wrote:
Samantabhadra possessed innate ignorance:

Malcolm said:
Most people do not realize that Samantabhadra initially possessed the first ignorance.

He never possessed the second.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 2:41 AM
Title: Re: Kuntu Zangpo
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Thanks for your reply.

Indeed last mentioned example / explanation is just that what i meant.
Have difficulties like always , to understand that which is never born and pure of the beginning and what did not got attached by dualisms etc. would have dispelled something.

I saw it untill now always as unborn and pure in the State abiding etc.
So i am very much intersted in how something perfect etc. has to dispell etc.
I guess that that dispelling has more to do with sentient beings like us who have to "develop" etc.
We have to dispell that is very clear to me.

KY

krodha wrote:
I only meant "dispelled" in the sense that Samantabhadra initially failed to recognize the appearances of the basis [gzhi snang] as his own self-display [rang snang] and mistook them to be external appearances [gzhan snang], so when he finally did recognize the appearances of the basis to be his own, he "dispelled" the delusion associated with mistaking them to be external appearances.

We as sentient beings are different because we have innate ignorance and imputing ignorance, along with the buildup of affliction and traces that we incur through our conditioning.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 11:35 PM
Title: Re: Kuntu Zangpo
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
The section concludes with the assertion that Kuntu Zangpo is the cause or reason for the existence of primordial Buddhahood (de ni ku n tu bzang -po ye sangs-rgyas-pa'i gtan - tshigs-so), because from the very beginning He has understood and, therefore, He has never been mixed up in Samsara.

krodha wrote:
Samantabhadra never possessed the imputing ignorance [kun brtags] and therefore

never entered samsara.

kalden yungdrung said:
In other Dzogchen texts did i read, Kuntu Zangpo did reached Enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
Samantabhadra did initially possess the innate ignorance, which is failure to recognize the appearances of the basis as one's own display. However he dispelled that delusion and successfully recognized his appearances as his own prior to engaging in the process of imputing self and other (imputing ignorance) which is the beginning of samsara.

Perhaps that is the difference you are asking about?

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Three_kinds_of_ignorance

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
krodha wrote:
Since the real guru is your nature, the essential meaning of guru yoga of the white A is resting in a "real knowledge of one's primordial state [aka the basis]."

smcj said:
Does that make ChNN the unreal guru?

krodha wrote:
He is the outer guru [phyi'i bla ma].

Depending on the cycle there can be various types of guru yoga, outer, inner, secret, innermost secret, etc., but in general the outer guru is always the lama who gives ngo sprod or direct introduction.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 8:02 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
smcj said:
Funny, I thought his advice was to practice the "guru-yoga of the AH" (which I think would make and interesting thread).

Guess not. Oh well.

krodha wrote:

Since the real guru is your nature, the essential meaning of guru yoga of the white A is resting in a "real knowledge of one's primordial state [aka the basis]."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 2:39 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
smcj said:
I guess that is why ChNN stresses the development of devotion in the Guru Yoga, right?

krodha wrote:
For ChNN, "devotion" boils down to interest. If you have interest in the teachings then that is the type of "devotion" that is important and beneficial. Apart from that he has said that devotion, in the usual way we think of it, can actually be a hinderance.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 3:22 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
smcj said:
Along the same lines Dudjom R. has said that when speaking about emptiness from an intellectual understanding Madhyamaka is best, but when speaking about it from an experiential perspective Great Madhyamaka (Shentong) is best.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong is not "Great Madhyamaka", really wish you would listen to what people say and stop referring to it as such.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 9:26 AM
Title: Re: Alex Jones
Content:
Myoho-Nameless said:
...conspiracy nonsense

krodha wrote:
An extremely blanketed and unbalanced attitude to adopt.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 2:27 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagharba = Shentong
Content:
sherabpa said:

Except that for Kongtrul, Rangjung Dorje was a zhentongpa, as well as others including Longchenpa, and I believe he was not unaware that their views were not entirely identical in all aspects.

smcj said:
Good thing this thread is in the Kagyu forum.

Do you have a source/citation for the Rangjung Dorje/Longchenpa position?

krodha wrote:
There's no source for Longchenpa being a gzhan stong pa, since he championed Prasanga Madhyamaka to be the definitive sūtra view in numerous places.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
florin said:
I dont really understand this quote.
I think it needs some work.

krodha wrote:
It is discussing the two sides of Dzogchen that you told me were nonsense.

(i) The side of the sentient being, the Dzogchenpa, a.k.a., the mode of appearance [snang tshul]. And (ii) the side of your nature, Dzogchen, which is the mode of reality [gnas tshul].

The quote makes perfect sense if both of those aspects are understood properly.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 1:29 AM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
Malcolm said:
Thus, florin and krodha are both correct. Florin is correct from the point of view of mode of reality [gnas tshul], kyle is correct from the point of view of the mode of appearances [snang tshul] for sentient beings.

krodha wrote:
Thanks. Although I suppose my gripe is that I'm willing to (and strive to) account for both sides of the equation (mode of reality and appearances) whereas Florin is solely clinging to the mode of reality and declaring that the mode of appearances is irrelevant and "not Dzogchen", which is essentially nihilism.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 7:12 PM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
florin said:
Namkhai Norbu said numerous times that the highest form of purification is resting in instant presence.
But this is not to say that this should involve some kind of additional effort or activity on our part while resting.
So if this is the highest form of purification i dont see th need to reinterpret what rinpoche has said and say" no...no we actually need to do more " and so on

krodha wrote:
Which is all well and good, but how long can you rest in that knowledge? That is the issue being discussed. As a beginner we have no knowledge of our state at all, and even once recognition occurs our view is unstable and fluctuates between equipoise [mnyam bzhag] and post-equipoise [rjes thob]. This is due to afflictive obscurations, as Jigme Lingpa describes here:

Vidyā [rig pa] as it is explained on the path is still accompanied by impure influences of subtle energy and mind, leading to the distorted states of ordinary mind [sems] and mental events. Because one's recognition of vidyā is thus contaminated and burdened, one can truly rest in vidyā only from time to time.

And this is the entire point I am making in regards to obscurations and afflictions. While resting in contemplation there is no issue, however contemplation does not become stable until karmic tendencies are diminished and ideally eradicated via the force of prajñā. Which means that equipoise i.e., contemplation is intermittent for a beginner, and even great masters may not rest in contemplation at all times. Only Buddhas rest in a direct and unobstructed knowledge of their nature at all times. And along with having omniscience, a Buddha is a Buddha because s/he has completely exhausted all affliction.

From Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:

Purification happens through training on the path. We have strayed from the basis and become sentient beings. To free the basis from what obscures it, we have to train. Right now, we are on the path and have not yet attained the result. When we are freed from obscuration, then the result - dharmakāya - appears.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 6:51 PM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:

florin said:
Spot on Magnus.
That is the core of it all.

krodha wrote:
Still, recognition of your nature is not buddhahood, which was the primary point of disagreement.

The first instance of recognition is simply awakening [bodhi], and from there one must refine one's knowledge [rig pa] through familiarization. Stability in the view must come about through dispelling obscurations such as habitual karmic tendencies. Granted these obscurations are divested and self-liberated effortlessly through resting in a direct knowledge of dharmatā, but just as in common Mahāyāna: the two obscurations (emotional and cognitive) must be uprooted for buddhahood to occur, and buddhahood does not occur prior to that.

As Khenpo Ngachung states here [per Malcolm]:

In any system of sutra or tantra, without gathering the accumulations and purifying obscurations, Buddhahood can never be attained. Though the system of gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations is different, in this respect [dzogchen] is the same.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
The primary disagreement I was referencing essentially concerned whether exhaustion of affliction is involved at all in Dzogchen.

It goes without saying that our nature is self-perfected and originally pure, meaning it is incapable of being afflicted, but affliction still arises due to non-recognition of that nature... and must be completely removed before so-called buddhahood occurs.

The individual I was talking with said the idea that afflictions must be removed to actualize buddhahood is a view of the causal tenet systems, but I respectfully disagree and do not see a contradiction between exhausting afflictions and Dzogchen being non-gradual.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
heart said:

Dzogchen is the path of self-liberation, that means that any kind of position, any kind of concept is self-liberated. That certainly include the afflictions.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
I agree. Yet self-liberation would merely be the way affliction and obscuration (for example) are naturally dispelled, this still implies that Dzogchen involves exhausting affliction.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 6:24 AM
Title: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
The following statement from Śrī Siṃha (which was translated and shared by Malcolm some time ago) was recently the subject of some discussion and disagreement between a fellow DW forummer and I:

This is acceptable since a so called “primordial buddhahood” is not asserted. Full awakening is not possible without being free of the five afflictions... It is not possible for wisdom to increase without giving up afflictions. Wisdom will not arise without purifying afflictions.
-- Śrī Siṃha

While I see this quotation as representative and indicative of the Dzogchen path, the aforementioned individual I was interacting with is convinced that the above statement is not representative of Dzogchen and that Śrī Siṃha was most likely giving an exposition to a group of aspirants involved with lower and causal yānas.

In any case a discussion ensued regarding the nature of obscuration and affliction in Dzogpachenpo, and what it means to be involved with the path of Dzogchen in the sense of dispelling affliction and habitual karmic tendencies. I figured it would be more fruitful if moved to a forum such as this.

To offer some questions for discussion: how should we view obscuration and affliction in Dzogchen? Is Śrī Siṃha's insight indicative of the path of Dzogchen or is it completely unrelated?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 21st, 2015 at 4:55 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Vasana said:
This is something I'm struggling with at the moment. Wouldn't a persona l basis by

definition entail reifying a person, subjective-agency or self-existing referent? I'm sure it ties in to your current signature.

krodha wrote:
The basis is conventionally personal.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 19th, 2015 at 5:40 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Matt J said:
Actually, SMCJ, Lopon Tenzin Namdak promotes a shentong view in the context of Dzogchen. Perhaps for another thread...

krodha wrote:
Lopön Tenzin Namdak holds Prasagika to be correct sūtra view, according to Jean-Luc Achard. This topic came up on his forum and he said Lopön Rinpoche does not uphold a gzhan stong view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
He is discussing the ground without the minds of any beings present whatsoever--either sentient or enlightened. That is transpersonal.

krodha wrote:
No he is discussing the nature of mind [sems nyid], which is not found separately from a mind [sems].

Like Malcolm has pointed out numerous times before, the term "ground" and variations of it like "ground of being" etc., are incorrect translations and incredibly misleading.

A basis without any mind present whatsoever is akin to positing a wetness without any liquid present whatsoever.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 2:04 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
...the basis is not sems.

krodha wrote:
Right, it is sems nyid, and hence in line with this statement from the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra cited earlier:

Outside of the saṃskṛtas [conditioned dharmas], there are no asaṃskṛta [unconditioned dharmas], and the true nature [bhūtalakṣaṇa] of the saṃskṛta is exactly asaṃskṛta. The saṃskṛtas being empty, etc. the asaṃskṛtas themselves are also empty, for the two things are not different.

This text goes on to say that the person who rejects the saṃskṛtas is attached to the asaṃskṛtas by attributing to them the characteristics of non-production [anutpāda], and by the very fact of this attachment those asaṃskṛtas are immediately transformed into saṃskṛtas. Which, as I have pointed out before; is equivalent to the act of turning dharmatā (the unconditioned nature of mind and phenomena) into a dharmin (a conditioned phenomenon) by considering it to be a separate, existent, unconditioned, free-standing nature.

It should instead be understood that the very non-arising of conditioned dharmas [saṃskṛtadharmas] is the unconditioned [saṃskṛta] dharmatā. It is an epistemic realization which dispels ignorance by severing the causes and conditions for invalid cognition... not an ontological essence that exists on its own (that is what Vedanta teaches).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
My understanding is that it is transpersonal.

krodha wrote:
This also contradicts the dam tshig of gcig pu, which is one of the four dam tshigs of the basis, Yongdzin Rinpoche explains here:

If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen. Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 1:31 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:

krodha wrote:
Well, the basis is also epistemic, personal and conventionally diverse, as opposed to being ontological, transpersonal and singular like Brahman. So it would be vastly incorrect to say the differences are merely nominal.

smcj said:
My understanding is that it is transpersonal. Kongtrul and Dudjom both seem to say it.

krodha wrote:
It is "universal" in the sense that it is a generic characteristic that all minds have in common (like all distinct instances of water share the generic characteristic of wetness), but it is never transpersonal.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 1:23 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Matt J said:
Not to speak for Malcolm, but after having a long thread about this, he said that the basic difference is that the base is empty and not established, unlike Brahman.

smcj said:
Since we are talking about things that are not manifest phenomena, and both are said to be "beyond conceptuality", as far as I'm concerned it is basically a difference in semantics and linguistic convention.

krodha wrote:
Well, the basis is also epistemic, personal and conventionally diverse, as opposed to being ontological, transpersonal and singular like Brahman. So it would be vastly incorrect to say the differences are merely nominal.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:33 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
The point of stating that samsara and nirvāna are not present in the basis is simply to communicate that the principle that the basis represents is unaffected by recognition and non-recognition that occurs in relation to it.

But that idea isn't meant to suggest that there is some sort of freestanding and independent unconditioned element that is itself free of everything else. That is the view of Vedanta.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
The basis should be understood to be in accordance with the following insight from Nāgārjuna:
Since arising, abiding and perishing are not established,
the conditioned is not established;
since the conditioned is never established,
how can the unconditioned be established?
and,
Outside of the saṃskṛtas [conditioned dharmas], there are no asaṃskṛta [unconditioned dharmas], and the true nature [bhūtalakṣaṇa] of the saṃskṛta is exactly asaṃskṛta. The saṃskṛtas being empty, etc. the asaṃskṛtas themselves are also empty, for the two things are not different. Besides, some people, hearing about the defects of the saṃskṛtadharmas, become attached [abhiniveśante] to the asaṃskṛtadharmas and, as a result of this attachment, develop fetters.
The latter portion of the second quotation addresses your issue.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:07 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
"These are not the droids you are looking for". I get it.

krodha wrote:
Unfortunately you don't get it.

Darmatā is not a freestanding principle that is itself free of samsara and nirvāna. It is the non-origination of the mind that appears to take rebirth in the three realms, that process is called "samsara". Dharmatā is not a freestanding, independently established or substantial X that is free of phenomena, it is the lack of essence in phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:00 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
What I am saying is that the emperor has no clothes. If you are going to say that the basis is beyond causes and conditions, is not mind (seems), does not have either samsara or nirvana at all present in it, you've got to cop to it. You can't have it both ways.

krodha wrote:

Firstly, it is sems. There's no such thing as seems.

Secondly, you aren't understanding that the conflict you see is a byproduct of your own meager comprehension of the basis [gzhi]. Nothing I have said is in conflict with the principles you are attempting to evoke to make your argument.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 11:46 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmatā (the basis) is not some sort of freestanding principle that is itself free of the phenomena of samsara and nirvāna.

smcj said:
I had bookmarked the quotes on another computer, so I can't readily cite the specific posts, but recently Malcolm has made the point that the phenomena of samsara and nirvana are not present at all in the basis. He has frequently made the point that the basis is beyond causes and conditions. Interdependence is nothing but causes and conditions. He has also made the point that the basis is not "mind" (seems).

So please factor those things into your understanding of the conversation.

krodha wrote:
I have factored those things into the discussion, and nothing I have said is in conflict with those ideas.

You see conflict because you don't understand the basis properly. You're interpreting the gzhi through a tirthīka lens. The basis is no different than Vedanta's purusa according to your understanding.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 6:19 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen
Content:
Matt J said:
So there are external objects after all for Dzogchen?

krodha wrote:
Though it is because Dzogchen posits a container universe like Yogācāra where the collective traces of sentient beings manifest a common reality... as opposed to positing an independently substantial external world that is accessed via the senses via intromission like western scientific materialism believes.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen
Content:
smcj said:
In the analogy there is nothing besides the images and the mirror, as Dudjom R. explains:

krodha wrote:
The issue is a bit more nuanced than that. Longchenpa discusses it here:

Although forms appear to the mind, the [objective] appearances are not mind... When the reflection of your face appears in a mirror, it appears as the face looks, because the clear surface of the mirror is capable of making the reflection appear and the face has the potential of appearing or of projecting the reflection. At that time, the reflection of the face is not the face, nor is there any other face than the face which imprinted it. Likewise, various kinds [of phenomena] are appearing in the deluded mind because of the interdependent origination of causes and conditions of delusion. The various objective appearances, such as mountains, are not mind. Also there is nothing in the mind which truly exists, but [merely] appearances [created by the] delusory habituations of the mind. so they are the forms of delusory appearances. They are wrong appearances, just as a person who has "hairy vision" will see hair before his eyes.

Some [scholars] inquire: "What are the appearances of earth and stone and so on if they are neither external [objects] nor internal [senses]?" I say, "You who think that all [phenomena] exist in the duality of [either] apprehender or apprehended are pigs!" Anyhow, it is said [in the scriptures] that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are nonexistent as external, internal or in between, from the very time of their appearance, as [illustrated by] the eight examples of illusion.

From those appearances [of the objects in the mind], which are nonexistent, arise the delusions of the apprehenders and the apprehended. Here, the apprehended means the thought arisen at the first instant [of encountering the appearances], through the apprehended objects. So it is the mind itself arisen as the apprehended. The apprehender is the is the analyzing [thought] which arises after [the thought of the apprehended] and it arises from the mind (sems). In spyan ras gzigs brtul zhugs it is said: "The apprehended arises from the mind which apprehends [the appearances] as the objects, the apprehender arises from the mind which analyzes it [the apprehended objects]."
The reflections appear in a mirror without the face passing into the mirror, nor do the reflections occur separately from the face. Likewise, it should be understood that from the very moment that all phenomena appear in the mind, they exist neither as the mind nor as anything other than the mind, as illustrated by the eight illusory examples.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:
steve_bakr said:
The mind is without essence, yet it is clear and aware, reflecting the phenomenal universe. Is it correct, then, to say that the mind is neither eternal nor annihilated?

krodha wrote:
Yes mind is free from the extremes of existence and non-existence, and any combination of the two.

Eternalism would be the consequence of holding a view that something truly exists. Annihilation occurs when an existent ceases to exist, and holding to a view of that kind is "annihilationism". So, it is true that both of those positions become untenable if the nature of the mind is properly understood.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 8:09 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
Who really overly cares about the concepts?

krodha wrote:
Anyone who is serious about their practice should "care about the concepts", wrong view corrupts one's entire path.

Granted traditions like Dzogpachenpo try to establish an experiential "right view" through direct introduction, but even then, a firm comprehension of the fundamentals of sūtra, tantra etc., is advisable, and understanding how the buddhadharma differs from tirthīka dharmas certainly will never be a hinderance.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
For me there are two big differences:

The first is that Dzogchen is predicated on an understanding of Madhyamaka. If you can't understand how things aren't you will surely misunderstand how things are.

The second is lineage and Direct Introduction. There have consistently been generations of accomplished practitioners. It's not hit and miss.

Those two things are enough to say they are different.

krodha wrote:
The differences are far more monumental than that.

I've witnessed others point these differences out to you and others on this board. I recall the thread titled something akin to "the basis is one's unfabricated mind" was a veritable book which hashed out these differences in a very thorough and exhaustive manner.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 7:55 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
They are quite different, and this becomes overtly apparent if both traditions are understood properly.
Lol, and that's where the conversation always ends, because they do look alike.

krodha wrote:
What do you mean "that's where the conversation always ends"? To say that is to neglect and ignore the pages and pages of discussion that have occurred on this forum which meticulously establish the glaring differences between these traditions.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 7:25 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
I can't distinguish the two, which is why I made that remark.

smcj said:
Neither can I.

krodha wrote:
Right. This is what I'm saying; I can't distinguish between your understanding of Dzogchen and the view of Advaita Vedanta. So glad you're being honest that there is no difference in your understanding of both views.

smcj said:
I'm not saying that they are the same, but they sure sound like each other only using different terms

krodha wrote:
It surely appears that way if both systems are taken at face value.

smcj said:

Somethings gotta be different, like their fingerprints at least.

krodha wrote:
They are quite different, and this becomes overtly apparent if both traditions are understood properly.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 6:01 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
Your understanding of the basis is no different than the purusa of Vedanta. This is a misunderstanding of Dzogpachenpo.
Yes, it is important to insist on that otherwise you fall into the problem of heresy.

krodha wrote:
Well, if you object to that charge then what are the differences between your understanding of Dzogchen and the view of Advaita Vedanta (which is explicitly rejected in the Dzogchen tantras)?

I can't distinguish the two, which is why I made that remark.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
If you say that the basis is beyond causes and conditions, without any phenomena of either samsara or nirvana at all present, you are talking about something that is not part of phenomena. You can still say it is "non-dual" if "the basis arises as the universe" in ignorance and "the universe arises as the basis" in knowledge. The transcendent (oops, excuse me, "Primordial") is also immanent.

krodha wrote:
Your understanding of the basis is no different than the purusa of Vedanta. This is a misunderstanding of Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 5:35 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
Dharmas and dharmatā are non-dual. Which incidentally is one of the definitions of "non-dual" in the buddhadharma.

Exactly so, yet... And there are also no phenomena of either samsara or nirvana at all present in the basis.
...without contradiction. Therefore the analogy of the mirror and the images on it.

krodha wrote:
You're interpreting the basis like the purusa of Vedanta.

Dharmatā (the basis) is not some sort of freestanding principle that is itself free of the phenomena of samsara and nirvāna. Dharmatā is simply the fact that the mind is essenceless, and therefore isn't something real. Dzogchen does not contradict the so-called non-affirming negation of Madhyamaka.

Phenomena are like a mirage, illusory appearances. Cause and condition are simply the factors that prevent us from recognizing that phenomena are illusory and essenceless. Cause is ignorance [avidyā], condition is habitual karmic tendencies of grasping that are predicated upon said ignorance.

The fact that you don't realize that a mirage is a mirage, and mistake the appearance to be existent foliage and water does not mean that flora and water originate. That is what cause and condition is. The factors that sustain the false conviction that trees, plants and water are present when there is truly only a mirage.

So we say that the flora and water have a "mirage-nature" a dharmatā, in order to communicate that they are not real. But that does not mean the mirage exists. The mirage is med par gsal snang, a non-existent clear appearance.

The basis is simply a way to communicate that the flora and water are actually a mirage, a.k.a. the mind and its dynamism are essenceless. Something that has no essence cannot have a substantial essence, because it's never been real to begin with.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
"Phenomena"="causes and conditions"
"Primordial"="beyond causes and conditions."
Therefore by definition
Phenomena≠Primordial

krodha wrote:
This is a misunderstanding of cause and condition. Since what originates in accordance with cause and condition does not ultimately arise at all, phenomena are primordial by nature. The only thing that obscures our knowledge of that primordial nature is ignorance [avidyā].

Dharmas and dharmatā are non-dual. Which incidentally is one of the definitions of "non-dual" in the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Malcolm said:
There is no actual state or condition that is free from duality. If one should think that there is, one will have not understood one single thing about Buddha Dharma.

Because people think there is a real state free from dualistic extremes, they fall into the pit of eternalism and grasping, never even recognizing emptiness correctly, let alone realizing it, and hampering their understanding of dependent origination.

Thinking there is such a thing as a real state of non-duality is precisely the Advaita Vedanta, Trika and so on.

The term non-dual (gnyis med, or advaya) is used frequently in Buddhist texts. The term non-duality (gnyis med nyid, advaita) is virtually never used, showing up only one time in the entire Kengyur, in a single passage in the Kalacakra tantra (hooray for a text searchable Tibetan canon!); and nineteen times in the Tengyur, the translations of Indian commentaries.

smcj said:
v.s.
Malcolm said:
And there are also no phenomena of either samsara or nirvana at all present in the basis.

smcj said:
I couldn't find the original, this is from a secondary:
http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=20258&hilit=nail&start=340

krodha wrote:
There's no contradiction.

That being said, if you think the basis [gzhi] is some sort of thing in itself that is free of duality then you are misunderstanding the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 3:58 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
That would indeed be the case. "Non-dual" in Buddhism and Vedanta mean different

things.

smcj said:
Yes, that is very important to remember since to admit otherwise would be heresy. That simply cannot be allowed!

krodha wrote:
I know you're being facetious here and the humor is all well and good, but nevertheless it is important to understand these differences.

Malcolm said:
There is no actual state or condition that is free from duality. If one should think that there is, one will have not understood one single thing about Buddha Dharma.

Because people think there is a real state free from dualistic extremes, they fall into the pit of eternalism and grasping, never even recognizing emptiness correctly, let alone realizing it, and hampering their understanding of dependent origination.

Thinking there is such a thing as a real state of non-duality is precisely the Advaita Vedanta, Trika and so on.

The term non-dual (gnyis med, or advaya) is used frequently in Buddhist texts. The term non-duality (gnyis med nyid, advaita) is virtually never used, showing up only one time in the entire Kengyur, in a single passage in the Kalacakra tantra (hooray for a text searchable Tibetan canon!); and nineteen times in the Tengyur, the translations of Indian commentaries.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
So therefore the "innate knowing" of each (without a subject/object dichotomy) must then know different non-dualities?

krodha wrote:
That would indeed be the case. "Non-dual" in Buddhism and Vedanta mean different things.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Has 'asunthatneversets' set?

krodha wrote:
We can pretend it is a permanent solar eclipse.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
steve_bakr said:
In Advaita Vedanta, the Self is Brahman. My question would be: What are the similarities between Brahman and Rigpa?

krodha wrote:
The only similarity is that "knowing" [jñā] (or "knowingness" for lack of a better term) is an innate characteristic of each (rig pa/vidyā literally means "knowledge"). Beyond that they are nothing alike.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Tsongkhapa Madhyamaka
Content:
Paul said:
Lopon Tenzin Namdak gives a great explanation in Bonpo Dzogchen Teachings on why chittamatra, madhyamaka, mahamudra, and the various levels of tantra are negated by Dzogchen. It's very interesting indeed.

krodha wrote:
Yet on the level of sūtra, Lopon Tenzin Namdak also goes with Prasangika Madhyamaka, according to Jean-Luc Achard.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 9:58 AM
Title: Re: Huang Po's One Mind & Dzogchen
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I asked the following question of an expert in Dzogchen and the Tibetan language.

krodha wrote:
Who is this alleged "expert in Dzogchen"?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 12:20 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:
Astus said:
It is only as incoherent as dependent origination, since dependent nature is just that: causality.

krodha wrote:
The paratantra [dependent nature] is the ālayavijñāna.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 3:49 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
So "true self", "genuine self" etc., are just rhetorical devices.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 11:57 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Malcolm discussed this on page 5 of this very thread:

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=97&t=19453&p=282844#p282844

This specifically:

Malcolm said:
As for tathāgatagarbha always existing in the continuums of sentient beings; if you think somehow tathāgatagarba is something other than or different than a sentient beings mind, there there is a fallacy of the tathāgatagarbha being something like an atman. But there is no atman in the tathāgatagarbha theory, not really. the supreme self, (paramātma) is explained very clearly in the Uttaratantra:
The supreme self is the pacification of the proliferations of self and and nonself.
But what does this mean? Asanga adds:
The perfection of self (ātmapāramitā) is known through two reasons: due to being free from proliferation of a self because of being free from the extreme of the non-buddhists and due to being free from the proliferation of nonself because of giving up the extreme of the śrāvakas.
He explains further:
From cultivating prajñāpāramita in order to turn away from seeing the five addictive aggregates as self, the non-existent self in which the others, the nonbuddhists, delight, one attains the result, the perfection of self. In this way all the others, the nonbuddhists, accept natureless things such as matter and so on as a self due to their being deceived by a characteristic of a self according to how those things are being apprehended, but that self never existed.

The Tathāgata, on the other hand, has attained the supreme perfection of the selflessness of all phenomena through the wisdom that is in accord with just how things truly are, and though there is no self according to how he sees things, he asserts a self all the time because he is never deceived by the characteristic of a self that does not exist. Making the selfless into a self is like saying "abiding through the mode of nonabiding.
There are some people who, ignoring the Nirvana Sutra's admonition to rely on the meaning rather than on the words, fall headlong into eternalism, unable to parse the Buddha's profound meaning through addiction to naive literalism.

Tathagatagarbha is just a potential to become a buddha. When we say it is has infinite qualities, this is nothing more nor less than when the Vajrapañjara praises the so called "jewel-like mind":
The jewel-like mind is tainted with
evil conceptual imputations;
but when the mind is purified it becomes pure.
Just as space cannot be destroyed,
just as is space, so too is the mind.
By activating the jewel-like mind
and meditating on the mind itself, there is the stage of buddhahood,
and in this life there will be sublime buddhahood.
There is no buddha nor a person
outside of the jewel-like mind,
the abode of consciousness is ultimate,
outside of which there isn't the slightest thing.
All buddhahood is through the mind...
Matter, sensation, perception
formations and consciousness
these all arise from the mind,
these [five] munis are not anything else.
Like a great wishfulfilling gem,
granting the results of desires and goals,
the pure original nature of the true state of the mind
bestows the result, Buddha's awakening
There is no other basis apart from this natural purity of the mind that is inseparable clarity and emptiness. We can call it whatever we want, but still this fact remains. The Lankāvatara rightly observes that tathāgatagarbha is just a name for emptiness and the ālayavijñāna for those afraid of emptiness. Jayānanda writes that ālayavijñāna is the mind that comprehends the basis, i.e. emptiness. How else can the mind be purified of evil conceptual imputations other than by realizing emptiness? Emptiness free from all extremes is the pure original nature of the true state of the mind, so why bother confusing oneself with all kinds of rhetoric? The mind itself has two aspects, emptiness and clarity, ka dag and lhun grub, and these are inseparable. This inseparable clarity and emptiness is call the ālaya in gsar ma and the basis in Nyingma. This also known as tathagatagarbha when it encased in afflictions, the dharmadhātu from its ultimate side, the ālayavijñāna from its relative side and so on. It really is not that complicated.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 4:19 AM
Title: Re: Book Release Party and Reading by Yudron—Oakland, CA
Content:
krodha wrote:
Good luck today Yudron! I would be there but I'm out of town.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 9:30 AM
Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances
Content:
Wayfarer said:
I also post on Philosophy Forum, and if you posted that line of argument, it would either be ignored or ridiculed, whereas I'm starting to understand how it could be true.

krodha wrote:
/r/philosophy on Reddit is like that too, very caged in realist and materialist thinking.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: Flight of the Garuda
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tony Duff has one too.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 2:38 PM
Title: Re: xiaozhengm
Content:
amanitamusc said:
Great example of ignorance.

krodha wrote:
Could be some sort of spam bot. Just be sure not to click the links.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 3:53 PM
Title: Re: Non-action/effort & Benefiting others -a false dichotomy
Content:
krodha wrote:
In the context of Dzogchen, the aspect of your nature that is referred to as

"compassion" [thugs rje] expresses itself through altruistic deeds, which are actions that naturally aim to benefit sentient beings. This is why Buddhas and bodhisattvas are naturally inclined to benefit beings and lead them to awakening.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 3:46 PM
Title: Re: How do you overcome anger and hate?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The only true "cure" for anger and hate is transcendent prajñā that eradicates kleśas, which is actualized through insight into the nature of your mind and phenomena. When that occurs you simply will have uprooted negative emotions altogether, and they will no longer arise.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 3:33 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:

Malcolm said:
Not exactly.

alpha said:
Jim Valbi says otherwise.

krodha wrote:
The aggregates, perceptions, emotions are the potentiality of your nature misconstrued as internal and external phenomena. They are at root, your own display, but that is meaningless unless one directly recognizes that to be the case.

Otherwise you're no better off than a monotheist who is satisfied believing X to be the case. The point (in Dzogchen etc.) is to experientially recognize that X is the case.

The salient issue is how you experience these things. You don't experience the aggregates to be wisdoms if you haven't recognized the nature of your mind.

In the same way that we can't exactly say that the snake is an expression of the rope. The snake is a misconception. A byproduct of ignorance, which is ultimately unreal and never actually originated at any point in time. Same goes for the aggregates.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 4th, 2015 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The nine position scheme consists of varying interpretations (of the basis) that key adepts have chosen to champion. They are:
1. gza' gtad dang bral ba [championed by Oḍḍiyāna Mahārāja and Vimalamitra]

2. lhun grub [Garab Dorje]

3. bdag nyid chen po [Vairocana]

4. rang byung ye shes [Ānandā (nun)]

5. bya btsal dang dral ba [Buddhagupta]

6. bde ba chen po [Śrī Siṃha]

7. gnyis su med pa [Kukurāja and Mañjuśrīmitra]

8. thig le chen po [Rājahastin]

9. chos thams cad gzhi ji bzhin pa [Garab Dorje, Dhahenatalo (king) and gNubs-chen Sangs-rgyas ye-shes]

Malcolm said:
You should clarify this is from sems sde, not man ngag sde.

krodha wrote:
Thanks, I actually wasn't aware of this, although makes sense. Are Nubchen's expositions generally classified as sems sde?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 4th, 2015 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
alpha said:
In the schema i came across in my readings the 7 positions listed do not include bdag nyid chen po
The list is as follows:
Kadag
lhun grub
ma ges pa
nges pa'i don
cir yang sgyur du btub pa
cir yang khas blang du btub pa
sna tshogs su char'ba

krodha wrote:
The nine position scheme consists of varying interpretations (of the basis) that key adepts have chosen to champion. They are:
1. gza' gtad dang bral ba [championed by Oḍḍiyāna Mahārāja and Vimalamitra]

2. lhun grub [Garab Dorje]

3. bdag nyid chen po [Vairocana]

4. rang byung ye shes [Ānandā (nun)]

5. bya btsal dang dral ba [Buddhagupta]

6. bde ba chen po [Śrī Siṃha]

7. gnyis su med pa [Kukurāja and Mañjuśrīmitra]

8. thig le chen po [Rājahastin]

9. chos thams cad gzhi ji bzhin pa [Garab Dorje, Dhahenatalo (king) and gNubs-chen Sangs-rgyas ye-shes]

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 at 10:13 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
monktastic said:
No doubt someone will enlighten us on what the above really means, but it's sort of irrelevant to my point, which is: it's really easy to deeply misunderstand words.

krodha wrote:
I wrote this on VC awhile ago regarding bdag nyid chen po which is the term being translated as "great self":

Depending upon which system of Dzogpachenpo you are using there can be between seven and nine positions one can take in relation to the basis [gzhi]. Vairocana's view of choice was bdag nyid chen po, however that is only one facet of the basis, and therefore grasping at that definition as an all encompassing view which speaks for the basis would be akin to the blind man grasping the elephants tail and proclaiming that the elephant is actually a rope. It is an incomplete view. Further, the only definitive view of the basis is held to be ka dag i.e. original purity, which is emptiness free from extremes. Ka dag as such therefore completely forbids any type of 'self'.

Dzogchen does not hold bdag nyid chen po to be a 'self' in the sense one may mistakenly think it is. This is known by anyone who understands the view of Atiyoga. You will not find any sect or cycle of Dzogchen which states there is a truly established 'self'.

As stated by Dylan Esler on this issue, 'integral being' [bdag nyid chen po] (what is being referred to as a 'great self') is nothing more than the inseparable emptiness and clarity [stong gsal dbyer med] which is experienced upon recognizing the nature of mind [sems nyid] and does not refer to an eternal self of any kind. He states "The fact that it is explicitly described as being both empty and luminous excludes reification into a monolithic self."

The point of bdag nyid chen po is to illustrate that the nature of one's mind is not to be found elsewhere, that it is one's immediate condition, however it is the the wisdom which ensues from recognizing the non-arising of one's mind [skt. citta, tib. sems]. This term is therefore pointing to that nature, and only that nature which is completely empty and free from extremes.

Esler continues:
"...the tantric and rDzogs-chen notion of integral being [skt. mahātman] should not be misconstrued to contradict the orthodox Buddhist insistence on selflessness [skt. anātman], simply because of the use of related words with different shades of meaning. As mentioned above, the terminology used is sufficiently precise to ward off misunderstanding, and that is to say nothing of the contextual meaning, which leaves no trace of doubt."
and:
"It is precisely when egocentric apprehension, the mistaken moment-by-moment reification of a self [skt. ātman], falls aside that one can speak of integral being [skt. mahātman], without this notion contradicting more normative Buddhist ideas of selflessness [skt. anātman]."
So, yes, agreed that it is important to understand these principles in context, otherwise you will have people who will attempt to skew and distort Dzogchen as some sort of eternalist dogma that is promulgating an unconditioned "self" (which is something I have unfortunately encountered).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
williamlam said:
Back to experiential difference. So realising the non-duality of the Witness (Advaita) FEELS different from realising the Emptiness of the Witness (Dzogchen)?

krodha wrote:
The latter involves direct insight the unreality and impossibility of the former, so yes.

williamlam said:
Isn't Emptiness (the lack of independent existence of all things) an intellectual concept, resulting from ones insight into the Law of Dependant Origination?

krodha wrote:
No the realization of emptiness is non-conceptual, like tasting sugar. There are paths such as Madhyamaka that employ analytical meditations, but those meditations are meant to actualize an experiential and non-conceptual realization.

williamlam said:
How does the experiential understanding or insight of Emptiness feels like?

krodha wrote:
"Awakening" is the most apt and succinct description of how it feels. Waking up to see the way things really are.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
In that way you can see that systems such as Dzogchen and Advaita Vedanta go in opposite directions in terms of praxis. The former sets out to recognize the emptiness of clarity, while the latter reifies and fortifies clarity.

In Vedanta you take the position as the passive witness. You are the seer, you are the hearer, and that is your true identity. In Dzogchen the witness is meant to be immediately uprooted, there is no seer or hearer, the idea of a core witness is an illusion that manifests due to ignorance and habitual patterns of grasping.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 3rd, 2015 at 1:30 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
williamlam said:
I think we are getting into very interesting territory here.

How does Dzogchen, and Buddhism, go "beyond" the non-duality of Awareness/Pure Witness/True Self in Advaita?

krodha wrote:
Because it treats the clarity of mind as being empty/non-arisen, and therefore avoids reifying clarity into some sort of abiding, background, substratum that serves as a foundation for a witness or true self, etc.

You should already be familiar with such views, e.g. in seeing there is just the seen, no "seer". Same goes for the other sense doors, etc... that is the emptiness of clarity.

Genuine insight into this completely decimates the possibility of a witness or a true self

etc. Those who champion such views are merely grasping at clarity (reifying it as something substantial and independent), which is taught to be a deviation in Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 2nd, 2015 at 10:46 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
williamlam said:
Is the difference in the non-duality of Avaita Vedanta and the non-duality of Dzogchen an intellectual difference, or an experiential one?

Is it "same taste", but interpreted differently?

* I'm asking as I have known many that have "realized non-duality" through Avaita, and will like to know if such realization has its similarities and place in the Buddhist system of awakening.

krodha wrote:
Those I know who have dabbled in both systems with some success say that the difference is experiential.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 1st, 2015 at 8:55 AM
Title: Re: Nature of mind vs. soul theory.
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmatā cannot be a "soul". Especially given that it represents the fact that there is no svabhāva to be found in the mind.

The misconception of a soul or an enduring self/entity comes about because we fail to recognize the nature of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 30th, 2015 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
tepp01 said:
I never implied that I was told the two systems were compatible. What I was told is that this particular teaching (considered to be basically the 'heart teaching' of Ramana Maharshi) itself is similar or compatible.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps provisionally, as a mere exercise, but they aren't not intended to lead to the

same species of insight.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 11:59 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Dzogchen tantras explicitly reject the Advaita Vedanta view, so it is quite questionable for a teacher to suggest the two systems are compatible.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
tepp01 said:
All I was trying to add here (since someone had mentioned Ramana Maharshi) is that the "Who Am I" (vichaara) practice itself is compatible with both Dzogchen and Advaita.

krodha wrote:
It really isn't since the goal of Advaita self-inquiry is to discover the mere clarity of mind (and reify it as some sort of irreducible, universal identity).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 6:55 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
It's also been pointed out before that so-called rang stong and gzhan stong are views taken up in post-equipoise. Which means they are experienced the same way in equipoise.

smcj said:
Agreed. Both views have produced enlightened beings so they are the same in that respect. That being the case, what's the big deal?

krodha wrote:
No ones arguing against gzhan stong in this thread as far as I can tell. Conflating Buddhist views with Hindu and Trika systems is the problem.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:

krodha wrote:
It's also been pointed out before that so-called rang stong and gzhan stong are views taken up in post-equipoise. Which means they are experienced the same way in equipoise.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 3:16 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Also, since it has been pointed out numerous times in this forum, it is worth reiterating: "Great Madhyamaka" does not mean gzhan stong.

smcj said:
Really? That again? Time to let go and move on.

krodha wrote:
Agreed.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 3:15 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Also, since it has been pointed out numerous times in this forum, it is worth reiterating: "Great Madhyamaka" does not mean gzhan stong.

smcj said:
The way Dudjom R. uses it, it does, as has been pointed out repeatedly numerous times by me. His usage is not exclusive, however since he is an authority he has license to define it how he pleases. Terms are regularly re-defined by various authors. For instance Khenpo Tsultrim defines Yogacara as synonymous with Shentong. He does not use Yogacara to mean "Mind Only". That's not how most other writers define Yogacara, but since he explains it he is allowed to use it how he sees fit.

krodha wrote:
Right, the point being that "great Madhyamaka" has been used various ways by numerous individuals. There's no trademark definition, and this means it does not indicate gzhan stong unless someone chooses to implement it in that context.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 29th, 2015 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:

smcj said:
As a footnote I'd like to point out that DKR is Dudjom R.'s grandson and presumably brought up in the tradition of his grandfather. Therefore I think it safe to assume he accepts the Great Madhyamaka/Shentong view of emptiness which is not universally accepted in Nyingma. Thus he may express opinions not all Nyingmapas would agree with.

krodha wrote:
Also, since it has been pointed out numerous times in this forum, it is worth reiterating: "Great Madhyamaka" does not mean gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 2:11 PM
Title: Re: Eternalism in Buddhadharma
Content:
nilakantha said:
Buddha is the eternally pure real upon which we project our karmically produced nightmare.

krodha wrote:
A "Buddha" is one who has fully uprooted ignorance, exhausted karmic traces and has actualized omniscience. Your nature is not "Buddha", Buddha is one who has a total and complete, unobstructed knowledge of his/her nature.

nilakantha said:
Even with good karma, if there were no Eternal Self, all we could produce would be new dreams with a limited shelf life; we could never wake up because there would no reality to which we could awaken.

krodha wrote:
This is absolutely false and indicates a fundamental lack of understanding regarding the buddhadharma.

nilakantha said:
To be a Buddha means to have produced a Sambhogakaya that is a fit locus for the hierophanic manifestation of the Eternal Buddha who is identical to our True Self.

krodha wrote:
There is no such thing as a "true self" in Buddhism. You are conflating the buddhadharma with sanatanadharma.

For as much alleged studying as you've done your view is not very refined or well-rounded, but I suppose that is the issue with understanding the buddhadharma: you truly cannot unless you've experientially tasted the truth it is founded upon.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 11:12 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
"Exists" is used here as a lexical indicator to gesture at the ground of being that is, of couse, not a being.

krodha wrote:
"Being" or "existence" is a misconception. The cause for the arising of that misconception is ignorance [avidyā], and since upon analysis, arising, abiding and cessation cannot be found, "being" cannot be found, much less a "ground" of said being. With the cessation of ignorance the misconception of "being" also ceases, and phenomena are realized to be essenceless and non-arisen. This is why Dōgen, for example, states that the Tathāgatas never go beyond clarifying cause and effect.

There generally is no Buddhist view that promulgates a "ground of being."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 10:41 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
Buddha alone exists independantly of causes and conditions. Some have called me an eternalist for this position. If you don't, fair enough.

krodha wrote:
Well, the Tathāgata technically does not "exist" but rather is free from the four extremes. If the Tathāgata existed s/he would be conditioned, see chapter 22 [tathāgataparīkṣā] of the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
Perhaps you aren't clear on what "eternalism" entails? Eternalism is a term used to indicate when an individual has taken a position which involves adhering to a view that supports a svabhāva, or an established essence that exists in a substantial way independently of causes and conditions (or independently in general). Which in short means you believe there are things that actually exist, be it the mind, wisdom or a self, etc.

Nothing you've shared thus far has argued for an eternalist position as I can tell. Yet like I said, that doesn't mean you are unable to interpret them with an eternalist bias, as

some surely do.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 9:45 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what any of that has to do with what we're discussing (nor how any of that advocates for, or supports an eternalist position).

Also, it's nearly impossible to differentiate your own writing with quotations and textual support for your argument. You should try to implement quotation boxes or italics in order to clearly differentiate cited passages from your own personal contribution to the discussion.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
That being said the general point of texts like that is to offer an upāya for people who are fearful of principles such as emptiness and so on. So they perform their function either way. Such is the wisdom of the Buddhas.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 8:48 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
Much like people who read texts such as the Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra and think it is talking about an actual "self". They are more often than not, very literal-minded individuals who are either (i) intentionally and willfully ignorant of context, nuance, literary devices etc., due to harboring various biases, or (ii) are simply legitimately ignorant and don't comprehend what they are reading.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 8:44 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
I interptet the text through the clear meaning of the words.

krodha wrote:

Well, I have no idea how you interpret it, but chances are if your interpretation errs towards eternalism then it is extremely literal, lacking nuance and context.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 8:29 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
Perhps you're familiar with a differant text.

krodha wrote:
There are individuals who interpret the Uttaratantra through a lens of eternalism, but that does not mean that is the actual intention of the text.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 8:20 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
The final teaching in Mahayana is in the Uttara Tantra Shastra, revealed by Maitreya to Asanga. In in we're taught (in Sanskrit):

krodha wrote:
Which has nothing to do with eternalism.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
Eternalism is the essence of the Buddhadharma.

krodha wrote:
I really hope you're joking.

nilakantha said:
I don't find Chinese Buddhism any more Eternalistic than I find Sanskrit Mahayana.

krodha wrote:
Then you aren't reading closely enough.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
nilakantha said:
Just mentioned it to suggest that canonicity in Buddhism is very differant than canonicity in Christianity. Just because a text was composed in China doesn't mean it's not Buddhavacana.

krodha wrote:
Although the majority of those sutras that are listed on the "Buddhist apocrypha" page do indeed read and contain principles that are quite different than those found in Indian texts, which is arguably why East Asian Buddhism tends to be very eternalistic.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 6:24 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The The Brahmajāla Sūtra is classified as Buddhist apocrypha:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buddhist_apocrypha

nilakantha said:
So we should also reject the Heart Sutra: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heart_Sutra?

krodha wrote:
The idea that it is apocrypha was put forth by Jan Nattier:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heart_Sutra#Nattier_hypothesis

From the wiki page:

The [Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya] text is very short, and it is generally believed to be Buddhist apocrypha written in China using excerpts of a translation of the Mahaprajnaparamita Sutra...

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
DGA said:
is this debate necessary to effective Dharma practice?

is it useful to the same?

krodha wrote:

It's only necessary and effective in that "non-dual" [gnyis med] should be understood properly in both systems, and the respective definition of "non-dual" in each tradition should not be conflated.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 4:01 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
The The Brahmajāla Sūtra is classified as Buddhist apocrypha:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buddhist_apocrypha

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 1:13 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Purusa gives rise to prakrti.

Malcolm said:
Not exactly, not in Saṃkhya proper, anyway.

krodha wrote:
Thanks, will research further then.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
Matt J said:
And Advaita doesn't say that pursua is an singular

krodha wrote:
It does, hence ekam advtītyam, the definition of "Advaita".

Matt J said:
ontological substance

krodha wrote:
Brahman is an unconditioned existent, defined as sat, cit, ananda or "existence, consciousness, bliss". This means it is ontological in nature.

Matt J said:

or source.

krodha wrote:
Purusa gives rise to prakrti.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 12:09 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
The model of Advaita Vedanta has puruṣa and prakṛti. Puruṣa is a singular ontological source that gives rise to prakṛti, however prakṛti (and the transformation of the three gunas) is held to be unreal, as it is illusion [māyā], only puruṣa is real. Puruṣa is Brahman, and is an unconditioned knower [jñā].

So Advaita involves working to remove the delusion of prakṛti i.e., māyā, so that only puruṣa remains. Puruṣa is then held to be truly established, as one without a second [ekam advtītyam].

The only thing that is unreal in Advaita is the expressions prakṛti, which implies that there is a real, and truly established nature which is alone true (and existent). This nature is then held to be one's true identity or a "true self", which means Advaita is an ātmavāda.

There is simply nothing like this in Dzogchen or Buddhism in general.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 12:03 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
I sincerely doubt these teachers knew what they were agreeing to. Ramana Maharshi's view is Advaita Vedanta, which does not resemble Dzogchen at all. They are completely different systems.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 27th, 2015 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
tepp01 said:
Actually, Ramana Maharshi did not emphasize "stripping content from experience," and his teachings were not, strictly speaking, necessarily the same as those of the traditional Advaita Vedanta of Adi Shankaracharya (as Ramana himself asserted).

Ramana's essential teachings were simply this: "As each thought arises one must be watchful and ask to whom is this thought occurring. The answer will be 'to me'. If you enquire 'Who am I?' the mind will return to its source (or where it issued from). The thought which arose will also submerge. As you practice like this more and more, the power of the mind to remain as its source is increased."

This particular teaching is compatible with any tradition, of any religion.

krodha wrote:
It isn't compatible with the buddhadharma, and especially not Dzogpachenpo due to the fact that it is a view which involves reifying the clarity of mind as ultimate.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 26th, 2015 at 1:18 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
krodha wrote:
The primary difference is in the nature and implications of "non-dual".

The puruṣa of Vedanta is "non-dual", however it is an ontological, transpersonal, homogenous, unconditioned existent. Which means that Advaita is a substantial and reductive non-duality.

Whereas one's nature in Dzogchen is epistemic, personal, heterogeneous and free from the extremes of existence and non-existence. This means that one's nature in Dzogchen is insubstantial and a non-reductive non-duality.

An ontological non-duality is where everything is reduced to a single substance that exists alone by itself. For example if subject and object were merged and we then held a view that the union of the two as a single X is truly substantial and valid.

On the other hand, an epistemological non-duality is simply a recognition that the nature of phenomena is free from the dual extremes of existence and non-existence, hence "non-dual". This is a non-reductive non-duality because it does not leave anything in its wake, there is no X left over once the nature of phenomena is recognized.

In epistemic non-duality the nature of a conditioned phenomenon [dharma] and its non-arisen nature [dharmatā] are ultimately neither the same nor different, hence they are "non-dual", because the misconception of a conditioned entity is a byproduct of ignorance, and therefore said entity has never truly come into existence in the first place. This means that the allegedly conditioned entity has truly been unconditioned from the very beginning. And to realize this fact only requires a cessation of cause for the arising of the misconception of a conditioned entity, i.e., a cessation of ignorance. If dharmins and dharmatā were not non-dual then it would be impossible to recognize the unborn nature of phenomena because that nature would be rendered another conditioned entity.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 22nd, 2015 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Refraining from Halloween
Content:
krodha wrote:
I LOL'ed.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 17th, 2015 at 6:50 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
steve_bakr said:
That is problematic due to distance. I will try my best.

krodha wrote:
I mean, you made the effort to travel and receive teachings from Jax. So perhaps next time you can make the effort to go see a truly qualified teacher.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 16th, 2015 at 9:11 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I am saying that one can indeed see into the nature of one's own mind through this text, although it is not my only Direct Introduction.

krodha wrote:
You can't receive direct introduction from a text.

steve_bakr said:
The subject of having a teacher in the climate of such an enormously large ratio of students per teacher deserves its own thread. It is very problematic.

krodha wrote:
Seems to work just fine for many people.

steve_bakr said:
The quality of teaching today is seriously compromised by the sheer numbers of students involved.

krodha wrote:
Why would the quality of the teaching be compromised by the number of students? That does not make sense.

steve_bakr said:
The entire landscape and the logistics of teaching are completely different today.

krodha wrote:
Not sure why that would compromise the quality of a master's teaching.

steve_bakr said:
On the other hand, there are more resources available than ever.

krodha wrote:
What does "resources" mean here? Teachers? Texts?

steve_bakr said:
To be certain, the old way of doing things is all but obsolete. It is a subject of critical importance, which I am very mindful of.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps what you mean is there are some contemporary western "teachers" who think they know better and are leading people like you down wrong paths in the name of some sort of delusional renaissance.

The so-called "old way" of doing things has a proven track record, producing realized individuals and masters for centuries with unbroken lineages, can't say the same for your "new-age-chen."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 16th, 2015 at 6:04 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Can a literary device have a standpoint?

krodha wrote:
The point of the basis being a "literary device" is that it is a principle that is used to indicate one's nature that hasn't been recognized yet. Once the basis is recognized it becomes the path. So it isn't something that is real and truly established as a thing in itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 16th, 2015 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
steve_bakr said:
There is no enlightenment. There is no nonenlightenment.

krodha wrote:
Many people make this error nowadays.

There is only "no enlightenment and no non-enlightenment" from the standpoint of one's nature i.e., the basis. But the practitioner is not their nature, the practitioner works with his/her knowledge of their nature.... and so for the practitioner there certainly is "enlightenment".

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 16th, 2015 at 3:05 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
steve_bakr said:
Fortunately, there is no "I" to take offense. It is not about who said what. The truth is self-authenticating.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen and Buddhism are never dealing with an "I" or a "self", so negating the "I" is a fool's errand that solves nothing.

Instead they deal with ignorance [avidyā], and afflictive habitual conditions of grasping that ensue as a result of said ignorance. You cannot uproot ignorance by declaring there is no "I", as this is a redundant point that has no bearing on anything due to the fact that an "I" has only ever been an imputation to begin with.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 16th, 2015 at 2:11 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
Paul said:
This is basically Jax's point of view.

Garudavista said:
Yep. Here is an example of him saying that direct introduction is not necessary in a discussion with Malcolm at the http://www.dharmaconnectiongroup site.
Jax wrote:
Isn't Longchenpa pointing to the fact that Awareness (rigpa) cannot be attained by training, practice or any efforts of any kind? He says that because Awareness is fully present right now. Its not hidden. He even says in the same text that no "direct introduction" or realization is necessary. Your cognitive presence that is experiencing, is the experience, of the five senses, as well as your thoughts and emotions...is this timelessly present Knowingness, that Norbu call pure "noticing". It's not more present after practice or study or transmission. Its the clear unchanging Awareness that appears as everything. Is it really so hard to notice that the Awareness he is speaking of

is your present open and clear awareness just as it is?

Malcolm wrote:
No actually, what Longchenpa is talking about vidyā as dharmakāya.

Because vidyā is essenceless, because a substantial active agent is contradicted in the real state, and because it has always been naturally formed, there are no stages to train on, paths to traverse, mandala to create, empowerment to receive, path to meditate, commitments to protect, activities to accomplish and so on. There is no need create again what has already formed naturally. If it were necessary, conventionally designating natural formation as unconditioned would be invalid. Consequently, the dharmakāya would be perishable because it would be conditioned, and because it would have been made by causes and conditions.

The purpose of this statement is to point out that in reality there are no agent and actions so therefore these following things do not exist in vidyā, the dharmakāya. It does not mean that there is nothing to do. Most people are unaware that lhun grub means "not made by anyone". It means that vidyā cannot be fabricated, only recognized.

But Longchenpa does not say that introduction is unnecessary. On the contrary, chapter nine explicitly teachs introduction:

"From the two systems in which naked vidyā is suddenly recognized, this is the introduction which does not depend on critical points. Since that stark, uninterrupted and uniform awareness (which does not move outwardly, grasp inwardly, rest in middle, is not fabricated with the mind and is without conceptual movement) exists at all times, by introducing it's naked arising within the state of the blessing at the time when the master and student are momentarily in the same state, starkness is seen nakedly. That alone can generate confidence in dharmakāya. The critical point is to sustain that state without meditation and without distraction."

Then of course there is the system of introduction that depends on six critical points.

However your contention "He even says in the same text that no 'direct introduction' or realization is necessary." is proven to be false.

krodha wrote:
It's actually originally from here, and then was re-posted to the dharmaconnection blog:

http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=7810&start=0

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 15th, 2015 at 10:43 AM
Title: Re: Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness
Content:
steve_bakr said:

I have internalized "Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness," by Guru Padmasambhava and the accompanying commentary by John Reynolds. As the text says, there are no antecedent or subsequent requirements. It is not accurate to say that it is used to transmit the Direct Introduction, the reason being that the text itself IS the Direct Introduction, without intermediary. No Lung is required. It is simple, straightforward, perfectly understandable, and requires no further explanation or elaboration. It does not require an extraneous transmission, insofar as the text IS the transmission, and this is the very purpose it serves. The text is sufficient in and of itself. To argue anything other than this is to be motivated by an agenda that contradicts the essential message of the text itself. This text is exactly what it claims to be, without obscurations. Those who come to a complete internalization of this root text will clearly see the nature of their own mind.

krodha wrote:
Does someone feed you this b.s. and then you regurgitate it? Or do you just make this stuff up as you go along?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 7th, 2015 at 8:31 AM
Title: Re: If 5 skandha are empty, why would you need to save being
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Or, as Berkeley's favorite tulku Pema Khandro Rinpoche puts it:

asunthatneversets said:
"Berkeley's favorite tulku" is a far stretch.

dzogchungpa said:
Hmm, maybe you have a point there but, you have to admit, she is pretty holotropic.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't know, you're the one with the affinity for her.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 7th, 2015 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: If 5 skandha are empty, why would you need to save being
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Or, as Berkeley's favorite tulku Pema Khandro Rinpoche puts it:

krodha wrote:
"Berkeley's favorite tulku" is a far stretch.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 3:51 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
Ivo said:
I don't mean to get in the way of Dzogchungpa's self expression, but can you be so kind to tell me a name of a genuine Dharma teacher who engages in criticizing other teachers?

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure how this question is relevant. We are discussing the evaluation and examination of teachers in general, no one said anything about criticism, although sometimes criticism (hopefully constructive) and critique is warranted.

Ivo said:
If this is too hard, and since we are so big here on scriptural authority, can you please provide a quote from a traditional Dharma scripture encouraging a student to judge and evaluate the teachers of others,

krodha wrote:
Teachers are to be evaluated in general. There is no guidelines which state it should be one's own teacher as opposed to Jane Doe's teacher, especially when Jane Doe requests advice.

Ivo said:
The key phrase here is - "the teachers of others" - i.e. not a teacher we want to study with.

krodha wrote:
Right, these distinctions are not made. Either way though, this thread was started because someone was looking for advice regarding a specific individual's view who presents himself as a teacher, and our fellow forummers obliged as they should.

An evaluation was offered in the same way a veterinarian or a mechanic should be evaluated. If someone needs to have their pet taken care of, or have their vehicle fixed, should we hold our tongues about an alleged specialist who is unqualified to be providing those services? Of course not, so why is this any different?

Ivo said:
Because this point somehow seems difficult to grasp, despite having been explained several times.

krodha wrote:
Explained by who? No one here is obligated to accept any "point" that is made by you, I, or anyone else.

And when it comes down to it, I could say the same to you: that the points made by so-

and-so in this thread seem difficult to grasp, despite having been explained several times. But I am not pompous enough to suggest that, because at the end of the day you are entitled to your own opinions and views, and your conduct and activities are your own to guard. Why should I attempt to condition you?

Ivo said:
And, to put it in yet another way. Whom are you emulating when you say that it is OK to judge and criticize teachers who you have no association with?

krodha wrote:
How would you know whether I've associated with X teacher or not? For someone who is so concerned with judgement and criticism you sure seem to be judging and criticizing quite a bit... such is the nature of projection though.

Ivo said:
I know of no Dharma teaching or teacher which/who encourages this.

krodha wrote:
You know of no dharma teaching that states teachers should be evaluated? I know my own teacher Chogyal Namkhai Norbu often cites the example of a honey bee that flies from flower to flower, a metaphor for the aspirant who goes from teaching to teaching, teacher to teacher investigating and evaluating them so that they can find the right fit.

Granted in that example that endeavor applies to oneself, but again, someone came to this forum asking for advice regarding a specific "teacher" for their own sake, and have now received that advice. So what is the problem?

Ivo said:
We are arguing over something so basic in Dharma, that it is way beyond ridiculous. Criticizing others is not Dharma, pure and simple.

krodha wrote:
If criticizing others is not dharma, then perhaps you should be quiet.

Ivo said:
It runs against every precept, explanation, and example one can point at. There is no justification for doing this if one is a Dharma practitioner.

krodha wrote:
The only justification is compassion. It is the compassionate thing to do.

Ivo said:
We are not an evangelical church, we are not out there to save souls.

krodha wrote:
No one is proselytizing. This isn't the Tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición.

Ivo said:
We are not here to tell anyone that samsara is bad, and that enlightenment is good.

krodha wrote:
Why are you implying that anyone here is engaged in activities of this nature? No one is proselytizing and attempting to push views onto those who are not interested or receptive.

Ivo said:
If someone ask us for help, of course we can help.

krodha wrote:
Right, and someone did ask for help, they came to this forum asking for advice, and received it. No one here actively pursued others who had no interest in the discussion, trust me, no one cares that much.

Ivo said:
But if we just want to make an impression, and if we actually want to follow the Buddhadharma, we can do this by aspiration and example only.

krodha wrote:
I don't think anyone is interested in making impressions, except for you. Someone started this thread asking for advice, they got advice, case closed.

If, with the intention of identifying and teaching higher and lower views, other precepts are deprecated, this is not transgression, but greatly increases merit.
- rtsa ba'i ltung ba bcu bzhi pa'i grel pa gsal byed 'khrul spong

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 8:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Somebody doth protest too much, methinks.

krodha wrote:
Agreed, you do protest a bit too much, in your signature and awkward passive aggressive manner.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 8:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
asunthatneversets said:

Are you insinuating that unqualified individuals should be allowed to teach without being subject to evaluation or investigation? And those who scrutinize them are "haters"?

You do realize that this is an irresponsible attitude that goes directly against the advice given by the adepts of the past, yes?

dzogchungpa said:
Insinuating?

Moi?

Whatever could you be smoking?

krodha wrote:
Look, I get that you want to play games and put on your little act, play the role of the contrarian and so on, but I'm genuinely interested. Are you truly meaning to suggest that teachers should not be evaluated? Because these teachings state otherwise, and even go as far as to state that a relationship with an unqualified teacher that is already formed should be severed immediately if said teacher deviates from what is agreeable in terms of these teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 7:31 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Possibly of interest, from Berkeley's favorite tulku Pema Khandro Rinpoche:
http://ngakpa.org/library/haters-and-who-they-really-are-2/

krodha wrote:
Are you insinuating that unqualified individuals should be allowed to teach without being subject to evaluation or investigation? And those who scrutinize them are "haters"?

You do realize that this is an irresponsible attitude that goes directly against the advice given by the adepts of the past, yes?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: Mass shooting in Oregon today
Content:
krodha wrote:
And here's an archive of the entire thread:

https://archive.moe/r9k/thread/22785073/

Truly tragic.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Mass shooting in Oregon today
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
What's crazy is the shooter announced he was going to open fire at an undisclosed Northwest campus last night on the 4chan boards, and people there encouraged him to go through with it.

Son of Buddha said:
People might not like me saying this but is there anyway to charge those people with a crime who knew what he planned on doing and ENCOURAGED him to carry out mass murder?

krodha wrote:
I believe so. There was another case recently which involved a young girl who encouraged her friend to commit suicide. He went through with it and she is being prosecuted for her role in the matter (charged with involuntary manslaughter). I don't see why this would be any different.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015 at 6:12 AM
Title: Mass shooting in Oregon today
Content:
Monlam Tharchin said:
A 20-year-old young man shot and killed 13 people, wounding almost 20 others, before being killed by police at Umpqua Community College this morning around 10:30a.

May all beings be swiftly liberated from samsara.
May we redouble in our efforts to help them without exception.

krodha wrote:
What's crazy is the shooter announced he was going to open fire at an undisclosed Northwest campus last night on the 4chan boards, and people there encouraged him to go through with it.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 1st, 2015 at 8:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
Garudavista said:

Status is the relative social standing of someone, which can be based on a number of things, such as what that person does. ChNN gives direct pointing, provides lungs and teaches and promotes the short and long thun and vajra dance, all of which Mr. Peterson has harshly criticized. Here are but just a couple s of that criticism:

krodha wrote:
In your screen shot here, he advocates for Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche's teachings, yet elsewhere he again, alludes to the fact that Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche is incorrect in his expositions.

For example, Jackson cites this passage from one of Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche's books:

"When you say original wakefulness, yeshe or wisdom, it by definition means a knowing for which there is no object. When you say thought, or namshey, it means a knowing with structure of subject and object. Yeshe is a knowing that doesn't fixate in a dualistic way, whereas our ordinary knowing is dualistic fixation. Dualistic fixation should be destroyed. That's the reason we strive so diligently in meditation and recognize mind essence. Yeshe is primordial knowing."

To which one of his "students", who quite obviously has no idea what they are talking about, states:

Started to really enjoy [the quotation], then saw words "destroy" "strive so diligently".. oops. Trekchod is "no" striving, 'no" destroying of anything, even thoughts, especially thoughts. Dzogchen texts say again and again, when we are in view, thoughts self-liberate without our doing anything about them.

And instead of correcting this mistaken view, Jackson affirms this criticism and claims X student corrects Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:

Yes, [student's name], that right! You correct Tulku Urgyen on this point! lol!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 1st, 2015 at 8:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
Ivo said:
As for Jax, whom I do not have the pleasure to know personally, I see in him strong disagreement with some of his teachers methods, but I have never seen evidence of him questioning their status as teachers, or their realization.

krodha wrote:
Well, he has questioned their status as teachers and their realization.

I've seen him on various occasions asserting that advice given by X teacher is bizarre,

weird, silly, etc., and advice of that nature really makes you question their authenticity.

Ivo said:
Either way I do not really care, but I do think that policing other practitioners should not be part of anyone's Dharma practice.

krodha wrote:
Since he presents himself as a teacher, there is nothing wrong with scrutinizing him. If he was just a practitioner sharing an opinion then sure, no reason to police him. But he doesn't present himself as a practitioner, he presents himself as an authority, a teacher, and so that title should be examined, investigated and evaluated.

Padmasambhava states:

Having an unexamined teacher is like jumping into an abyss;
Having an unexamined student is like drinking poison.

And from the Rig pa rang shar:

Very proud and ignorant,
Followed because of his foolish words,
Without any realization of the meaning of secret mantra,
His arrogant words disparaging others,
Engaging in a false path,
Not seeing the face of the initiation mandala,
Becoming lax in his vows,
Not coming up with the answers to pure questions,
Very proud of the little he has learned,
The unexamined master is a demon of a master.

Jigme Lingpa's commentary on the above passage:

As it says, do not get involved with such a demonic master.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 30th, 2015 at 7:59 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
Well, be that as it may, Yogacara is a buddhist view. And whether it is higher or lower to Madhyamaka does not seem to matter that much. As I've said elsewhere, to me the highest teaching is the one that helps a specific individual progress the most.

krodha wrote:
Incidentally, I have to tell this to Son of Buddha quite often since he believes there is truly such thing as objectively provisional and definitive views.

smcj said:
And quite frankly for my the Yogacara?Shentong view makes the most sense and allows me to practice with the least confusion and doubt. And if that makes me an eternalist, well I will allow my teachers to address that issue.

krodha wrote:
That doesn't make you an eternalist, but it is very easy to formulate eternalist views based on those teachings, which is why many eternalists gravitate towards those teachings. They can manipulate them to fit their desired (eternalist) narratives much easier than other Buddhist views.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 30th, 2015 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Queen Srimala Sutra

Chapter 9: The true understanding of the meaning of emptiness V97. O' Bhagavan, the wisdom of the Buddha Nature is the World Honored One's wisdom of Sunyata[Emptiness]. The Buddha Nature is not something that has been seen or realized by any Arhat, or Pratyekabuddha. There are two types of Emptiness wisdom concerning the Buddha Nature which are as follows. (1) The Buddha nature is empty from, separate from, independent from and different from all the stores of defilement. (2) The Buddha nature is not-empty from, is not separate from, not independent from and not different from the inconceivable Buddha Attributes which are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. V98. O Bhagavan, The great Sravaka's can have faith and entrust themselves to the Buddha through the two types of emptiness wisdom of the Buddha Nature. All the disciples and Pratyekabuddhas are stuck in the domain of the four inverse views because of their incorrect knowledge of emptiness. This is why none of the Sravakas and Pratyekabuddhas have ever seen or attained the Buddha Nature. Only the Buddha's have experienced the extinction of all suffering and destroyed all the stores of defilement. They alone have practiced all the paths which lead to the extinction of suffering.

Further commentary

Awakening of Faith in Mahayana
Suchness has two aspects if predicated in words. One is that it is truly empty (sunya), for this aspect can, in the final sense, reveal what is real. The other is that it is truly nonempty (a-sunya), for its essence itself is endowed with undefiled and excellent qualities.

1. Truly Empty
Suchness is empty because from the beginning it has never been related to any defiled

states of existence; it is free from all marks of individual distinction of things, and it has nothing to do with thoughts conceived by a deluded mind. It should be understood that the essential nature of Suchness is neither with marks nor without marks; neither not with marks nor not without marks; nor is it both with and without marks simultaneously; it is neither with a single mark nor with different marks; neither not with a single mark nor not with different marks; nor is it both with a single and with different marks simultaneously. In short, since all unenlightened men discriminate with their deluded minds from moment to moment, they are alienated from Suchness; hence, the definition “empty”; but once they are free from their deluded minds, they will find that there is nothing to be negated.

2. Truly Nonempty
Since it has been made clear that the essence of all things is empty, i.e., devoid of illusions, the true Mind is eternal, permanent, immutable, pure, and self-sufficient; therefore, it is called “nonempty”. And also there is no trace of particular marks to be noted in it, as it is the sphere that transcends thoughts and is in harmony with enlightenment alone.

krodha wrote:
You do realize this is agreeing with the general Mahāyāna presentation of emptiness found in the prajñāpāramitā and Madhyamaka, yes?

"Non-empty" is simply a play on words to convey that one's nature is not deprived of Buddha qualities, which all Mahāyāna systems agree with... so this is a non-controversial view.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 30th, 2015 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
I agree the Prajnaparamita Sutras were taught for the timid who are afraid of the Lion's Road of Emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 30th, 2015 at 6:42 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Oh obviously he is talking about my interpretation of the yogacara teaching's, he obviously wasn't saying that the Yogacara Sutra's and commentaries were provisional or that Yogacara as a system was realist and lowly, beneath the Madhyamaka system

krodha wrote:
Which I do agree with, Madhyamaka is far more refined than Yogācāra, since Yogācāra

ends up a realist view.

Either way, this doesn't change the fact that many criticisms that are leveled against you are addressing your own interpretations.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 30th, 2015 at 6:24 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Also the OP asked for a list of Buddhist teachers that taught True Self teachings, he didn't ask for a list of names for people on DW that want to complain because he is using Sutras and commentaries of the Yogacara tradition..... Also the fact that you think its okay to harass people just because they follow a different tenent system than your's SMACKS of Sectarianism.

krodha wrote:
For this charge of "sectarianism" to be valid you would first have to be accurately representing the system you claim to be representing. However since you are not, and all you are doing is parading around your own meager and unrefined misunderstanding of these teachings, it is again, not the teachings themselves that are being addressed, but your own misinterpretations.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 29th, 2015 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
The meaning of the Sutra is explicit...

Malcolm said:
No, it really isn't.

dzogchungpa said:
Apparently some fairly reputable teachers think it is:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=15368&p=213897#p213897

krodha wrote:
Those teachers are not addressing the meaning, or whether said meaning is implicit or explicit [i.e., meant to be taken literally].

The point being made above is that Son of Buddha is far to literal minded to understand that sūtra properly and so he takes the text at face value, which causes him to believe it is describing a real "self". He doesn't get that "self" is a rhetorical device.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 11:23 PM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
frankc said:
The Citta is beyond concepts. I've already sent stuff on this forum that says that. But to explain it to other people you have to use concepts. I also didn't say the Thai Forest Tradition calls it a "self" It's not really the point. The teaching is that it is independent of the five khandas, cannot be destroyed, beyond the three characteristics of dukkha, anicca, and anatta, and when you become enlightened it merges with nirvana and returns home.

krodha wrote:
There is no difference between your "citta" and Advaita's purusa.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 10:12 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Vimalakirti432 said:
Non-Duality, by David Loy. I don't endorse everything he says, but I do think he's one of the few people I know that has made a real effort to tactfully look past the labels.)

Malcolm said:
The problem with Loy, and I told him so, 25 years ago at BU, is that he does not differentiate between ontological non-dualism [Hinduism], and epistemic non-dualism [Buddhadharma], in fact he conflates them.

krodha wrote:
So does Vimalakirti432, incidentally.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 7:01 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Vimalakirti432 said:
So I've been following this eternalism dustup, and here's what puzzles me. In the context of a non-supernaturalist view of the dharma (if you'll allow me that for the moment) the line you're taking here makes perfect sense to me.

krodha wrote:
A "supernaturalist" view or otherwise is not relevant to this issue at all.

Vimalakirti432 said:
If the goal is simply to attain that complete letting go, that non-fabrication etc. which is the culmination of the holy life, etc. (again be charitable and let this go as well if this is not precisely the way you would put things), then obviously it matters not in the least what comes after.

But given what I would call the supernaturalist view, which entails rebirth, etc., your firm rejection of eternalism would appear to open you up to the opposite charge of annihilationism.

krodha wrote:
I never said that an existent becomes a non-existent, so I've never once alluded to anything that even remotely resembles annihilationism. I also don't reject rebirth, so not sure what you're taking about.

Vimalakirti432 said:
I know the familiar passages in the suttas where the Buddha, as Thathagata and therefore unconditioned, is said to be beyond the reach of the usual categories.

krodha wrote:
Which is non-controversial.

Vimalakirti432 said:
But is it not probable that the Buddha's non response/evasion of a clear answer was upaya, and that the question remains? If the goal of Buddhism truly is not annihilation than there must be something going on other than the breaking up of the aggregates and the end of rebirth.

krodha wrote:
Who said anything about he goal being the breaking up of the aggregates? What are you talking about?

Vimalakirti432 said:
So is this upaya from your point of view as well, part of training in non-clinging, metaphysical tact in the interest of achieving an experience and not a mere confection of words? It seems to me that all these "heretical" attempts to characterize in some way the ultimate goal only arise because the question remains open.

krodha wrote:
Is what upāya?

Vimalakirti432 said:
It seems to me that playing whack-a-moles with eternalism is not enough. One really needs to address the question at hand in a way that truly avoids both extremes. There are various ways of doing this, I'm sure. But how do you, personally, address this question?

krodha wrote:
How do I approach a freedom from extremes? The same way everyone else does in the buddhadharma, emptiness [non-arising].

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
How many is many?

krodha wrote:
It's okay if you like him dzogchungpa, he teaches about souls and God and true selves... stuff that's right up your alley.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
No Maha Bua is not considered a heretic by many in Thailand, this a case where you are straight up running your mouth and lying about a deceased Buddhist teacher who was actually considered an Arhant by the vast majority of Thailand.

krodha wrote:
His views are considered to be controversial by many.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
frankc said:
Perhaps they just have another narrative they are trying to confirm which isn't an eternalist narrative.

krodha wrote:
Not usually. Eternalists generally seem to have some level of existential angst that they are trying to quell through clinging to the idea of a transcendent identity. Those who don't adhere to views of that nature are, in my experience, generally more intellectually honest when it comes to understanding various principles and reading texts. They don't allow confirmation biases to dominate their comprehension, and are not driven by desire and fear.

frankc said:
How can a Buddhist not have an eternalist narrative anyways?

krodha wrote:
It's quite simple. Don't seek to affirm unconditioned existents, homogenous ontological principles, and transpersonal ultimates.

frankc said:
The Buddha describes Nirvana as the supreme happiness.

krodha wrote:
Which has nothing to do with an eternalist view.

frankc said:
How can something be a supreme happiness if there is nothing left after the five khandas break apart to experience it.

krodha wrote:
There are various presuppositions in this question that demonstrate a meager understanding of the buddhadharma. Either that, or a clear indication that you have not even attempted to cultivate a balanced view.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 27th, 2015 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
That actually not my view that is what is taught in the Nirvana Sutra
Nirvana Sutra
“Sena asked: “According to Gotama’s opinion, then, that there is no ‘I’, let me ask what can be the meaning of that description he gives of Nirvana, that it is permanent, full of joy, personal, and pure?” Buddha says: “Illustrious youth, I do not say that the six external and internal organs, or the various species of knowledge, are permanent, etc; but what I say is that “that” is permanent, full of joy, personal, and pure, which is left after the six organs and the six objects of sense, and the various kinds of knowledge are all destroyed. Illustrious youth, when the world, weary of sorrow, turns away and separates itself from the cause of all this sorrow, then, by this voluntary rejection of it, there remains that which I call the True Self; and it is of this I plainly declare the formula, that it is permanent, full of joy, personal, and pure.”].

krodha wrote:
Again, it is your own interpretation. Others can read the same text and walk away with a completely different view on the matter, which is in most cases more accurate due to the fact that they don't have an eternalist narrative they are seeking to confirm.

Also, the Mahāyāna-mahaparinirvana sutra never uses the term "true self" at any point in time, so it is clear that the translation you usually cite was crafted by an individual who also has an eternalist agenda.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 2:21 PM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Vimalakirti432 said:
Here I feel you're latching on to metaphysical terms as if they were real things, and missing the point of what I said. Perhaps you might read again? It's short!

krodha wrote:
I mean, terms and concepts communicate specific views and experiential insights. Buddhism has no problem with concepts, this isn't neo-Advaita.

Vimalakirti432 said:
In my view, we need to look to overall systems and their methodology, not fixate on individual terms or pieces of reasoning out of their context.

krodha wrote:
Overall systems, their methodologies and resultant insights are what I'm addressing.

Vimalakirti432 said:
We need to look at the actual states and experiences envisioned or attained, and not at metaphysical descriptors that are always ambiguous and usually misleading.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure why they would be misleading, they're fairly straightforward if you understand the systems you are discussing.

Vimalakirti432 said:
The point is not whether some term is styled "ontological" etc. or not

krodha wrote:
This is straw man since I never said I was fixating on terms.

Vimalakirti432 said:
Here I feel you're in danger of trying to carry the raft to the other shore.

krodha wrote:
Vimalakirti, help, this raft is so heavy.

Help.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 10:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
steve_bakr said:
If you have specific issues about teaching, you should articulate these without attacking the person. Our demeanor expresses our realization, am I right or not?

All I have seen here are anecdotes. I have not seen anyone address specific points of teaching.

krodha wrote:
Here:

1. He is not a qualified teacher.
2. has not completed the practices he teaches.
3. teaches neo-Advaita dressed up as Dzogchen.
4. inserts the result into the basis.
5. rejects the path.
6. merely negates imputation instead of addressing underlying causes.
7. loses the conduct in the view.
8. errs into eternalism.
9. errs into nihilism.
10. confuses mind for wisdom.
11. confuses marigpa for rigpa.
12. conflates tenet systems and their underlying principles.
13. claims to have knowledge of teachings and principles that he does not truly understand.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:46 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Malcolm said:
"Ground of being" is a term coined by the theologian Paul Tillich to describe God.

dzogchungpa said:
Malcolm, you are very fond of pointing this out but, honestly, it is not relevant.

krodha wrote:
It makes all the difference in the world. The proper way of understanding the gzhi is as a conventional literary device that represents an epistemic insight that has yet to be

recognized.

If on the other hand you insist that the gzhi is some sort of ontological ground, then one misunderstands Dzogpachenpo altogether.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
There is no Tibetan term which means "ground of being", this isn't that difficult to understand, and further has zero to do with "positions", classical or otherwise.
You seem heavily invested in this.

krodha wrote:
On the contrary you seem to be the one that is clinging to decrepit translations so that you can bend these teachings to fit some desired narrative.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:37 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
Right, so an outdated translation since gzhi is not a "ground of being" in any sense.

Malcolm has gone over this point thoroughly, various times.
Malcolm is a proponent of a position. I respect his position. It is classical Dharma. There are other positions to which he objects. He is entitled to do so. There is no unanimity in TB--aside from the 4 Thought that Turn the Mind.

krodha wrote:
There is no Tibetan term which means "ground of being", this isn't that difficult to understand, and further has zero to do with "positions", classical or otherwise.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
To put this to rest: what Tibetan term does "ground of being" allegedly translate?
p.238 of the glossary:

ground [of being]=gzhi

The next entry is:

ground manifestation=gzhi snang

krodha wrote:
Right, so an outdated translation since gzhi is not a "ground of being" in any sense.

Malcolm has gone over this point thoroughly, various times.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:16 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
That translation is outdated, there is no such thing as a "ground of being" in Dzogchen... apart from the ālaya of course, which is pure ignorance.
Kalu Rinpoche Translation Committee. State of the art translation.

You keep making that assertion. There are multiple presentations on Dzogchen. This one you don't like. That's ok, it is not the only presentation.

krodha wrote:
Knowledge of these systems has evolved since then. There is no such thing as a "ground of being" in Dzogchen. And no, there are not "multiple presentations", but there are outdated translations predicated on outdated understanding.

To put this to rest: what Tibetan term does "ground of being" allegedly translate?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
No, actually it is specifically and deliberately being presented as a "ground of being". "Myriad Worlds" is about the various cosmologies, starting with Mr Meru and such. It ends with a Dzogchen cosmology, which is unambiguously a "ground of being". Excluding the presence of either buddhas or sentient beings makes that clear.

Hey, you don't have to buy it. Plenty of people have become enlightened that find such ideas heresy. But plenty of people, such as Kongtrul himself presumably, have become enlightened while holding those types of ideas. So either way is fine. It is a matter of preference.

krodha wrote:
That translation is outdated, there is no such thing as a "ground of being" in Dzogchen...

apart from the ālaya of course, which is pure ignorance.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Gzhan stong simply says that your nature is not deprived of qualities... it doesn't advocate for ontological, transpersonal, holotropic, unconditioned existents.

dzogchungpa said:
Seriously dude, I know you like Capriles but it's enough with 'holotropic' already.

krodha wrote:
What's wrong with "holotropic"? It's a very succinct way to say that something is singular and whole.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
Gzhan stong simply says that your nature is not deprived of qualities... it doesn't advocate for ontological, transpersonal, holotropic, unconditioned existents.
Kongtrul's "Myriad Worlds" p,204: What is the fundamental nature of the original, primordial ground of being, before buddhas appear by realizing it and before sentient beings appear by not realizing it? To answer this, the tradition of Great Perfection states that...
Sounds like Kongtrul is taking "the basis" to mean it is actually "the basis".

krodha wrote:
If this is a Dzogchen context then this is simply a bad translation of a passage that is referencing the gzhi... which definitely is not a "ground of being".

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:48 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
frankc said:
Lol come on.

krodha wrote:
What? "gcig shes kun grol" means "knowing one thing, liberates all things"

And what is this one thing?

Padmasambhava states:
Do not resolve the Dharma, resolve your mind.
To resolve your mind is to know the one which frees all.
Not to resolve your mind is to know all but lack the one.
A common notion in Atiyoga texts, but it is also found elsewhere... for example the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra states:
What is called "knowledge of all things" is the result of knowing one thing: the true nature of phenomena, which has the attribute of peace.
This "one thing" is an epistemic insight. Not some ontological truth.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
smcj said:
Brahman is an ontological, transpersonal, holotropic, unconditioned existent... there is absolutely nothing like that in the buddhadharma.
That depends. If you define anything like that as a tirthika heresy, then yes, by definition there is nothing like that in Buddhadharma.

However you'd have to include Shentongpas in that dismissal, which would include the modern Karma Kagyu sect of TB. As a self-identifying Kagyupa I find that a bit harsh.

krodha wrote:
Gzhan stong simply says that your nature is not deprived of qualities... it doesn't advocate for ontological, transpersonal, holotropic, unconditioned existents.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:35 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
frankc said:
Venerable Tong Songchol had wrong view?

krodha wrote:
I don't agree with a lot of East Asian Buddhist views, but to be completely honest I thought this was your writing due to the fact that you did not cite this quotation properly at all. Upon re-reading it is clear that he is speaking of the nature of mind, as in the prajñāpāramitā statement which says the knowledge of one thing liberates all things i.e., gcig shes kun grol. He isn't speaking of some sort of "one thing" in the sense of a Vedantin type transpersonal, holotropic existent.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 4:24 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
frankc said:
When attempting to climb a mountain one should begin, Zen masters say, at the top, and strangely enough I have found this most effective. So let us begin with the Everest of human thought, the Absolute.

krodha wrote:
There is no such thing as an "absolute" in the buddhadharma, apart from ultimate truth, which isn't an "absolute" in the way you mean.

frankc said:
It has of course no name, but men have never wearied of supplying one. The Hindus speak of THAT, the Christians, at their best, of Gottheit, 'Godness' beyond God. In Buddhism we read of 'the Unborn, Unoriginated, Unconditioned'. Later we read of the Adi-Buddha, Dharmakaya, Sunyata, Mind-Only and the essence of the pure mind (or No-Mind)

krodha wrote:
Sorry, but this just sounds like a weak attempt at some sort of perennialism. There is no such thing as a shared "absolute" that all traditions are referring to, this is a wrong view.

frankc said:
How to describe this land? We cannot, for it is void of every attribute we could supply, it is without limit or shape of any conceivable kind. From the book "Exploring Buddhism", page 92.

Udana Nikaya (viii: 3)

“There is, O monks, an Unborn, Unoriginated, Uncreated, Unformed. Were there not, O monks, this Unborn, Unoriginated, Uncreated, Unformed, there would be no escape from the world of the born, originated, created, formed. Since, O monks, there is an Unborn, Unoriginated, Uncreated, Unformed, therefore is there an escape from the born, originated, created, formed. Udana Nikaya (viii:3)

krodha wrote:
This is describing the absorption cessation of an arhat, not some perennialist, transpersonal "absolute".

frankc said:
In Vajrayana Buddhism, the Adi-Buddha, or Adibuddha (Tibetan: Dang-po'i sangs-rgyas), is the "Primordial Buddha." The term refers to a self-emanating, self-originating Buddha, present before anything else existed. Samantabhadra, Vairocana and Vajradhara are the best known names for Adi-Buddha, though there are others like Sanghyang Adi Buddha from Indonesia. Adi-Buddha is usually depicted as dark blue. Adi-Buddha is better

compared to the abstracted forces of Brahman, Ayn Sof or Arche rather than a personal creator God in the mold of Yahweh or Allah. Also, Adi-Buddha is not said to be the creator, but the originator of all things. Adi-Buddha is a deity in an emanationist sense. From wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adi-Buddha

krodha wrote:
The so-called Adi Buddha is the nature of your own mind, not some transpersonal "absolute". Whoever wrote that has no idea what they're talking about. Alas, that is the problem with Wikipedia, all one needs is a computer and an Internet connection and they can write whatever nonsense they want on there.

frankc said:
There is One Thing - It existed before the earth and skies came into being, and it will exist long after they all have disappeared. The heavens and earth could appear a thousand times and be destroyed ten thousand times, but this One Thing would not change at all.

krodha wrote:
Not according to the buddhadharma. There is no holotropic source in Buddhism. This is a tirthīka view.

frankc said:
This One Thing is incomprehensibly huge. The entire universe is just a spray of water in comparison to this ocean. This One Thing is incomparably brighter than a trillion billion suns and moons, and it constantly lights up everything. This absolute Great Light is beyond light and dark, and yet it lights everything that exists. This One Thing is beyond description, beyond discrimination, and it is absolute. But even the term "absolute" is entirely inadequate to describe it. To call it "One Thing" is to lie, because "One Thing" is only a name, and a terribly inadequate name. All Buddhas of the universe could spend eternity describing it, but such an effort would be insignificant. If you were to become enlightened, then you yourself would know; but you would never be able to explain it to anyone.

krodha wrote:
This view deviates from Buddhism altogether.

frankc said:
This One Thing is called "Buddha" by those who have become enlightened. It is beyond the agony of life and death, and those who know it become free-flowing for the rest of eternity. But those who have not become enlightened to this One Thing continue to struggle and suffer in the sea of life and death, in the everlasting cycle of the four forms of birth and the six realms of sentient existence. Even the tiniest form of life includes this One Thing. Both an enlightened Buddha and an unenlightened ant possess it. The only difference between them is that one knows it and the other doesn't.
It is so brilliant and astounding that even the Buddha and Bodhidharma cannot look at it when they raise their eyes. They can open their mouths, but cannot describe it. They and all our other Zen patriarchs become merely blind and mute in the face of it. All one

can do is to become enlightened to it, and then become totally free-flowing in it. Tong Songchol (1912~1993), one of the great Zen masters in the last century was also called the Living Buddha of Korea.

krodha wrote:
All of this is wrong view. You are attempting to make some sort of perennialist soup out of various traditions and then project it onto Buddhism.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 3:51 AM
Title: Re: Talking about the self, whatever that is
Content:
krodha wrote:
Just a word of friendly advice: if you really want people to engage with you and discuss your ideas you should try to be less verbose. I have no doubt that many people would like to interact and have a discussion with you, but most do not have time to read through a wall of text.

Which is to say you'll find that your replies will increase ten fold if you shorten your posts.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 3:48 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Vimalakirti432 said:
If you follow the thought of various systems, and not just within the Buddhist fold, you'll find it very difficult to distinguish them at their ultimate levels. So we find in the Uttara Tantra that the Buddha as a dharmakaya is permanent, as samboghakaya luminous, as nirmanakaya everywhere, etc.; at this level the distinction "being" and "knowing" collapse and it takes a fine metaphysician to distinguish between this cosmic Buddha from Nirguna Brahman.

krodha wrote:
What do you mean? Brahman is an ontological, transpersonal, holotropic, unconditioned existent... there is absolutely nothing like that in the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 2:40 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
I could of swore an externalist...

krodha wrote:
The term is "eternalist", not "externalist".

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 1:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm being a bit heavy handed with my criticism. I appreciate that Jackson has an affinity for the teachings, and I think it is good that he shares Dzogchen and brings it to people's attention who may otherwise never encounter it. I also think he means well and has a good heart, but I don't agree with his views and I don't think he is qualified to be teaching, especially not upadeśa teachings.

He actually sent me a message the other day on Facebook to say that he has read my criticisms and doesn't appreciate it and wanted me to remove them, and apologize. And I told him that this is how I feel.

I respect him as a man, and I wish him a long and happy life, but I don't think he is qualified to be teaching Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 26th, 2015 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
steve_bakr said:
Judging from a retreat with Jackson Peterson in Mexico, I did not hear anything contradictory to Dzogchen teachings.

krodha wrote:
I really hope you're joking.

steve_bakr said:
He also gave spontaneous Pointing Out instructions, which I thought were simple and affective. I have also read some of his posts in another Internet forum.

krodha wrote:
The blind leading the blind.

steve_bakr said:
A lot of what I have seen here about Jackson Peterson looks like gossip: "He said," "She said."

krodha wrote:
No, it is simply an informed observation.

steve_bakr said:
"This teacher said this and that about him." My mind remains open.

krodha wrote:
Well, someone has to play the role of the guy who receives teachings from the fraud.

steve_bakr said:
I've seen nothing wrong in his teaching that I have heard or read.

krodha wrote:
That is because, unfortunately, you don't know any better.

steve_bakr said:
I think Longchenpa said, "Pay no attention to the personality of the teacher but pay attention to his teachings."

krodha wrote:
Right, and the teachings are inauthentic.

steve_bakr said:
Another gem of wisdom is: "The truth is self-authenticating." Don't exclusively judge from a lineage. Verify the truth for yourself.

krodha wrote:
Not sure how that is relevant here.

steve_bakr said:
I get a red flag when someone judges another person's realization.

krodha wrote:
I get a red flag when people take unqualified "teachers" seriously.

steve_bakr said:
That is not appropriate and is not possible in an absolute sense.

krodha wrote:
It is possible.

steve_bakr said:
I validated Jackson's Pointing Out instructions and they were authentic

krodha wrote:
No, they weren't, you've been swindled, sadly.

steve_bakr said:
in the sense that they could open a window to Rigpa.

krodha wrote:
Jackson doesn't understand what rig pa is, all he points out is the clarity of mind and then falls into nihilism thinking that is all that need be done.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 5:45 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
If there is no saguna Brahman it makes no sense to use "nirguna". And it follows from that there is no atman either.

frankc said:
Madhyamaka scholars did not deny that numerous passages describing an eternal substratum—much like the Vedic concept of brahman, the supreme reality—appeared in Buddhist sutras and tantras; there were just too many such passages to dismiss.

krodha wrote:
And what sūtras and tantras allude to something like an "eternal substratum"? I've never seen a sūtra or tantra say anything like that.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Like Malcolm said: weeds in an untended garden.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
monktastic said:
There may also be something else going on too.

In my experience, there are (legitimate) Dzogchen teachers who explicitly do not call out -- or even seem to acknowledge -- the distinction. Tsoknyi R. sometimes hedges with the terms "baby" or "conceptual" rigpa. From my (very limited) experience, it may be because the more attention is drawn to the distinction, the more it prolongs worry or doubt in a certain kind of practitioner. Admittedly, maybe other practitioners will have the opposite problem. But I sometimes wonder if it's helpful to talk so much about this stuff online.

krodha wrote:
I suppose it would depend on the student. I'm sure if a teacher senses that a particular student is going to fixate on the distinction and allow doubt and worry to compromise their practice then it may be wiser to simply point out the so-called "baby rigpa" and let them feel comfortable and confident with that.

I personally don't see that as all that useful since it's sort of sugar coating the situation, but in the end who am I to judge?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 2:55 AM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
conebeckham said:
I think "Clarity" and "limpidity" mean "stainless," but "luminous" means something a bit different...it's more of a "radiance," which I relate to the awareness aspect, and not the emptiness aspect.

But you shouldn't listen to me, I think all of this needs to be heard at the feet of a master.

krodha wrote:
Tsoknyi Rinpoche does equate clarity with the "knowing" noetic capacity of the mind, granted he says clarity is the knowing and appearances that are known.
Sometimes I say emptiness in the clarity and sometimes emptiness in the appearance. These mean exactly the same thing because emptiness is emptiness in each case and because the clarity part and the appearance part come down to the same meaning. Clarity is the knower and appearances are what it knows.

Now, when we do not know this emptiness and appearance we stay in duality and staying in duality we are confused. The definition of confusion is: "Not directly seeing the actuality of things."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 2:18 AM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Gsal. Ok, ty. Space is said to be "luminous", however. Even in semde they aren't synonymous?

krodha wrote:
"Luminous" just means "pure", "unstained", etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist teachers that teach a true self?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Actually iirc the Suzuki translation of Lankavatara specifically expounds that the Tathagatagarbha is, in fact, neither a self nor soul. In addition, belief in an Atman like thing is refuted at various points throughout the sutra in some detail. I have no idea how someone could read even the Suzuki translation and be under the impression that Lankavatara teaches a True Self in the way the term is being used here, without simply ignoring major parts of the sutra.

krodha wrote:
Eternalists can be impressively talented at ignoring vast amounts of information and cherry picking citations that can be bent to fit their narratives.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
Malcolm said:
rang byung rig pa is "self-originated rig pa", it means knowledge [rig pa] of your primordial state that originated [byung] from your own [rang] discovery of it.

krodha wrote:
Right, so seems to make for confusion when the term rig pa is used in referring to gnas gyu shes pa, which is simply a relative, everyday cognition. My point being that these various uses for the term rig pa are most likely the reason for people's confusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 25th, 2015 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
Malcolm said:
RIg pa is not intrinsic to every experience. If it were, there could be no ma rig pa, and there would never be any need to point anything out at all.

krodha wrote:
Do you think confusion about this arises due to the fact that "rig pa" as a Tibetan term can also mean plain old, everyday "knowing"? I've seen some teachers use it in that context, such as when the relative knowing of mind as gnas gyu shes pa is referred to as rig pa in the context of gnas gyu rig gsum. This seems to create confusion and lends to the misconception that rig pa is always present.

For instance, Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche uses rig pa like that, but then makes a point to

differentiate two different types of rig pa, which strikes me as a plausible example of how so much confusion arises over this principle.

In the case of stillness [gnas pa], occurrence [gyu ba] and noticing [rig pa], the word rigpa is used for noticing. Self-existing awareness [rang byung rig pa] is also called rigpa. The word is the same but the meaning is different. The difference between these two practices is as vast as the distance between sky and earth.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 2:54 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
...I suppose Malcolm would have to clarify there, being that it's his translation.

Malcolm said:
Phenomena is chos, dharmin; nonphenomena is chos min, i.e., dharmatā; the former is the relative, the latter is the ultimate. Since they are merged, there is no such thing as an ultimate phenomena, don dam chos, paramārthadharma.

In other words, the two truths of Madhyamaka are a deviation.

krodha wrote:
Thank you

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 2:42 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
catmoon said:
I still think that from an analytical point of view that suchness is such a horrifically ill-defined entity, that it defies inclusion in any kind of meaningful analysis, much as the God concept does.

krodha wrote:
Tathatā or "suchness" means "the way things really are" or "the actual way of things"... it's just a succinct way to denote the ultimate nature of phenomena.

When viewed that way it doesn't seem all too abstract or ill-defined, at least IMO.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:

smcj said:
I don't think we are reading "nonphenomena" the same way.

asunthatneversets said:
Agreed. I think you desire to see "nonphenomena" a certain way that it really isn't, hence why you like to try to bend gzhan stong to fit that narrative (and in the process reify the rang stong straw man and relegate it to addressing what is allegedly "phenomenal").

smcj said:
I don't understand that at all.

What I'm saying is that "nonphenomena" sounds like a euphemism that somehow avoids the pitfall of "ultimate phenomena" to me. I'm ok with that.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps. I personally don't see why it would be addressing anything other than relative and ultimate natures but I suppose Malcolm would have to clarify there, being that it's his translation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
smcj said:
I don't think we are reading "nonphenomena" the same way.

krodha wrote:
Agreed. I think you desire to see "nonphenomena" a certain way that it really isn't, hence why you like to try to bend gzhan stong to fit that narrative (and in the process reify the rang stong straw man and relegate it to addressing what is allegedly "phenomenal").

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 12:59 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
smcj said:
So-called ultimate a relative truths are species of cognition. The so-called "ultimate" is a direct experiential knowledge of the non-arising of the relative (in Dzogchen this knowledge is called "rig pa"), hence from that standpoint conditioned and unconditioned are non-dual and there's no need to analyze so-called conditioned entities in order to realize their emptiness (unconditioned nature). An endeavor of that nature becomes superfluous from the standpoint of the definitive Dzogchen view. Semantics. If you want "nonphenomena" to mean something other than "ultimate

phenomenon" that's fine with me.

krodha wrote:
I didn't suggest they are different.

smcj said:
Defining the problem away seems to be an acceptable way to deal with things.

krodha wrote:
Not sure what you're talking about.

smcj said:
It is "ultimate phenomena" that is the bug-a-boo.

krodha wrote:
Not really, dharmatā or the unconditioned [ultimate] nature of phenomena is quite straightforward.

smcj said:
Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an “ ultimate phenomenon ”.

krodha wrote:
Yes, precisely.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
smcj said:
The passage is saying that there is nothing to analyze from the standpoint of the experiential view [lta ba] of Dzogchen because dharmas and dharmatā are known to be neither the same nor different.
Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable...
So being "merged and inseparable" means something other than they are the same?

krodha wrote:
It means that for a yogin resting in that view there is no distinction between relative and ultimate. All that is perceived is what we (from the standpoint of the relative) would call "ultimate truth", but for the adept who is resting in that view no distinction can be made, nor would a distinction be warranted or necessary.

So-called ultimate a relative truths are species of cognition. The so-called "ultimate" is a direct experiential knowledge of the non-arising of the relative (in Dzogchen this knowledge is called "rig pa"), hence from that standpoint conditioned and unconditioned are non-dual and there's no need to analyze so-called conditioned

entities in order to realize their emptiness (unconditioned nature). An endeavor of that nature becomes superfluous from the standpoint of the definitive Dzogchen view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 12:27 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
smcj said:
The gzhan stong and rang stong dichotomy is really altogether extraneous to what is being pointed out in the passage above.
I thought that might be the case. But in any event, read from a my perspective, it is in accord with my thinking.

krodha wrote:
The passage is saying that there is nothing to analyze from the standpoint of the experiential view [lta ba] of Dzogchen because dharmas and dharmatā are known to be neither the same nor different.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 11th, 2015 at 12:21 AM
Title: Re: Analysis or Nothing
Content:
smcj said:
Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an “ultimate phenomenon”.
I like that quote. When I hear it said, when they are correctly understood, both Shentong and Rangtong end up being the same thing, that's what I understand it to mean. I'm not sure that is how it is intended, but that's how I read it.

krodha wrote:
Why? Because you think so-called gzhan stong applies to "nonphenomena" and so-called rang stong applies to "phenomena"? That isn't true at all.

The gzhan stong and rang stong dichotomy is really altogether extraneous to what is being pointed out in the passage above.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 4th, 2015 at 11:32 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 2nd, 2015 at 3:28 AM
Title: Re: Self or No-Self
Content:
krodha wrote:
Self and no-self are not really the issue in Dzogchen.

Dzogchen is concerned with an ignorance of one's nature [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa] and a knowledge of one's nature [skt. vidyā, tib. rig pa].

Buddhism in general (including Dzogchen) really jettisons the whole idea of a self, and instead focuses on afflictive causes and conditions. Ignorance (cause) and the habitual tendencies of accepting and rejecting (conditions) are the problem, so to speak. So instead of worrying about a self, the point is to overturn ignorance through recognizing one's nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 2nd, 2015 at 3:06 AM
Title: Re: Self or No-Self
Content:
Pinus said:
Can anyone help clarifying, whether the self (or rather the no-self) is the same as shunyataa (or ka dag) in the Dzogchen-view? There seem to be conflicting opinions in Buddhism, whether the aatman (pure self) is the same as shunyataa (perhaps out of concern that one may confuse it with the ordinary ego or ideas of self).

krodha wrote:
The idea of an unconditioned ātman in Buddhism is really a fringe notion that is primarily relegated to a few East Asian Buddhist sects. Indian and Tibetan systems, including Dzogpachenpo do not promulgate a view of that nature. There is no such thing as a pure self "ātman" in Dzogchen.

A "self" in terms of Dzogchen is nothing more than a designation that is imputed onto various habitual patterns of ignorance and grasping. As a result of those karmic tendencies and ignorance the misconception of a (conditioned) subjective individual entity [self] and an outer environment [world] both arise.

Ka dag is merely a way to communicate that the allegedly conditioned phenomena we experience from the standpoint of ignorance, are actually unconditioned and have always been unconditioned. We simply fail to recognize this and so we relate to our delusion and suffer.

Pinus said:
Other terms are also used, e.g. rang stong (self-empty).

krodha wrote:

Rang stong and gzhan stong are not really relevant to the Dzogchen view. So-called "rang stong" is simply a straw man moniker that was attributed to traditional Madhyamaka by those who adhere to the so-called "gzhan stong" view.

Pinus said:
So, considering just the Dzogchen-view (ignoring other Buddhist ways of looking): is the aatman or self considered to be the same as shunyataa?

krodha wrote:
Śūnyatā would be pointing to the fact that a self cannot be found due to a "self" being nothing more than a confused inference that ultimately refers to nothing (as a self is nothing that is truly findable when sought). We can implement the idea of a "self" in everyday activities, and refer to ourselves as a self, this is called a "conventional self". That convention only becomes a problem when we believe that it actually refers to something real. So it is the misconception of a truly substantial self (whether pure or impure) that is negated.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 29th, 2015 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: Experience of Shunyata All the Time?
Content:
Pinus said:
Thanks for your straight-forward answer, Gyurme!

So would you then say that the term Shunyata, as it is used in Dzogchen teachings, denotes the state of consciousness (or state of mind) that allows one to subsequently realize/understand/recognize one's true nature by remaining in it, which then is what is called Rigpa?

krodha wrote:
Śūnyatā in Dzogchen is called "ka dag", which is the emptiness of consciousness i.e., the nature of mind. A direct, experiential knowledge of that nature is called rig pa.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 29th, 2015 at 1:13 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Kaccāni said:
For Nagarjuna one would need the original phrases, as he was apparently constantly playing with the ambiguity of svabhava as identity and causal independence and a translation may not catch that.

krodha wrote:
Nāgārjuna was quite clear in what he meant by svabhāva, there was no ambiguity involved.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 28th, 2015 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
truly

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
If we say any "x is/isn't truly y", e.g. "arising is/isn't truly nonarising" or "emptiness is/isn't beyond elaboration" we still haven't unified the two truths.

krodha wrote:
On the contrary, we have unified the two truths, since non-arising is freedom from the four extremes. This does not mean appearances cease, we are not advocating for an inert void... appearances manifest, but are devoid of self-nature, illusory, this is the union of the two-truths.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
We're still pulling back the curtain. Same as "maya is/isn't truly atman".

krodha wrote:
I don't see how this is relevant.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Because, the two truths themselves, both arising and non-arising, are DOs - by definition.

krodha wrote:
No, "arising" is a misconception of ignorance, and as a result of that initial misconception the duality of existence and non-existence ensues, because the conditioned entities that are mistaken as having "arisen" must now exist and are then susceptible to a cessation of existence, whereby they would naturally "not-exist."

When that ignorance is uprooted, the perception that phenomena have arisen is overturned, and thus it is realized that appearances have been free from the extremes of existence and non-existence from the very beginning.

Dependent origination is simply the fact that no conditioned entity can be found to exist independently of causes and conditions. Because for something to truly exist, it must do so independently of cause and condition. Since an independent and inherent existence of this nature is impossible, we state that conditioned entities are dependently originated, and therefore they ultimately do not originate at all (hence they are empty).

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
It's directly related to the theism idea. It doesn't matter whether the x and y is arising/non-arising or maya/atman.

krodha wrote:
I don't follow.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Saying "arising is/isn't truly nonarising" is like putting up a target to hit. Or like taking out a piece of paper and drawing a "no" on it.

krodha wrote:
No, it actually isn't. Stating that dependently arisen entities do not ultimately arise is the very definition of dependent origination. This sentiment is found throughout various expositions...

Mañjuśrī states:

Whatever is dependently originated does not truly arise.

Candrakīrti affirms this sentiment:

The perfectly enlightened buddhas-proclaimed, "What is dependently created is uncreated."

And Nāgārjuna follows suit:

What originates dependently is unoriginated!

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Exactly the same target as "maya is/isn't truly atman".

Whereas: the egolessnesses aren't really two but two "fold", i.e. there's no dependence at all. No arising or non-arising. Not possible.

No curtain to pull back. No target to put up. No paper. No "truly". No "beyond".

krodha wrote:
I'm sorry but I can't make sense of what you are trying to say.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 28th, 2015 at 12:35 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:

that which originates dependenly does not originate at all.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
That can't be right, since being nonexistent is a conceptual elaboration pertaining to the appearances of DO.

krodha wrote:
Non-arising [anutpada] is not non-existence. Something must first exist, and then cease to exist in order to be non-existent (unless were talking about horns on a hare or hair on a tortoise, etc). Since dependently originated entities never truly originate to begin with, they are free from the four extremes (although by default this arguably means they are indeed "non-existent" appearances i.e., illusions).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 28th, 2015 at 12:14 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
? Parabhava is "defeat".

krodha wrote:
Parabhāva is dependent existence, it is a guise for inherent existence [svabhāva].

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 28th, 2015 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Emptiness and dependent origination are synonymous.

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:
Not necessarily. According to the union of the two truths we say the appearances of DO are in reality beyond conceptual elaboration. Is that the same as saying that both self and phenomena are already absent of any reality?

krodha wrote:
I don't follow.

Emptiness and dependent origination are synonymous because that which originates dependenly does not originate at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 28th, 2015 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism

Content:
krodha wrote:
Often times when people claim to be discussing dependent origination [pratityasamutpada] they are actually referring to dependent existence [parabhava].

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 27th, 2015 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Matt J said:
In Buddhism, the central principle is "emptiness" or sunyata.

Kaccāni said:
In Madhyamaka.

Otherwise, the unifying principle would probably be "dependent origination".

krodha wrote:
Emptiness and dependent origination are synonymous.

Also, you would be incorrect to state that emptiness as a central principle is relegated to Madhyamaka, as there is no Buddhist view that does not center itself around emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 27th, 2015 at 9:36 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
muni said:
I wanted to answer on the question whether similar or not, but I am stuck with " similar".

krodha wrote:
An unfortunate misconception.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 27th, 2015 at 9:35 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
The basis [gzhi] in Dzogpachenpo and the Brahman of Vedanta are nothing alike. Anyone who says they are is unfortunately uneducated on the subject.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 27th, 2015 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Matt J said:
In fact, modern traditional Advaita uses the same "dependent origination" formula as the Pali Suttas to argue that consciousness is primary.

krodha wrote:
A genuine view of dependent origination does not place consciousness as primary. Dependent origination does not advocate for a unilateral dependency, but rather bilateral dependencies which turn out to be implications more than anything truly valid.

If one is attempting to implement the view of dependent origination in order to arrive at a position where consciousness is "primary" then they have failed to understand dependent origination.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 14th, 2015 at 5:09 AM
Title: Re: Direct introduction. What is it?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
No need to bow out though.

krodha wrote:
Especially if you need a place to stay; dzogchungpa has a five-star bed and breakfast.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 14th, 2015 at 4:30 AM
Title: Re: Direct introduction. What is it?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Pertinent factoid: the term "direct introduction" is actually derived from the Tibetan phrase ngo rang thog du sprad which, according to Lopön Malcolm, roughly translates to "a direct self-encounter with [one's] state [lit. face]."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 14th, 2015 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Direct introduction. What is it?
Content:
Astus said:
Zen teaches sudden enlightenment, Dzogchen does not.

alpha said:

That is not strictly true.

krodha wrote:
It isn't true at all actually. Awakening [bodhi] or "enlightenment" is always sudden, as it is a sudden realization or epiphany that occurs due to a cessation of ignorance.

However awakening is not buddhahood, and that is a crucial and key point to make. There is no system that teaches sudden buddhahood, as that is impossible. So both Zen and Dzogchen would be equal in the sense that they both are able to actualize sudden awakening.

That being said, the methods to actualize said awakening, and the paths that ensue after said awakening would undoubtedly differ.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 12th, 2015 at 4:30 AM
Title: Re: New forum: Dharma Paths Practice Community
Content:
Urgyen Dorje said:
I really don't see mahayana and vajrayana practice being outside the scope of this forum. There's only one dharma. I've seen the four visions of togal related to the four noble truths. It's as compatible as we make it and understand it.

krodha wrote:
Right, but no practitioner in their right mind is going to discuss that in a public forum. That's one of the other reasons it won't work out well for Vajrayāna practitioners, samaya. No one is going to openly broadcast their practices and activities to strangers and practitioners of other yānas who have no connection to Secret Mantra. Discussing view (within reason) is one thing, that occurs daily here on Dharma Wheel and elsewhere, but practice is something entirely different.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 12th, 2015 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: New forum: Dharma Paths Practice Community
Content:
krodha wrote:
As it is right now it seems like it should all be relegated to one section that focuses on Theravadin practice. And then perhaps have two other sections for Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. That may defeat the idea of a "pan-buddhist" forum to have those different sections, but as it stands right now it does not cater to Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna so well.

All in all I can't really see renunciant paths and tantric transformative paths mixing very well, to say nothing of the path of self-liberation, so I suspect this new site in its current trajectory will really just turn into a Dhammawheel part 2.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 8th, 2015 at 11:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
From "Longchenpa's Advice From the Heart": With the thought of preserving the purity of the Teaching
You may engage in discussions, defending your opinion and refuting that of others;
Yet in this way you create disturbing thoughts.
Remain silent! This is my advice from the heart.

krodha wrote:
Yes, well that would be ideal. Yet even Longchenpa (in his rdzogs pa chen po sems nyid ngal gso) criticized individuals who hold views like Jax, calling such views "the utmost nihilism" belonging to those who had "entered the path of the most inferior" and even went as far as to state that they aren't followers of the dharma.

So while I'm sure we can all agree that it is better to just mind our own business and tend to our own practice/conduct, at the same time those who are sincerely interested in the teachings deserve to know if a teacher is questionable.

I mean, Kongtrul said to sever ties with teachers who deviate from the proper teachings even if you have already formed a relationship, and Padmasambhava said establishing a connection with an unexamined teacher is like jumping off of a cliff. I feel there is a time and place to be quiet and a time and place to speak.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 8th, 2015 at 7:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
Matt J said:
How do you know what Jackson knows "experientially?"

krodha wrote:
From interacting with him off and on for some years now. The way he presents his view and the nature of his insight is not indicative of having recognized the nature of mind... otherwise he would not present his teachings in the way that he does.

Also, he has expressed doubts about his own experience before, which is a clear sign that he hasn't had authentic insight regarding his nature, as there is no way to have doubt if one has truly actualized a legitimate knowledge of their state.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 8th, 2015 at 4:43 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
Malcolm's point about parrots and garudas is spot on but apart of that what Tulku Urgyen says and what Jackson says are exactly the same. Whether it is entirely experiential for Jackson is another matter.

krodha wrote:
You are correct, it isn't experiential for Jackson and so he ends up teaching through his limitations. For example, when Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche speaks of "thought-free wakefulness" he is speaking of "non-conceptual primordial wisdom [ye shes]". In contrast, when Jackson speaks of "thought free wakefulness" he is pointing to the mere fact that the movement of thought does not effect or impede upon our relative, everyday, afflicted cognizance... and this is because Jackson has never recognized the definitive nature of mind, so he settles for a provisional form of rigpa in the form of "gnas gyu shes pa" or "the mere knowing of the stillness and movement of mind" and he then parades this as ye shes when it is nothing more than dualistic consciousness [rnam shes].

So Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche is talking about something completely different. And incidentally there is a quote from Tulku Urgyen where he compares the definitive view of rigpa (that he is pointing to) to the relative view of rigpa (such as the one Jackson promotes) and he says the difference between the two is like the earth and the sky, meaning: they are worlds apart.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 8th, 2015 at 4:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
Malcolm said:
Being a parrot is relatively easy. Living that knowledge is not so easy. There are a lot of Dzogchen parrots, not so many Dzogchen garudas.

tomamundsen said:
Sure. But if one has faith in the Dzogchen teachings and continues to apply themselves in the practice, they will eventually get there.

krodha wrote:
He means parrot teachers vs. the small handful of teachers who are the real McCoy.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 8th, 2015 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:

zenman said:
Tulku Urgyen's quote btw wonderfully has lead us back to the original topic! I bet that doesn't happen very often after over 120 messages He says that when thoughtfree wakefulness grows longer and longer and all the way up to 24/7 then one has attained great perfection. That is precisely Jackson Peterson's message as well, though he is not an authorised dzogchen teacher.

krodha wrote:
No, Jackson is not taking about what Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche is discussing. I've spent quite some time hearing what Jackson has to say in other forums and engaging in debate with him etc., he is not pointing to what Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche is discussing in that excerpt... far from it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 7th, 2015 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I hold Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in high regard, so I must agree. As he said, we are dealing with words and concepts. I am sure he would have no problem if I say that there is a provisional sense and an Absolute sense. In "The Supreme Source," he writes much about the relative or provisional in relation to the Absolute.

krodha wrote:
Relative and ultimate truths are both species of cognition in Mahāyāna and they are also species of cognition in Dzogchen where relative truth becomes ma rig pa and ultimate truth becomes rig pa.

steve_bakr said:
The text of "The Supreme Source" cuts through all provisional teachings and what remains is "Pure and Total Consciousness" only.

krodha wrote:
The kun byed rgyal po is spoken from the point of view of Samantabhadra, which means the exposition is given from the standpoint of the ultimate. "Pure and total consciousness" is translating the Tibetan term "byang chub sems" which is "bodhicitta" i.e., the sems sde term for the nature of mind [sems nyid].

steve_bakr said:
It cuts through every practice and belief dearly held.

krodha wrote:
Not really. It is simply speaking from the standpoint of one's nature.

steve_bakr said:
This text says that none of these cherished "provisional" practices are adequate unless

one arrives at "Pure and Total Consciousness."

krodha wrote:
Right, because the Dzogchen view [lta ba] is that of ye shes or a pristine consciousness that apperceives one's nature.

steve_bakr said:
There is nothing to meditate on and no meditation other than relaxing effortlessly in "Pure and Total Consciousness,"

krodha wrote:
Which is only true if you are resting directly in equipoise [mnyam bzhag]. Beginners who have yet to recognize their nature cannot rest in equipoise, so there is meditation to do. Many people read statements of this nature which are made from the standpoint of wisdom [ye shes] and they mistake this as applying to your relative condition and then decide there's nothing to do and no meditation or practice required. This is called "nihilism".

steve_bakr said:
which if mistakenly, I relate to Rigpa and the nature of mind, clear and empty. I am willing to accept provisional terminology but the provisional is not where I am living, simply because I have too little time left to live.

krodha wrote:
You cannot just decide that you don't live in the relative condition. You either have recognized your nature and you rest in that knowledge or you don't. That knowledge is a direct, experiential condition, like tasting sugar. You cannot simply decide "I'm tasting sugar" if you aren't. And likewise you cannot simply decide you are resting in the natural state of you aren't. If you are not, which applies to all of us essentially, then you have much to do in terms of practice and meditation.

steve_bakr said:
If provisionally Rigpa is a knowing or the experience of mind's nature, in Absolute terms the experiencer, experience, and experienced are inseparable. This is what I have been trying to say. Guru Padmasambhava says this and I am certain that Chogyal Namkhai Norbu said the same thing when appropriate.

krodha wrote:
This isn't really an appropriate use of "provisional" since both a knowledge of the nature of mind and a cessation of dualistic cognition are one and the same.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 11:35 PM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek M,

The experience could be "similar", but not the words. The words seems to give, possible different interpretations /explanations etc. Well that is just the point here.

krodha wrote:
"Knowledge" is simply more accurate. Everyone has awareness, my cat has awareness. But very few have a working knowledge [rig pa] of their nature.

JLA has said he also prefers "discernment", so there is an element of recognition and an experiential knowledge derived from recognition that is involved with the term "rig pa". "Awareness" fails to capture that.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 3:13 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
Here is Norbu Rinpoche's answer. Because he answered personally to me in the latter part of his message, I will only post the first part/sentence of it.
"If Jackson is SMS Base teacher, you can follow about these teaching, bu not neccssary to you considering that
are becoming a student of Jackson...

With many Tashi Delegs NN."

... from here he goes on to discuss my relationship with him, Norbu, which I do not feel appropriate to post here in a public forum.

What is SMS Base?

krodha wrote:
Rinpoche is saying if Jackson is a Santi Maha Sangha Base teacher then you can follow him (Jax isn't an SMS teacher so this doesn't apply). And if he was (hypothetically) an SMS teacher and you followed him it wouldn't be necessary to consider yourself a student of Jackson's, because you would be Rinpoche's student.

He doesn't know who Jackson is. It is pretty clear he never gave Jax permission to teach anything.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 9:20 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
dzogchungpa said:

Hint: maybe you don't know what context is being referred to and therefore you can't understand how they could be identical.

krodha wrote:
Hint: the context is clearly stated in the excerpt you cited.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 8:48 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
All it says is that in "one particular context" the gzhi and rig pa are "identical", although I don't agree that they're identical ...

dzogchungpa said:
Hmm, I wonder what that context might be?

krodha wrote:
What do you mean? It is the context I just referenced where the basis is recognized and becomes the path. That is when rig pa directly cognizes the three wisdoms and expresses itself as ye shes.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I would agree that ground is one way to describe Rigpa. Rigpa is very deep and all-pervasive.

asunthatneversets said:
"Ground" is a bad translation of the Tibetan term "gzhi", which means "base" or "basis" as in the threefold scheme of basis [gzhi], path [lam] and result [bras bu].

Gzhi is not rig pa.

dzogchungpa said:
Take it up with EPK. Anyway, in that book, it's definitely synonymous with "nature of mind", as used in that book: In this book I will outline ground, path and fruition in the hope of helping you gain some understanding about our basic nature, your own mind. This nature of mind is always present, and it can be called different names: the natural state, the basic nature, the real condition, the enlightened essence, or buddha-nature. This basic nature is what is meant by ground.

krodha wrote:

All it says is that in "one particular context" the gzhi and rig pa are "identical", although I don't agree that they're identical, one can say that once the basis is recognized it is experientially known and therefore inseparable from one's knowledge [rig pa], whereby the basis then becomes the path [lam]. Lest we forget the basis [gzhi] is only the "basis" as long as it is not recognized, however once recognized the basis ceases to be the basis and becomes the path. So the basis is not some transcendent, ontological reality that is truly real, it is a literary device.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 7:41 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I would agree that ground is one way to describe Rigpa. Rigpa is very deep and all-pervasive.

krodha wrote:
"Ground" is a bad translation of the Tibetan term "gzhi", which means "base" or "basis" as in the threefold scheme of basis [gzhi], path [lam] and result [bras bu].

Gzhi is not rig pa.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
The description of Rigpa as nature of mind occurs in the works, "Natural Perfection: Longchenpa's Radical Dzogchen," "Original Perfection: Vairotsana's Five Early Transmissions," "Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness" (Padmasambhava), and elsewhere.

krodha wrote:
Yes but can you cite where this is said specifically? By preferably posting the quotation which directly says this. The request for you to post the citation is to see if you can actually produce said statement, as people who know these texts and the works of Longchenpa and Padmasambhava know that they most likely didn't say this. The point is to figure out if the error is on the translator's side or if you simply misread or misconstrued what you are reading.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 5:18 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
I guess so that this Nature is beyond Rigpa?

krodha wrote:
One's "nature" is the unconditioned nature of mind (i.e., the basis a.k.a., the three wisdoms, as Malcolm pointed out above). Which is that this cognizant faculty we refer to as our "mind" is ultimately unborn or non-arisen i.e., empty.

We can either recognize that nature or we can fail to recognize it. If we have recognized it then we have a working knowledge of it, and that knowledge is called "rig pa". If on the other hand we fail to recognize that nature, then we are ignorant of it, and that lack of knowledge is called "ma rig pa" or "ignorance".

So there is either (i) a knowledge of one's nature or (ii) an ignorance of one's nature, but rigpa isn't one's nature, it is simply the knowledge that ensues from recognizing that nature.

I'm curious about this citation that steve_bakr says exists which states that rigpa is the nature of mind. What context that would be said in, or if it is a mistranslation, or if steve_bakr simply misread.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 6th, 2015 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I am correct, by the way, in reporting that Dzogchen masters such as Longchenpa define Rigpa as the nature of mind.

Malcolm said:
Citation please?

krodha wrote:
Bump.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 5:06 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
From Jean-Luc Achard:

There is never enough reading.

dzogchungpa said:

From Chögyal Namkhai Norbu:

It would be senseless to think that one should spend one's whole life accumulating words, like a bee flying from one flower to another gathering nectar.
"

krodha wrote:
He means solely accumulating words and not putting them to practice. That isn't what Jean-Luc is saying.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
steve_bakr said:
I am studying an oral introduction to the nature of our mind by Guru Padmasambhava whose short title is, "Self-Liberation Through Seeing Clearly With Naked Awareness" and I will pay close attention to the nuances. This work mentions Rigpa in connection with the nature of mind and the repeated phrase is "Intrinsic Awareness." Whether this is given as the nature of mind or its characteristic is perhaps a matter of semantics.

krodha wrote:
It isn't semantics. When rig pa doesn't recognize its nature it is called "the clarity [cognizance] of mind". Clarity alone is the characteristic of mind. Clarity and emptiness (non-dual) is the nature of mind.

Being able to notice its thought-occurrence and stillness doesn’t mean one knows the real nature of this mind. It is simply the ability to detect when there are thoughts and when there is not the presence and absence of thought. This is called ‘knowing the character of the mind’. It is not knowing buddha nature.
— Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

steve_bakr said:
Suffice it to say that Intrinsic Awareness and the nature of mind are inseparable. They are nondual, just as clarity and emptiness are inseparable.

krodha wrote:
Right, because rig pa is what knows the nature of mind. And rig pa is then called "ye shes".

steve_bakr said:
Language only goes so far.

krodha wrote:
This essentially goes without saying.

steve_bakr said:
The more we get into definitions and classifications as such, the more we impose limitations on what is limitless.

krodha wrote:
This is completely false.

From Jean-Luc Achard:

There is never enough reading. All the main masters of the past and recent times that one venerates from Longchenpa to Jigme Lingpa, from Dru Gyelwa to Kundrol Rinpoche, from Khyentse Wangpo to Shardza, from Khenpo Gangshar to Sakya Tridzin, from HH the Dalai Lama to Yongdzin Rinpoche (too many names to list), all of them have spent a gazillion sessions of their practice in formal study. I don't think this has caused them any obscurations. I don't buy a single minute the legends of brainless yogis reaching Rainbow Body as a paradigm to follow for westerners without a proper buddhist/bon complete education. The Dharma is one of the three Jewels, it does not cause obscurations. I would add to this that ignorance comes from not recognizing one's state but it is maintained, developed and intensified by the absence of study. It is only among lay people in the West that there is this fancy that one will reach anywhere on the path of Dharma while despising texts and teachings.

and,

There are other forums where people are proud of their ignorance. I am not. I am ashamed of it when I compare it to the knowledge of my masters. I try every single day to spend my time 50/50 in between practice and study. Study never let me down. I can tell you, for having met people who reject study in the past 35 years, that not a single of them has a clue about what Rigpa is. You can spend a gazillion years on your cushion, if the correct understanding is not there, you simply waste your time. You never waste your time reading the teachings the masters so kindly composed for the past 2 000 years. So reading texts after texts is a correct way to chase ignorance away. I don't think anybody here claims to be a great vidyadhara. However, I have met countless people with a dramatically superficial "knowledge" of the teachings who claim to be advanced on the path and who actually ignore the stages of that path. Lopon said this once :"I prefer someone who has clearly understood the state of Dzogchen, even intellectually, as opposed to a brainless yogi able to stand upside-down on the tip of a grass with one single finger. I know which of the two can have a chance at recognizing the state in the Bardo."

steve_bakr said:
The nature of mind is like space. It has no boundaries, no center, no location. We can only say, "It is like this, like that." But we cannot say, "This is it." When we say the nature of mind, we remain nondual. When we say the mind has a characteristic, we separate the mind on one side and its characteristic on the other.

krodha wrote:

The mind's characteristic is clarity [cognizance]. The characteristic of the mind is to cognize. The nature of the mind is the emptiness of said cognizance. In all Dzogchen texts there is a clear separation of samsaric mind and wisdom.

steve_bakr said:
Perhaps, in the Dzogchen sense, we must realize that what we are talking about are our own mental constructs, which are not real. We must experience the nature of mind directly to find out what it is like. Granted, we must use language, no question, albeit language is not reality. At best, language is a pointer. Buddha is nothing other than our mind.

krodha wrote:
Again this is a fairly redundant point that goes without saying.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 2:11 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
If he taught meditation practices like trekcho and thogal going straight and keeping to the point, then sure I'd probably tune in too.

krodha wrote:
This is akin to saying "I'm interested in building houses but don't want to bother learning how to lay a strong foundation."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
Thanks for the advice for joining Norbu's organisation but this is not for me.

krodha wrote:
You don't have to join his organization to watch webcasts. And even then it's not like you're drinking the kool-aid as its pretty laid back... you simply tune in when there's a webcast, for free.

I'm sure most here simply figure that you have an interest in the teachings, so why not receive teachings from a genuine master.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 12:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts

Content:
random person zenman quoted said:
I felt his presence and method created a palpable pull back into "my" nature, which is apparently open awareness-knowing-clarity, unchanging regardless of any other experience that may or may not be arising, to no one.

krodha wrote:
This person sounds like they have no idea what they're talking about, and not to mention ridiculous (they sound like they're regurgitating Jaxchen).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 12:47 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Rig pa is not the nature of mind [sems nyid], but rather simply "knowledge". Rig pa is expressed as dualistic consciousness [rnam shes] or wisdom a.k.a. pristine consciousness [ye shes] depending on whether the nature of mind is recognized or not.

steve_bakr said:
I appreciate your nuanced reply. Rather than call Rigpa "knowledge," I prefer to say, "awareness with knowledge." The most common translation of "Rigpa" that I have seen is "Intrinsic Awareness." I still associate the nature of mind with Intrinsic Awareness, that being its natural state without obscurations.

krodha wrote:
The issue is that you can have awareness without knowledge, but you cannot have rig pa without knowledge. Rig pa is the "knowing" capacity of a mind.

The nature of mind [sems nyid] is defined as the "emptiness of clarity" or "non-dual emptiness and clarity" but it is never defined as "awareness" since awareness would be precisely the clarity [gsal ba] mentioned in the aforementioned definition. Clarity or awareness alone is just mind, and more specifically a dualistic mind. That clarity or awareness has to be recognized as empty, meaning "non-arisen", "unreal" etc., if one is to recognize the nature of mind. Clarity and awareness by themselves are often called the "characteristic of mind" and not the "nature of mind".

steve_bakr said:
I am a tiny bit uncomfortable here with the word "consciousness" out of the fear of introducing subcategories such as "subconscious" or "unconscious." Honestly, the other poster is correct in prefering "awareness" to "consciousness" because all the Dzogchen literature and texts that I have seen use "awareness," specifically "Intrinsic Awareness." The word "intrinsic" signifies that awareness is intrinsic to mind; that is, awareness is the nature of mind.

krodha wrote:

In Buddhism consciousness [rnam shes pa] is a term that is used to denote a threefold species of cognition consisting of a (i) sensory organ, (ii) a sensory function, and (iii) a sensory object. Which means consciousness is generally an afflicted, dualistic cognition. The knowing [rig pa] capacity of a mind which fails to recognize its own nature and/or the nature of phenomena, mistakes itself and appearances to be truly real and substantial, this is how dualistic mind and the mistaken notion of objective phenomena arise. The arising of that subject-object split is the arising of dualistic consciousness [rnam shes], which is rig pa when confused by its own appearances.

Awareness is a popular translation for rig pa, or was for quite some time. It just strikes me as somewhat vague.

Awareness is not the nature of mind, rather it is the "characteristic of mind".

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 5th, 2015 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Rig pa is not the nature of mind [sems nyid], but rather simply "knowledge". Rig pa is expressed as dualistic consciousness [rnam shes] or wisdom a.k.a. pristine consciousness [ye shes] depending on whether the nature of mind is recognized or not.

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek A,

- Can we replace here, pristine consciousness with awareness maybe ?
This because the experience in the latter practice is not based on consciousness .

Mutsug Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
"Awareness" wouldn't work for translating ye shes because while ye shes is a species of cognition, it is a very specific species that cognizes the dharmatā or non-arising of mind and/or phenomena. Which is why it is often translated as "wisdom".

Regular, everyday awareness is a dualistic cognition for sentient beings. I only threw "pristine consciousness" in there because I've seen that Malcolm has started to use it as a translation for ye shes instead of "wisdom", and I trust his judgement.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 4th, 2015 at 3:45 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts

Content:
zenman said:
However, isn't gazing the actual practice of thogal after the mind and subconscious has been cleared in trekcho?

krodha wrote:
The "subconscious" has nothing to do with it. This is an example of what Jean-Luc was talking about in terms of the creation of obstacles. When a person who claims to be an authority such as Jackson begins to spin stories and incorporate principles such as the "subconscious" into his so-called teachings, people (functioning under the assumption that he knows what he's talking about) take this to be a genuine aspect of Dzogpachenpo, when it is nothing of the sort. And so this degrades the teaching and introduces foreign principles that then obfuscate the original intention and corrupt the instructions. And although this is a minor detail, when numerous minor details begin to stack up they become something bigger.

So this is an example of why intimate instruction from a qualified lama is so valuable. Jackson will only poison you, I would advise you to quickly abandon any and everything you've picked up from him and seek out a genuine and qualified teacher.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 4th, 2015 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: Natural State and Nature
Content:
krodha wrote:
Rig pa is not the nature of mind [sems nyid], but rather simply "knowledge". Rig pa is expressed as dualistic consciousness [rnam shes] or wisdom a.k.a. pristine consciousness [ye shes] depending on whether the nature of mind is recognized or not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 4th, 2015 at 12:43 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
krodha wrote:
Zenman, here are a few examples of Jax's "teachings" that are highly questionable and in general go against the view that he claims to be teaching. Hearing even one of these absurd statements from a "Dzogchen teacher" should raise a huge red flag. For example...

Denying suffering:

No one has ever suffered.

Conflating dharmakāya and ye shes with the brahman of Vedanta:

Switch Dharmakaya Awareness for Brahman and it comes very close... very close to Dzogchen view.

primordial Wisdom is Brahman. The Buddha was an expression of Brahman.

Not understanding karma:

in Dzogchen karmic imprints or afflictions are themselves wisdoms needing no purification.

Denying convention:

There is NO conventional self.

Denying practice and stating the clarity of mind requires no refinement:

In the "practice" of Dzogchen Atiyoga, even the slightest trace of a practice being practiced is much too much! This includes the slight effort to be "mindful". Any practice, intention or effort of any kind is always "sem" or the karmic mind-self in action. Our natural knowing awareness is always perfect and requires no further realization or preliminary purification. Everything is simply left as-is, without the need to "leave it" as-is.

Denying guru yoga:

I don't recall Garab Dorje saying anything about Guru Yoga. Somebody else contrived that later. Nothing and no practice is required in Ati.

There is absolutely no need for guru yoga, it's a Mahayoga level practice not Ati.

Again expounding nihilism and denying practice and the path:

there is no entity that goes from lifetime to lifetime. There is no entity in this lifetime either. There is no one to benefit from practice or to progress. There is no self in Buddhism, so who is there to benefit from practice?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 3rd, 2015 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
... Jean-Luc Achard to cease all discussion of Dzogchen on his forum... Another master is Chögyal Namkhai Norbu.

zenman said:
Okey. What forum is referred here? What did Norbu say?

krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc's forum is http://forumdzogchen.forumactif.com/

As for Chögyal Namkhai Norbu: I believe when Jackson first started "teaching" Dzogchen he claimed that Norbu Rinpoche gave him permission to teach sems sde, but who knows if this is actually true... and it ultimately doesn't matter now anyway since Jackson presently gives instruction for any and everything from sems sde to men ngag sde without any qualification or permission.

Magnus wrote to ChNN:

A person called Jackson Peterson (ejackpete @ aol.com), has a group called DzogchenPractice on Yahoo Groups. He claim to have permission from you to teach Semde,is this true?

He also claim to be able to give direct introduction by means of e-mail. For me this seem highly unlikely, could you please comment on this?

And received the following answer:

Dear Magnus,

Thanks for your info. I'll inform him that he is going
wrong direction.

With many Tashu Delegs NN.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 3rd, 2015 at 2:45 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
That fellow (Jackson Peterson) ... has been denounced by masters such as Lopön Tenzin Namdak.

zenman said:
Please provide a quote or a source on this? Who other masters have denounced him? Names please.

krodha wrote:
Lopön Tenzin Namdak told Jean-Luc Achard to cease all discussion of Dzogchen on his forum in order to ensure that Jax does not get ahold of any further information in regards to Lopön's teachings, as it is clear he is concerned there are samaya issues with allowing Jax to get ahold of his teachings. Another master is Chögyal Namkhai Norbu.

Jean-Luc writes:

Since somebody from this forum has been sending some posts I did on Dzogchen to Jax (or it may be that Jax is here under a log-in name that we have not identified yet), I have just been advised by my master [Lopön Tenzin Namdak] to avoid discussing anything related to Dzogchen that might be of use to Jax. This person is really a creator of obstacles. I have been for a very short period of time on his lists and helped the best I could and all the result was insults, despise and contempt from people (Jax and Roo) who overtly vomit on Lamas and who think they can guide people.

Therefore I am sorry but I am not allowed to discuss these matters publicly on the forum and neither on PMs since, except for a few people who have disclosed openly their identity, I can't identify who is who behing these log-in names.

I also don't think a "secret forum" can be a solution because there are always leaks coming out one day or the other. This is not good for the lama, the teachings and not good for me. There are Protectors over these teachings and I don't want to be karmically involved in anything related to Jax.

So as i wrote in another post, i will only discuss matters related to Sutras, philosophy (logic mostly and nothing Dzogchen-related), history and literature.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 30th, 2015 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
I don't think this person is completely bad in his teachings even though he clearly has his own view which sure does seem like neo-advaita for the most part. I think he is somewhat sincere and that he doesn't purposefully lead his students astray.

krodha wrote:
Sure, he isn't purposefully leading them astray, but he is (leading them astray) if they are interested in pursuing Dzogpachenpo in any effective or meaningful way.

zenman said:
One thing that I did notice was that he likes when people agree with him and play around him like puppies, wagging their tails and asking him for more. It does look like some sort of ego-tripping that he probably isn't aware of himself. On the other hand, to comments that are not in accordance with his sayings, he denies and rejects them and is not willing to discuss them in a rational way.

krodha wrote:
Right, he creates an enclosed echo chamber where everyone parrots what he wants to hear back at him. And he then systematically removes dissenters. This is the reason why he limits his presence to closed groups where he can maintain constant control.

zenman said:
In those cases he always, without exception as far as I have seen, pulls out some neo-advaita and by doing so he kind of sets himself above others, or at least those who do not agree with what he says. Hence, his teachings are only understood by those who agree with the view of neo-advaita which is just silly play and waste of time for me.

krodha wrote:
What's more though is that his entire view is essentially Neo-Advaita as he makes all of the errors associated with such a view. He attacks mere imputation rather than underlying causes, he inserts the result into the basis, he clings to the ultimate and denies the path, he treats mere clarity as wisdom and the list goes on and on.

zenman said:
I never saw real dzogchen masters having any problems with expressing things in clear understandable language or speaking of the relativity of things. I am sure people with not much experience and discrimination of their own are easy targets for him.

krodha wrote:
Yes, he essentially preys on the same crowd that was caught up in the Neo-Nondual circuits around seven years ago.

zenman said:
Having said all of this there are also positive sides to him and his teachings. I don't think he is all bad apple. There are so many kinds of people seeking so many kinds of things here, like it or not. And there are many kinds of teachers too, some good, some not so good, some clearly harmful. Therefore, from my point of view, I don't think he is that bad and might actually be able to help some in their issues.

krodha wrote:
Sure, he can help some people in certain ways in their relative lives, but the main issue is that he states that he is teaching Dzogchen, and these people come away from interacting with him believing they've received something authentic. This is a problem.

zenman said:
Even though he is critical of many teachers out there, and has named a few of them, he does also refer to some sources other than him who are recommendable in the light of studying oneself and dzogchen. Because he has openly talked, in the limits of his own experience, about the methods and practice of tregchod and thogyal I actually think his offerings could help people who have enough exp of their own and discrimination.

krodha wrote:
No, he cannot help anyone in terms of Dzogchen because he does not teach Dzogchen. Also, he has no business giving teachings on tregchö or thögal since it is clear his experience in either department is that of a novice. He is doing far more harm than good when it comes to these matters.

zenman said:
It is always about ones own responsibility, you know.

krodha wrote:
Correct, and those with fortunate karmic connections to the teachings will stay away from him. It is just unfortunate that many are beguiled by his charade. The only positive aspect of this whole mess is that he introduces people to Dzogpachenpo, in that they encounter the name and teaching in general, but past that they do not receive Ati teachings and if they follow Jackson then they end up wasting a considerable amount of precious time. In the end I personally have no problem calling a spade a spade, Jackson has virtually nothing redeemable to offer and is a burden to the teachings and those who are unfortunate enough to cross his path.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 29th, 2015 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts
Content:
zenman said:
Hello all

I came across this fellow in the internet who is a teacher of dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
That fellow (Jackson Peterson) doesn't teach Dzogchen for the record. He teaches some sort of Neo-Avaita wrought with eternalism and nihilism, and then attempts to dress his teaching up in Dzogchen drag by using Dzogchen vernacular and citing Dzogchen texts that he misconstrues.

He also has no permission to teach Dzogchen, very limited experience, and has been denounced by masters such as Lopön Tenzin Namdak. All in all he's one of the biggest charlatans on the Internet when it comes to Atiyoga. I would avoid him like the plague.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 21st, 2015 at 1:37 AM
Title: Re: Introductory books for Ayurveda/Tibetan Medicine?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Quintessence Tantras of Tibetan Medicine by Dr. Barry Clark

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 8th, 2015 at 1:03 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:

thought that kind of acceptance of an impersonal universal principle was more of a Tibetan development--or corruption--depending on who was talking.

krodha wrote:
What Tibetan developments are you suggesting propose an impersonal universal principle?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 4th, 2015 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
srivijaya said:
If it lacked any existence it could not possibly appear. It is dependent arisen, not without existence.

krodha wrote:
That which originates dependently does not ultimately originate, and is therefore free from the four extremes, which means it is without existence.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 4th, 2015 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Experiences with crazy wisdom?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc Achard on crazy wisdom:

There is no original, classical word corresponding to "crazy wisdom" in tibetan. It was coined very lately by Chogyam Trungpa, to justify a behavior which is not acceptable within Buddhism. As HH the Dalai Lama says, there is nothing "crazy" about wisdom, otherwise it would not be wisdom. I have personally met some masters who pretend to have this "crazy wisdom": they are just deluded people leading others to their own destruction. Lopon [Tenzin Namdak] once said about them : "It is generally an excuse for cultivating ego."

And on crazy yogis [smyon pas]:

Well, none of them [individuals in old Tibet] spoke of crazy wisdom, the expression was coined by Trungpa in the 1970s to justify his behavior. There was no wisdom at all in this. It's just the same old ranting from people trying to justify their addictions. In particular, trying to coin back the term from english (crazy wisdom) to tibetan, he made a weird choice, translating "crazy wisdom" as "ye shes 'chol ba". Ye shes is wisdom. 'Chol ba means to mix up, to make errors (in judgement), to be scattered, to be incoherent and raving, etc. There is no wisdom in 'chol-ba at all. I wish people who think they can teach, like Surya Das or K. Dowman, would stop referring to this nefarious concept because it has already led astray generations of westerners... Contrary to what Trungpa says,

Dzogchen has nothing to do with smyon pas, not any of them reached Rainbow Bodies, whereas humble individuals who followed ethics and spent years in retreat practicing dzogchen instead of years of alcoholism did reach such a result.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 3rd, 2015 at 9:08 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
It should be noted that the term “Mahayana” here is not used in the usual sense of the word, that is, Mahayana versus Hinayana. According to the definition given in the discussion immediately following, Mahayana designates Suchness or the Absolute. The title of the text, the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana, should therefore be understood as the “Awakening of Faith in the Absolute,” not in Mahayana Buddhism as distinguished from Hinayana Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
Although there is no "the absolute" in Buddhism.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 1st, 2015 at 5:41 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm said:
In what way can things exist?

Wayfarer said:
In all the billions of ways that billions of things exist.

krodha wrote:
You're blowing my mind right now.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 1st, 2015 at 8:56 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
So are you of the opinion that every Shentongpa simply does not understand the

discussion? I find that to be

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure I would go as far as to say your view accurately represents "every Shentongpa"... it more accurately represents "every smcj", of which there happens to be only one.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 1st, 2015 at 8:42 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
What he is saying is not going over my head.

krodha wrote:
It is, but that is alright.

smcj said:
I simply, and respectfully, disagree.

krodha wrote:
Which is my case in point. If you actually understood the implications involved with said disagreement then you wouldn't disagree.

smcj said:
However this disagreeing is with the understanding that it only goes as far as language can take the conversation.

krodha wrote:
Language can address the topic as precisely as needed and can do it successfully, as far as language needs to go. You can't simply hide behind the idea of an unenumerated ultimate nature, for this is no different than saying the description "sweet" is different than the actual experiential taste of sugar, which is a given, and doesn't corrupt the possibility of being clear and accurate in one's description of said experiential taste. Even though the direct, unenumerated, experiential taste of sugar is "inexpressible", said taste certainly isn't "sour". So there is both an unenumerated ultimate and an enumerated ultimate for this very reason. You are attempting to hide behind the idea of an unenumerated ultimate and are using that vague area as a platform to push your eternalist view, as eternalists usually do.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 1st, 2015 at 8:13 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:

I cannot see having an actual disagreement about the right way to characterize something that we agree is inconceivable and inexpressae.

krodha wrote:
Yet you still believe there is some sort of established and existent ultimate that is itself "inexpressible", and this means what Malcolm is saying is going over your head.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 31st, 2015 at 7:19 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Compared to what? That doesn't avoid nihilism - that is nihilism.

krodha wrote:
No it isn't. Nihilism is clinging to a view of non-existence.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 31st, 2015 at 1:37 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Matt J said:
The calculus doesn't add up. How can the Buddha have so clearly refuted this, and yet:

1) taught an unborn, undying knower or alayavijnana or bhavanga citta, which is very similar to the Advaita atman?

krodha wrote:
Ālayavijñāna is considered to be afflicted and is completely personal, as Malcolm pointed out above. It is not the transpersonal, ontological knower of Vedanta, and frankly does not resemble the purusa of Vedanta at all. You need to study these principles before you come to conclusions like this.

Matt J said:
2) established a set of teachings that led to the rise of the Chittamatra, which (under some interpretations anyway) seems very similar to to Advaita vedanta?

krodha wrote:
Cittamatra does not resemble Advaita at all.

Matt J said:
3) established a set of teachings that a leading Buddhist teacher was unable to separate the shentong Buddhist view from Advaita according to a dharma scholar and eyewitness?
http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=8318&p=102251&hilit=advaita+greg#p

102251

krodha wrote:
Perhaps the gzhan stong of Dolbupa, but not the majority of gzhan stong. And truthfully, even Dolbupa states that his view is not commensurate with tīrthika views such as Advaita Vedanta.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 31st, 2015 at 1:30 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Those are all later developments which, to a classicist, are degradations and corruptions of Dharma.

krodha wrote:
They aren't degradations or corruptions if they are properly understood.

smcj said:
Hence much discussion and confusion here at DW.

krodha wrote:
There certainly isn't confusion for those who understand these principles properly.

smcj said:
I side on the more modern (and Tibetan) perspective. Malcolm sides on the more classical/conservative (and Indian) perspective.

krodha wrote:
Again this alleged dichotomy that you often fall back on is a total fabrication that you have concocted. Your view is not "modern" at all, the whole "modern" versus "classical" thing is completely unfounded in every way.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 17th, 2015 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: Natural Luminosity
Content:
Wayfarer said:
I think 'luminosity' must be a metaphor for 'knowing' - mind is intrinsically knowing, and that 'knowing' is fundamental to its nature; but that 'knowing' is not an attribute of 'something', it is simply an intrinsic attribute of mind.

krodha wrote:
The "knowing" cognizance of mind is called "clarity" [gsal ba]. Clarity is susceptible to conditioning. The nature of mind as non-dual clarity and emptiness is the

unconditioned luminosity [od gsal] of mind.

For the luminosity of mind to be directly known one has to recognize the emptiness of clarity, meaning the non-arising of the "knowing" or cognizance of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 14th, 2015 at 4:16 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
SOB, ASTNS, as much as it pains me to say this, I feel it is my duty to suggest that you two should get a room.

asunthatneversets said:
Post the jpeg or your plea goes unheard.

dzogchungpa said:
Oh, right, I forgot to mention that I have reserved such a room for you two here:

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 14th, 2015 at 4:04 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
SOB, ASTNS, as much as it pains me to say this, I feel it is my duty to suggest that you two should get a room.

krodha wrote:
Post the jpeg or your plea goes unheard.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 14th, 2015 at 3:54 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Again one sentence with no context.

This is only in reference to inherent enlightenment manifesting in the life of the sentient being, it is in no way saying that the Buddha nature is a part that you can use to create the unconditioned unborn Enlightenment.

asunthatneversets said:
As I've pointed out to you before "Inherent enlightenment [bodhi]" also makes zero sense.

Son of Buddha said:
Sure it makes zero sense.....to you.

krodha wrote:
What do you mean? Are you meaning to suggest that you are inherently a bodhisattva or buddha, and have no need for the teachings at all? Because that is what "inherent enlightenment" would entail.

Son of Buddha said:
If everyone was inherently enlightened then samsara wouldn't even be an issue and there would be no reason for the buddhadharma.
nobody said the current individual had manifested their inherent Enlightenment.
Enlightenment itself even from the Pali Canon standards has always been uncreated ,Unborn, Unbecome, Unmade,Unconditioned(Udana 8,3)

krodha wrote:
Firstly, Udana 8.3 is arguably describing the sopādhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa of an arhat, so it is for the most part irrelevant to this discussion. Secondly, Udana 8.3 is not describing 'bodhi', so your point is null.

Son of Buddha said:
This means that your Bodhi has never never been created or born and has always been Bodhi since beginningless time.

krodha wrote:
You do not seem to grasp what 'bodhi' means or entails. Your statement here is akin to saying "awakening in the morning from sleep has always been since beginningless time"... the statement doesn't make sense. Awakening [bodhi] is not "awakening" if you are not waking up to recognize something that was previously unrecognized. This is simple logic.

Again (and why this is so hard for you to grasp I have no idea), 'bodhi' is not your uncreated, unborn, unconditioned nature. 'Bodhi' is the event of awakening to directly and experientially cognize said nature. So you are confusing two different things.

Son of Buddha said:
This means that Enlightenment is not something you create it is only something that is revealed/manifested when all defilements are removed.

krodha wrote:
No, it means your nature is not something you create, your nature is what is revealed when all defilements are removed. And one must initially "awaken" [budh] to recognize that nature in order to follow through with a praxis that will remove any defilements that obscure said nature. So again, 'bodhi' is the event of awakening to recognize and directly know your uncreated nature... bodhi is not said uncreated nature, they are two different things.

Son of Buddha said:
Example while the person is still a sentient being the inherent enlightenment is obscured by defilements (you being one of them) and when the person IS a Buddha, then the inherent enlightenment has been seperated from the defilements that has been obscuring it.

krodha wrote:
Again, as stated above 'bodhi' is not your innate, unconditioned nature... bodhi is awakening to know that nature. If bodhi were "inherent" then one would always be in recognition of their nature, and the teachings would be superfluous because we would all be born as fully omniscient buddhas.

Son of Buddha said:
either way your Enlightenment has been unborn and uncreated from the beginning....that is inherent enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
No, your latent buddha-nature has been unborn and uncreated from the very beginning... enlightenment [bodhi] is the event of awakening to know that nature that has been unborn and uncreated from the very beginning.

You must understand that we have to initially awaken to recognize that nature, because it has been obscured by afflictive causes and conditions... you are not a buddha, you are not even a bodhisattva, so you must apply the teachings and awaken [budh] to know your unborn and uncreated nature. That event of awakening is called "enlightenment" [bodhi]... your nature is not bodhi.

Son of Buddha said:
So inherent enlightenment is an incorrect view.
Enlightenment is uncreated ,Unborn, Unbecome, Unmade, Unconditioned(Udana 8,3)

krodha wrote:
Udana 8.3 is describing the goal of the Śrāvakayāna, which is the sopādhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa or "nirvāṇa with remainder" of an arhat... it is the absorption cessation that bodhisattvas must awaken arhats from in order to allow them to continue on their paths towards buddhahood. Why you are continually citing this quote as a support for your baseless claim I'm not sure, but it has no relevance to the current discussion.

Son of Buddha said:
can you create your enlightenment?

krodha wrote:
Obviously, that is the point of choosing a practice that is suited for your capacity and applying it... the goal is to actualize 'bodhi' which is awakening to your uncreated nature.

Son of Buddha said:

nope it is uncreated,

krodha wrote:
Uncreated awakening means you are a fully omniscient buddha with no need for the buddhadharma whatsoever, and have been that way since beginningless time.

Son of Buddha said:
when was your enlightenment born??

krodha wrote:
It hasn't been for you or I... now, our respective natures being 'unborn' is another topic entirely. Our natures are not "enlightenment". We are only "enlightened" when we awaken to experientially know our unborn natures, respectively.

Son of Buddha said:
its not born Enlightenment has always been since beginningless time

krodha wrote:
That's impossible, but hopefully you got my point by now, the issue here is that your knowledge of the teachings is very unrefined, so you are confused by certain principles and are making a mess of things. I doubt you'll listen since your confirmation biases are so thick they are almost unprecedented in nature, but perhaps if we keep hammering away at this topic the light bulb will eventually turn on. We shall see...

Son of Buddha said:
when do we make our enlightenment and become buddha's?

krodha wrote:
When you choose a system and apply the practices associated with said system in a successful way.

Son of Buddha said:
we don't Enlightenment is not made by us

krodha wrote:
Well, it is, but if you want to keep insisting that you are a fully omniscient buddha you're welcome to... apologies in advance if no one believes you.

Son of Buddha said:
your enlightenment is like a mirror that is covered in dust all you have to do is remove the dust and the mirror that has been under it all along will be revealed.

krodha wrote:
No, your nature is like a mirror. Bodhi is the event of awakening to directly (and experientially) know that mirror-like nature.

Son of Buddha said:

"Enlightenment" or "awakening" [bodhi] only arises due to causes and conditions, as does buddhahood, buddhahood's cause (for example) is primarily the removal of the two obscurations and gathering of the two accumulations. There is no enlightenment to speak of without rectifying those afflictions, and one would be a fool to state otherwise. Ahh so if people disagree with you then they are automatically fools.

krodha wrote:
Not necessarily, they could also be fools even if they agree with me... or they could not be. My only point is that if you think you are already a fully omniscient buddha and have no need for the buddhadharma, you are in fact a fool, no doubt.

Son of Buddha said:
and AGAIN Enlightenment does not arise due to causes and conditions, that goes against the basic definition of Bodhi itself.

krodha wrote:
What do you mean? You, yourself just stated that buddhahood arises due to causes and conditions above when you wrote this:

your enlightenment is like a mirror that is covered in dust all you have to do is remove the dust and the mirror that has been under it all along will be revealed.

So you are in agreement that the cause for buddhahood is awakening to recognize this mirror, and the conditions for buddhahood to manifest entail the removal of the metaphorical "dust" i.e., obscurations.

So there you have it, you have just stated yourself that buddhahood manifests in accordance with certain causes and conditions.

Son of Buddha said:
“There is, O monks, an Unborn, an Unbecome, an Unmade, an Unconditioned; if, O monks, there were not here this Unborn, Unbecome, Unmade, Unconditioned, there would not here be an escape from the born, the become, the made, the conditioned. But because there is an Unborn,...therefore there is an escape from the born....” (Udana 8,3)

krodha wrote:
Since you can't seem to leave this quote alone I'll simply paste what I wrote above: Udana 8.3 is describing the goal of the Śrāvakayāna, which is the sopādhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa or "nirvāṇa with remainder" of an arhat... it is the absorption cessation that bodhisattvas must awaken arhats from in order to allow them to continue on their paths towards buddhahood. Why you are continually citing this quote as a support for your baseless claim I'm not sure, but it has no relevance to the current discussion.

Son of Buddha said:
There are causes and conditions needed to remove the defilements off of the unborn, unmade, unconditioned

krodha wrote:
Excellent, now we are making progress, Son of Buddha.

Son of Buddha said:
Bodhi, But Enlightenment itself is unborn

krodha wrote:
Oops and now we're regressing into wrong view again. All you have to do is comprehend that "enlightenment" [bodhi] is the event of awakening to the aforementioned "unborn" and you've got it.

Son of Buddha said:
uncreated and unmade and does not need causes and conditions to CREATE IT.

krodha wrote:
Correct, your nature, as nondual clarity and emptiness is uncreated and unmade and does not need causes and conditions to create it... the catch is that your nature is not "enlightenment" [bodhi]. Bodhi is the act of awakening to recognize said uncreated and unmade nature.

Son of Buddha said:
like I said before, our inherent enlightenment only needs to be manifested from what obscures it.

krodha wrote:
Replace "enlightenment" with "nature" and yes, you've got it.

Son of Buddha said:
What you are mistakenly referring to as "inherent enlightenment" is a misinterpretation of the innate purity of phenomena, i.e., their unconditioned nature. That nature is not 'enlightenment'.
Although it is quiet, it has the ability to illumine the entire dharma-realm the three thousand great thousand world system. "Fundamental enlightenment" refers to the natural, primary essence inherent within us, which neither increases nor decreases, is neither produced nor destroyed, is neither defiled nor pure. Fundamental enlightenment is also called initial enlightenment.

Venerable Master Hsuan Hua

krodha wrote:
Bad choice of words Ven. Master Hsuan Hua. The intention of his statement is on point, but calling your nature "fundamental enlightenment" is not very helpful or accurate... your confusion on the matter being a prime example of why it isn't helpful or accurate.

Son of Buddha said:
As I have cited before Śrī Siṃha is very clear about this idea of 'primordial buddhahood'

or 'inherent enlightenment' being a misunderstanding, and you should make sure you are VERY clear on this, otherwise you will compromise your chances of buddhahood altogether:

This is acceptable since a so called “primordial buddhahood” is not asserted. Full awakening is not possible without being free of the five afflictions... It is not possible for wisdom to increase without giving up afflictions. Wisdom will not arise without purifying afflictions.
I have 5 translations of the Queen Srimala Sutra which is literally my favorite sutra and I have NEVER seen this passage ever, do you care to send a link to the chapter and translation you are using (the sutra itself is only 36 pages long so you should have no problem whatsoever sourcing this)

krodha wrote:
Well thank the lord that Śrī Siṃha has nothing to do with the Śrīmālādevī-siṃhanāda sūtra.

Son of Buddha said:
So no, 'inherent enlightenment' is not taught in any buddhist teachings, and you are grievously mistaken if you believe it is. Really these discrepancies are due to your unrefined knowledge of these teachings, hopefully you will take heed and learn correctly.
there are entire Buddhist schools built around the idea of inherent enlightenment

krodha wrote:
No, there actually isn't. Not one of them state that there is no need for the teachings, or path and that everyone is a fully omniscient buddha... not one, and if they do, they are not buddhadharma, and should be avoided like the plague.

Son of Buddha said:
Tendai, the most popular chan teacher in the west Venerable Master Hsuan Hua,(a simple google search into his commentaries can easily prove that),Shingon, Dolpopa's Jonang, and the idea itself rubbed off on most if not all Japanese Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
Right, well none of these schools, systems, or figures state that bodhi is inherent, so the issue is a misunderstanding on your part.

Son of Buddha said:
so quit being sectarian guy.

krodha wrote:
Sectarianism has nothing to do with this issue.

Son of Buddha said:
Also the idea that Buddha Nature is full fledged Buddhahood is the Basic Buddha Nature teachings 101

No, it actually isn't. The Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra states in no uncertain terms that buddha nature refers to a potential:

Child of the lineage, I have said that "curd exists in milk", because curd is produced from milk, it is called "curd".

Child of lineage, at the time of milk, there is no curd, also there is no butter, ghee or manda, because the curd arises from milk with the conditions of heat, impurities, etc., milk is said to have the "curd-nature".
this quote doesn't say Buddha nature is different from Dharmakaya, this quote is just talking about the causes and conditions needed to manifest our inherent enlightenment

krodha wrote:
If your buddha-nature was full fledged buddhahood, and you were already a fully omniscient buddha (as you, by default, claim to be as a result of your view) then there would be no need for any causes and conditions.

But I'm glad you are finally admitting you need the cause of awakening [bodhi] and the condition of removing obscurations to actualize buddhahood. There is hope for you yet.

Son of Buddha said:
and the Nirvana Sutra says in no uncertain terms

Nirvana Sutra Moreover, emancipation is termed that which severs all conditioned phenomena [samskrta-dharmas], gives rise to all untainted [anasrava], wholseome qualities / phenomena and eliminates the various paths/ approaches, that is to say, Self, non-Self, not-Self and not non-Self. It merely severs attachment and does not sever the view of the Self/ the seeing of the Self/ the vision of the Self [atma-drsti]. The view of the Self is termed the ‘Buddha-dhatu’ [Buddha-Nature]. The Buddha-dhatu is true emancipation, and true emancipation is the Tathagata.

krodha wrote:
And you do realize this quote betrays your assertion that buddhahood and bodhi are inherent, yes?

Son of Buddha said:
and

True emancipation is the Tathagata. The Tathagata is Nirvana. Nirvana is the Infinite. The Infinite is the Buddha-Nature. Buddha-Nature is definiteness. Definiteness is unsurpassed Enlightenment.”

krodha wrote:
This is merely stating that your buddha-nature is a latent potential for buddhahood, it is demonstrating how one's buddanature, and the condition of a buddha are identical... yet the entire path separates the two, otherwise all sentient beings would be fully omniscient buddhas, and this is obviously not the case.

Son of Buddha said:
So this is yet another case of me telling you the book says the "stop sign is red", then you proceeding to tell me that the passages that says the "stop sign is red".....REALLY does'nt mean or say that the stop sign is red....it really means something opposite of what it is actually saying

krodha wrote:
Well, not really, but I'm glad you're so confident in your confusion that you have the audacity to formulate nice little metaphors of this kind. Unfortunate it has no application to the issue at hand, which is your own lack of education in regards to these teachings, and your meager understanding of these various principles.

Son of Buddha said:
I can post quotes all day that literally say the Dharmakaya is the Buddha Nature....and you would still deny what is literally written right in front of you.

krodha wrote:
Yes, like posting quotes all day that demonstrate that an acorn is the same as an oak tree in essence... yet even though they are identical in essence, they are not the same in nature, and that is the salient point.

Son of Buddha said:
Queen Srimala Sutra Chapter 8: The Dharmakaya V96. O' Bhagavan, the extinction of suffering is not the destruction of the Dharma. Why so? Because the 'extinction of suffering' is known as the Dharmakaya of the World Honored One, which is beginningless, uncreated, unborn, undying, free from destruction, permanent unchanging, eternal, inherently pure, and separate from all the stores of defilement. The Dharmakaya is also not different from the inconceivable Buddha Natures which are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. The Dharmakaya of the World Honored One is called the Buddha Nature when it is obscured by the stores of defilement."

krodha wrote:
Yes, and oak trees are also not different from the inconceivable acorns that are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. The oak tree is called the acorn when it has not germinated.

So fixating on the fact that dharmakāya and tathāgatagarbha are identical in essence is rather pointless, because they are nothing alike in nature. Just as sentient beings are buddhas are the same in essence, yet are nothing alike in nature.

Ordinary beings are truly buddhas, but this fact is obscured by adventitious distortions, once these are removed, truly there is buddhahood.
-- Hevajra Tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 9:57 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There is no school in Buddhism that states sentient beings are inherently awakened... sure, they may state that we possess an innately unconditioned nature... but that is something different than awakening or enlightenment [bodhi].

Qianxi said:
The Awakening of Faith in Mahayana 大乘起信論 states that all sentient beings are 'inherently awakened' 本覺. 覺 is the usual translation for bodhi, 本　means 'root' or 'originally'.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hongaku

You'd either have to argue that schools following Awakening of Faith in Mahayana (most of East Asian Buddhism) are not Buddhist schools, or argue that although the text talks about inherent awakening, they really mean 'innately unconditioned' (that's a plausible argument).　But the Awakening of Faith, and many other East Asian Buddhist texts do use a term that translates as 'inherent awakening'.

krodha wrote:
Being "inherently awakened" means you already have a direct, experiential knowledge of your nature and you don't need the teachings at all... I'm sure you can understand the issue with such a view.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 2:19 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
"inherent enlightenment" is not posited, otherwise there would be no reason for a path, or the teachings in general...

Wayfarer said:
Hate to jump in here, but this is not so. In many schools of Buddhism, it is said that the 'original nature of mind is inherently pure but is obscured by adventitious defilements'. It is not something you would find in the Pali (I don't think) but I'm sure that general idea is found in many Mahayana sources, both Sanskrit and East Asian.

krodha wrote:
Right, but this is not "inherent bodhi", that is the point I'm making. The fact that the nature of mind is originally pure and naturally perfected is not what is being challenged or addressed. What is being addressed is the event of awakening to that nature, that "awakening" or recognition of said nature is what we call "enlightenment" [bodhi].

So (i) bodhi and (ii) one's unconditioned nature, are two different things, our nature is always innately pure, but initially we do not have a direct, experiential, knowledge of that nature. We have to awaken to that nature, and that event of "awakening" is bodhi or "enlightenment". This means that enlightenment is not "inherent".

Wayfarer said:
Another thing that ought to be considered is the difference between the various buddhist schools, not from the perspective of an advocate of one or another of them, but a more general perspective. This would help to get an understanding of the way the term 'mind' is used in Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
There is no school in Buddhism that states sentient beings are inherently awakened... sure, they may state that we possess an innately unconditioned nature... but that is something different than awakening or enlightenment [bodhi]. "Enlightenment" is awakening to experientially know that unconditioned nature that was previously obscured by adventitious defilements.

If enlightenment was inherent, then we would all be fully omniscient buddhas who have conquered saṃsāra, we would be free of all defilement, free of suffering, and the buddhadharma would serve no purpose because none of us would need it. Obviously this is not the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 1:57 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
As I've pointed out to you before "Inherent enlightenment [bodhi]" also makes zero sense. If everyone was inherently enlightened then samsara wouldn't even be an issue and there would be no reason for the buddhadharma. So inherent enlightenment is an incorrect view. "Enlightenment" or "awakening" [bodhi] only arises due to causes and conditions, as does buddhahood, buddhahood's cause (for example) is primarily the removal of the two obscurations and gathering of the two accumulations. There is no enlightenment to speak of without rectifying those afflictions, and one would be a fool to state otherwise.

zengen said:
I'm not sure if you can refute inherent enlightenment altogether as it is the basis of Vajrayana from which beings can attain Buddhahood in one life, with one body, instead of in the Mahayana, beings have to practice for countless eons. This is what distinguishes the quick path from the slow one.

krodha wrote:
What makes Vajrayāna so rapid is the nature of its praxis, and yes its view plays a role in

the expedient nature of its path... but even then, "inherent enlightenment" is not posited, otherwise there would be no reason for a path, or the teachings in general.

Again, what I think you're getting at is the fact that our unconditioned nature is originally pure and naturally perfected, no one is suggesting that it isn't. However, the issue is that this unconditioned nature is obscured by adventitious defilements, so the nature of the path is akin to an excavation. Nothing is being created anew, or constructed, we are only removing the veil of defilement so that our unconditioned nature is known, free of any obscurations.

This process does not suggest an "inherent enlightenment". "Enlightenment" [bodhi] is awakening to our unconditioned nature that was previously obscured by delusion. The term "inherent" also does not makes sense because if something is inherently so, it is always the case no matter what. Bodhi is not always the case no matter what, we must actualize bodhi, meaning we must awaken to our nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 8:12 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Ok so Koji = Ardent = songhill... which explains a lot.

Koji said:
When your own defense of natthattā (Pali, for there is no ātman) runs out of gas there is nothing like a good old ad hominem attack.

krodha wrote:
Oh, well "there is no ātman" is not my view, so I wouldn't have to run out of gas defending it in order to note that you are songhill.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 6:55 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Thrangu R. is a lharampa geshe and Shentongpa. I'm going to say that he understands Madhyamaka far better than you or I will ever even imagine doing. So I don't think that's the issue.

asunthatneversets said:
Thrangu Rinpoche's "gzhan stong" is very subtle, and usually is in harmony with Prasanga etc., when I read his expositions I never encounter anything controversial or out of the ordinary. Which is to say you'd never know he was a gzhan stong pa unless it was pointed out to you. So he is not a good example.

smcj said:
No, that is why he is an excellent example. There are many shades of grey when it comes to Shentong.

I haven't managed to get into his commentary on the Uttartantra yet, but Jomgon Kongtrul "The Great" was by reputation almost as much a Shentongpa as Dolpopa. More to be seen as I read more.

krodha wrote:
In any case, my point is that if you understand Madhyamaka properly then there really is no need for gzhan stong, because of doesn't offer anything different than so-called "rang stong".

Now, Dolbupa is a different story, his gzhan stong is incredibly extreme IMO, so those who are adherents to Dolbupa's view are clearly looking for a view that deviates from normative Buddhist views. That is a different story.

From what I've seen, Kongtrul's gzhan stong owes more to those like Shakya Chogden than Dolbupa. Dolbupa is really in a league of his own.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
The problem is that people don't understand Madhyamaka.
Thrangu R. is a lharampa geshe and Shentongpa. I'm going to say that he understands Madhyamaka far better than you or I will ever even imagine doing. So I don't think that's the issue.

krodha wrote:
Thrangu Rinpoche's "gzhan stong" is very subtle, and usually is in harmony with Prasanga etc., when I read his expositions I never encounter anything controversial or out of the ordinary. Which is to say you'd never know he was a gzhan stong pa unless it was pointed out to you. So he is not a good example.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:45 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Ergo emptiness, like space, except pregnant with infinite potential, is your inexhaustible cause (conventionally of course).
So you've become a Shentongpa. Welome to the club.

krodha wrote:
No, and this is why the whole gzhan stong thing is extraneous and rather pointless... the original Indian Madhyamaka never denied things like potential, or Buddha-qualities etc.

The problem is that people don't understand Madhyamaka.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:37 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Phenomena have inexhaustible dynamism and potentiality because they are ultimately empty... if they were truly existent, they would have no potentiality, they would instead be fixed, lifeless, dead, and overall inconceivable impossibilities.
And, in this text, the Dharmadhatu is the "inexhaustive cause". Not interdependent causation, inexhaustive cause--a cause without a cause.

krodha wrote:
Afflictive dependent origination only occurs when emptiness is not recognized, because in truth what originates dependently does not originate at all, so there is no production occurring in what you are referring to as "interdependent causation". Ergo emptiness, like space, except pregnant with infinite potential, is your inexhaustible cause (conventionally of course).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ok so Koji = Ardent = songhill... which explains a lot.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
You can't spin that into Prasangika.

krodha wrote:
Why not? After all, Nāgārjuna did say:

Where emptiness is possible, everything is possible,
Where emptiness is not possible, nothing is possible.

Phenomena have inexhaustible dynamism and potentiality because they are ultimately empty... if they were truly existent, they would have no potentiality, they would instead be fixed, lifeless, dead, incapable of expression, reactivity, evolution, growth, and moreover they would be nothing short of inconceivable impossibilities.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:21 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
"...That's why it is the in exhaustive cause."

asunthatneversets said:
Correct, this is describing emptiness... not some universal pleroma-like source.

smcj said:
You're joking, right?

krodha wrote:
I'm as serious as a heart attack. Are you joking?

This text is perfectly in line with the standard Indian view of phenomena and the emptiness of said phenomena, why you think it deviates in the least I have no idea.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:14 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Well, that certainly isn't true for the Dharmadhatustava, which is also describing the emptiness of phenomena and nothing more.
"...That's why it is the in exhaustive cause."

krodha wrote:
Correct, this is describing emptiness... not some universal pleroma-like source.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 5:09 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Dharmadhātu is simply the emptiness of phenomena:
Like I've been saying, a term often is re-defined by a given tradition, author, context, etc.

That's just how Tibetans do it. So simply giving a counter-quotation does not invalidate the intention/definition of the original quotation given by a given author in a given context. Even though the two quotation may be using the same work you are comparing apples and oranges.

krodha wrote:
Well, that certainly isn't true for the Dharmadhatustava, which is also describing the emptiness of phenomena and nothing more.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 4:47 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Dharmadhatustava tr. Brunnholzl

8
Unarisen is the dharmahatu,
And never cease it will.
At all times without afflictions,
Stainless through beginning, middle, end.

Brunnholzl interprets (p.115) the following as saying, "...the dharmdhatu is the fundamental basis for everything in samsara and nirvana."

57
The great and might ones' supreme abode,
Akanistha that's so beautiful,
And consciousness, all three of them,
Fuse into a single one, I say.

58
As for knowing all among the childish,
The diversity amoun the noble,
And the great and might, infinite in time--
What's the cause of time in eons?

59
For sustaining the duration,
During eons truly infinite,
Of [all] beings outer realms
And for creatures' life-force to remain,
This is what's the inexhaustive cause.

****
That's why, when Malcolm quoted Brunnholzl on another thread, Brunnholzl excluded

this text from the classical Indian Madhyamaka view.

krodha wrote:
Dharmadhātu is simply the emptiness of phenomena:

If it is asked what is the bodhisattva's skill in the elements [khams, dhātu], it is that which is the wisdom that engages the dharmadhātu. The dharmadhātu is the element of earth, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of solidity. The dharmadhātu is the element of water, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of wetness. The dharmadhātu is the element of fire, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of maturation. The dharmadhātu is the element of air, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of motility. The dharmadhātu is the element of the eye, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of sight…The dharmadhātu is the element of the body, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of touch. The dharmadhātu is the element of mind, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of perception [vijñāpti]. The dharmadhātu is the element of eye consciousness, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of of the specific perception of form…The dharmadhātu is the element of form, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the element of perception of an eye consciousness. The dharmadhātu is the element of phenomena [chos kyi khams, dharma dhātu, one of the eighteen dhātus], but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the perception of phenomena…the dharmadhātu and the element of the self are the same. The dharmadhātu, the desire realm, form realm and formless realm are the same. The dharmadhātu and the element of samsara and the element of nirvana are the same. The dharmadhātu, the element of sentient beings the element of space and the element of all phenomena, those are the same. If it is asked why they are the same, because they are the same as emptiness, they are the same.
-- Āryākṣayamatinirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra [per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 3:54 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Matt J said:
I haven't seen this in the Chan teachings.

Sheng Yen wrote in Orthodox Chinese Buddhism:
Do Buddhists Believe in the Existence of a Soul?

No, Buddhists do not believe in the existence of an eternal, unchanging soul. Someone who believes in the existence of an eternal, unchanging soul is not truly a Buddhist, but rather an outer-path adherent maintaining the existence of a self (sehnwo waidao).

krodha wrote:
Thanks, perhaps I've only been exposed to the Chinese Buddhism that ends up promoting a self, but that is good to know that such views are not as widespread as some like to claim they are.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 3:28 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Plus it's not just the Chinese. Tibetans have Shentong, which in varying forms and to varying degrees is currently found in 3 of the 4 major schools. And that's not counting the Jonanagpas.

krodha wrote:
Right, but gzhan stong is a form of Madhyamaka that is essentially only aiming to convey that one's nature is not deprived of buddha-qualities... some species of gzhan stong are a bit more extreme, such as Dolbupa's interpretation, and in that respect one could probably indeed argue that Dolbupa was making a case for a "self" of some stripe, but even then, he does clarify that he is not advocating for a "self" like that of the tīrthikas:

Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self [ātman] of the forders [tīrthikas], and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the forders impute to be permanent.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 3:16 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Matt J said:
What?

asunthatneversets said:
Chinese Buddhism is also highly influenced by Taoism and managed to acquire a "self" or "soul" in its view as a result of that influence, so much if it is flawed. But this is why eternalists eat it up. And this is also why you may indeed see Chinese sources appearing to advocate for a dharmatā that is separate from dharmas... however this does not mean such a view is correct.

krodha wrote:
https://www.amazon.com/Buddhism-Acquired-Buddhist-Studies-Monographs/dp/1845539974

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 3:15 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism

Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Also the idea that tathāgatagarbha is full-fledged buddhahood is contradicted by this passage:
The seed existing in oneself that turns into buddhahood is called "tathāgatgarbha," the buddhahood which one will obtain.
Again one sentence with no context.

This is only in reference to inherent enlightenment manifesting in the life of the sentient being, it is in no way saying that the Buddha nature is a part that you can use to create the unconditioned unborn Enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
As I've pointed out to you before "Inherent enlightenment [bodhi]" also makes zero sense. If everyone was inherently enlightened then samsara wouldn't even be an issue and there would be no reason for the buddhadharma. So inherent enlightenment is an incorrect view. "Enlightenment" or "awakening" [bodhi] only arises due to causes and conditions, as does buddhahood, buddhahood's cause (for example) is primarily the removal of the two obscurations and gathering of the two accumulations. There is no enlightenment to speak of without rectifying those afflictions, and one would be a fool to state otherwise.

What you are mistakenly referring to as "inherent enlightenment" is a misinterpretation of the innate purity of phenomena, i.e., their unconditioned nature. That nature is not 'enlightenment'. Enlightenment [bodhi] is an event that occurs in the continuum of a sentient being, because that aspirant has actualized a perfect and unobstructed knowledge of the unconditioned nature of phenomena. So you are confused on this matter and have been for some time. When you say "inherent" you actually mean to say "innate", and when you say "enlightenment" you actually mean to say "unconditioned nature"... this issue with the term "bodhi" is really a reoccurring theme for you.

As I have cited before Śrī Siṃha is very clear about this idea of 'primordial buddhahood' or 'inherent enlightenment' being a misunderstanding, and you should make sure you are VERY clear on this, otherwise you will compromise your chances of buddhahood altogether:

This is acceptable since a so called “primordial buddhahood” is not asserted. Full awakening is not possible without being free of the five afflictions... It is not possible for wisdom to increase without giving up afflictions. Wisdom will not arise without purifying afflictions.

You are confusing bodhi, with the unconditioned nature of phenomena. Phenomena are indeed innately pure and unconditioned, however due to afflictive obscurations you do not have a direct or experiential knowledge of this. You must first recognize that unconditioned nature, and then remove the afflictive traces that sustain the two obscurations in your continuum. Upon exhausting the two obscurations you will actualize buddhahood i.e., "enlightenment", but not prior to that. The unconditioned

nature of phenomena remains unconditioned at all times, but you do not have knowledge of that nature, much less a complete knowledge divested of obscurations.

So no, 'inherent enlightenment' is not taught in any buddhist teachings, and you are grievously mistaken if you believe it is. Really these discrepancies are due to your unrefined knowledge of these teachings, hopefully you will take heed and learn correctly.

Son of Buddha said:
Also the idea that Buddha Nature is full fledged Buddhahood is the Basic Buddha Nature teachings 101

krodha wrote:
No, it actually isn't. The Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra states in no uncertain terms that buddha nature refers to a potential:

Child of the lineage, I have said that "curd exists in milk", because curd is produced from milk, it is called "curd".

Child of lineage, at the time of milk, there is no curd, also there is no butter, ghee or manda, because the curd arises from milk with the conditions of heat, impurities, etc., milk is said to have the "curd-nature".

Son of Buddha said:
Simply said the term Buddha Nature is just a word used to describe the Dharmakaya(full buddhahood) when it us still obscured by adventurous defilements.....that's it.

krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is the result as complete, omniscient, buddhahood. Since the nature of sentient beings is ultimately unconditioned, they have the potential to recognize this nature and remove the adventitious obscurations that have obscured that unconditioned nature... at that time of being completely free of ignorance and obscuration, the result, as dharmakāya is made manifest. Buddhahood is a term that is used to denote that event. The only thing that sentient beings have is a latent potential for that omniscience, just like milk has a latent potential to manifest curd if certain conditions are met.

Son of Buddha said:
Queen Srimala Sutra Chapter 8: The Dharmakaya V96. O’ Bhagavan, the extinction of suffering is not the destruction of the Dharma. Why so? Because the ‘extinction of suffering’ is known as the Dharmakaya of the World Honored One, which is beginningless, uncreated, unborn, undying, free from destruction, permanent unchanging, eternal, inherently pure, and separate from all the stores of defilement. The Dharmakaya is also not different from the inconceivable Buddha Natures which are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. The Dharmakaya of the World Honored One is called the Buddha Nature when it is obscured by the stores of

defilement.”

krodha wrote:
This is referring to the full omniscience of a buddha at the time of the result, and is stating that said omniscience can be found to be latent within all sentient beings, and that is all it is saying.

Son of Buddha said:
Nirvana Sutra Moreover, emancipation is termed that which severs all conditioned phenomena [samskrta-dharmas], gives rise to all untainted [anasrava], wholseome qualities / phenomena and eliminates the various paths/ approaches, that is to say, Self, non-Self, not-Self and not non-Self. It merely severs attachment and does not sever the view of the Self/ the seeing of the Self/ the vision of the Self [atma-drsti]. The view of the Self is termed the ‘Buddha-dhatu’ [Buddha-Nature]. The Buddha-dhatu is true emancipation, and true emancipation is the Tathagata.

krodha wrote:
This is again, simply describing buddhahood as a complete cessation of cause for the arising of suffering, and is using the term "self" as a literary device to denote buddha nature, it is not controversial at all. Your misinterpretation is the only controversial aspect of this.

Son of Buddha said:
Also, emancipation cuts off all greed, all external appearances, all bonds, all illusions, all births and deaths, all causes and conditions, all karma results. Such emancipation is the Tathagata. The Tathagata is Nirvana. When all beings [come to] fear birth and death and illusion, they take refuge in the Three Treasures. This is like a herd of deer who fear the hunter and run away. One jump may be likened to one refuge, and three such jumps to three refuges. From the three jumps, peace comes. It is the same with all beings. When one fears the four Maras and the evil-minded hunter, one takes the three Refuges [in Buddha, Dharma and Sangha]. As a result of the three Refuges, one gains peace. Gaining peace is true emancipation. True emancipation is the Tathagata. The Tathagata is Nirvana. Nirvana is the Infinite. The Infinite is the Buddha-Nature. Buddha-Nature is definiteness. Definiteness is unsurpassed Enlightenment.”

krodha wrote:
This is just straight up Mahāyāna, and does not say anything to support your colorful interpretations.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
That's an important point. Classical Chinese translations are often highly terse and due to their poetic and evocative quality amenable to widely divergent translations and

interpretations. Consequently, Chinese Madhyamaka seems much less logically elaborate in its categorizations and the terms of debate than what I see in contemporary Tibetan traditions, but at the same time more provocative, if that makes sense.

krodha wrote:
Chinese Buddhism is also highly influenced by Taoism and managed to acquire a "self" or "soul" in its view as a result of that influence, so much if it is flawed. But this is why eternalists eat it up. And this is also why you may indeed see Chinese sources appearing to advocate for a dharmatā that is separate from dharmas... however this does not mean such a view is correct.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There is no system of the buddhadharma that posits a dharmatā that abides separately from dharmas.

smcj said:
Well, if you define anything that does posit such thing as "heresy" it is a truism. If not, you're on thin ice.

krodha wrote:
Rather than "heresey" it is simply an inaccurate view that is not conducive to actualizing buddhahood.

Overall it is simple logic, how could there be an essence or nature of something that resides separately from said something? Once you state that a dharmatā is found apart from a given dharmin, you automatically render said dharmatā as another conditioned dharma. Such a view removes the possibility of an unconditioned dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 2:04 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
You are positing a dharmatā that abides apart from dharmins, this means your view deviates from the buddhadharma.
I think that could be better phrased "...deviates from a classical Indian style of buddhadharma." (if you ignore "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" that is).

krodha wrote:
There is no system of the buddhadharma that posits a dharmatā that abides separately from dharmas.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 13th, 2015 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
zengen said:
I think people keep confusing between the "self" that is an illusion of the five skandhas and the "True Self" that is beyond the five

asunthatneversets said:
There's no such thing.

Son of Buddha said:
Yes there is such a thing. Everything he said is actually supported in the Sutras
Nirvana Sutra All such meanings of the letters well enable beings to purify their verbal actions. The Buddha-Nature of beings does not first become pure when assisted by letters. Why not? Because that nature is originally pure. Also, while co-existing with the five skandhas, the 18 realms and the 12 spheres [of the senses], the Buddha-Nature is not one with the five skandhas, the 18 realms and the 12 spheres. Because of this, all beings should take refuge in the Bodhisattvas and others.

krodha wrote:
Yet this passage does not support the assertion that there is a self outside the skandhas. It merely states that tathāgatagarbha is not one of the skandhas... this does not mean it abides outside of them.

You are positing a dharmatā that abides apart from dharmins, this means your view deviates from the buddhadharma.

zengen said:
and is taught in Buddhism as the Buddha Nature that is inherent in all living beings.
ASTNS
Tathāgatagarbha is not a self, it is one's latent nature that is a mere potential for omniscience. The term "self" only appears in the tathāgatagarbha sūtras as a subversion to Hindu sanatanadharma. It is a mere rhetorical device that is wholly conventional.

Son of Buddha said:
Your unsupported opinion as usual.

The Buddha Nature is the True Self

krodha wrote:
Ironically, this is your unsupported opinion, since the term "true self" never appears in the sūtras you cite in order to support your baseless claim.

Son of Buddha said:
Nirvana Sutra Kasyapa said to the Buddha: “O World-Honoured One! Is there Self in the 25 existences or not?” The Buddha said: “O good man! “Self” means “Tathagatagarbha” [Buddha-Womb, Buddha-Embryo, Buddha-Nature]. Every being has Buddha-Nature. This is the Self. Such Self has, from the very beginning, been under cover of innumerable defilements. That is why man cannot see it.

krodha wrote:
And it has been pointed out repeatedly that "self" (no need to capitalize) in this context is a mere literary device. There is no such thing as a self, beyond the scope of the conventional, of course.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 12th, 2015 at 11:25 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
zengen said:
I think people keep confusing between the "self" that is an illusion of the five skandhas and the "True Self" that is beyond the five

krodha wrote:
There's no such thing.

zengen said:
and is taught in Buddhism as the Buddha Nature that is inherent in all living beings.

krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha is not a self, it is one's latent nature that is a mere potential for omniscience. The term "self" only appears in the tathāgatagarbha sūtras as a subversion to Hindu sanatanadharma. It is a mere rhetorical device that is wholly conventional.

zengen said:
When you argue whether or not the SELF exists, which "self" are you referring to?

krodha wrote:
Both. Neither one has any validity or reality to it.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 12th, 2015 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I don't follow... where is this phrase "transcendent sublime identity" used?

dzogchungpa said:
Oh, nevermind.

krodha wrote:
You're clearly referring to this:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=17872&start=80#p257790

In any case, Malcolm already clarified that "atma" in that context denotes "nature", and not an identity, self, etc.

You've also mentioned it here:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=14626&start=280#p197538

And stated that bdag dam pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa is synonymous with bdag nyid chen po spoken of in Dzogpachenpo, however this does not suggest a "self" of any kind.

Depending upon which system of Dzogpachenpo you are using there can be between seven and nine positions one can take in relation to the basis [gzhi]. Vairocana's view of choice was bdag nyid chen po, however that is only one facet of the basis, and therefore grasping at that definition as an all encompassing view which speaks for the basis would be akin to the blind man grasping the elephants tail and proclaiming that the elephant is actually a rope. It is an incomplete view. Further, the only definitive view of the basis is held to be ka dag i.e. original purity, which is emptiness free from extremes. Ka dag as such therefore completely forbids any type of 'self'.

So Dzogchen does not hold bdag nyid chen po to be a 'self' in the sense you seem to be implying it is. This is known by anyone who understands the view of Atiyoga. You will not find any sect or cycle of Dzogchen which states there is a truly established 'self' in the sense you are insinuating.

As stated by Dylan Esler on this issue, 'integral being' [bdag nyid chen po] is nothing more than the inseparable emptiness and clarity [stong gsal dbyer med] which is experienced upon recognizing the nature of mind [sems nyid] and does not refer to an eternal self of any kind. He states:
"The fact that it is explicitly described as being both empty and luminous excludes reification into a monolithic self."
The point of bdag nyid chen po is to illustrate that the nature of one's mind is not to be found elsewhere, that it is one's immediate condition, however it is the the wisdom which ensues from recognizing the non-arising of one's mind [skt. citta, tib. sems]. This term is therefore pointing to that nature, and only that nature which is completely empty and free from extremes.

Esler continues:
"...the tantric and rDzogs-chen notion of integral being [skt. mahātman] should not be misconstrued to contradict the orthodox Buddhist insistence on selflessness [skt. anātman], simply because of the use of related words with different shades of meaning. As mentioned above, the terminology used is sufficiently precise to ward off

misunderstanding, and that is to say nothing of the contextual meaning, which leaves no trace of doubt."
and:
"It is precisely when egocentric apprehension, the mistaken moment-by-moment reification of a self [skt. ātman], falls aside that one can speak of integral being [skt. mahātman], without this notion contradicting more normative Buddhist ideas of selflessness [skt. anātman]."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 12th, 2015 at 9:08 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
The very description of the True Self in the Nirvana Sutra...

asunthatneversets said:
This would first require the presence of a "true self" in the Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra to begin with, however there is no such term in the original Sanskrit, so a "true self" of whatever stripe is merely the whimsical fabrication of some translators.

dzogchungpa said:
How about "transcendent sublime identity"? Talk about a whimsical fabrication.

krodha wrote:
I don't follow... where is this phrase "transcendent sublime identity" used?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 12th, 2015 at 9:03 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
The very description of the True Self in the Nirvana Sutra...

krodha wrote:
This would first require the presence of a "true self" in the Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra to begin with, however there is no such term in the original Sanskrit, so a "true self" of whatever stripe is merely the whimsical fabrication of some translators.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 11th, 2015 at 11:45 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
Since he is a Jonangpa, if his posts are in keeping with Dolpopa, he is simply sharing

Jonang orthodoxy, much like Tsongkhapafan does with Gelug orthodoxy. And Dolpopa is definitely well qualified in his referencing of the the tantras. After all, all of Jonang view is based on the experiences of a group of Kalachackra practitioners.

Of course that doesn't mean everyone else, or even other Shentongpas, have to accept those interpretations of the sutras and tantras in that way. It is Jonang specific, but obviously with extensive influences outside the Jonang.

krodha wrote:
Sure, but then why quote the rdo rje sems dpa' snying gi me long gi rgyud? It is not a Jonang tantra, much less a text that coincides with Son of Buddha's view.

In case you haven't noticed, SoB is a bit of an opportunist when it comes to these scriptures, he'll quote any literature that even remotely resembles his view so that he can twist to promulgate his "buddhanature is a self" campaign. I've seen him go as far as to attempt and wield random excerpts from other Dzogchen tantras as a weapons in furthering his agenda, which means he doesn't understand the literature... since no Dzogchen text agrees with his view, and in fact refute it outright. So sure, if he wants to quote Dolbupa all day long that's fine, but quoting a Dzogchen tantra is quite a stretch, especially when taken out of context like the one above.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 11th, 2015 at 7:41 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Except in both the Sutras and Tantras it is taught that the Buddha Nature is physically present within you, and can even be seen with the eyes. So the Buddha Nature is not just some word that denotes the possibility or potential to attain Enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
Only in the tantras are practices described that entail seeing sugatagarbha, there's nothing like that in the sūtras apart from Buddhas being able to see dharmakāya at the time of the result, but that is a completely different principle.

Even then, buddha nature is a latent potentiality in both cases, the fact that it is embodied does not change the fact that it is latently present... otherwise everyday sentient beings would cognize their nature effortlessly and at all times.

Son of Buddha said:
the Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva Tantra states:

The sugatagarbha exists intrinsically in all sentient beings. That exists just as sesame seeds are permeated with oil. Its basis — it is based on the material aggregate. It’s location — it is located in the center of the heart. Also that is called “the transcendent state of Samantabhadra’s sealed locket”. For example, like a sealed locket of leather,

inside its location, from the center of a five colored light there exist peaceful kāyas the size of mustard grains in halos of light. That is the location of vidyā. For example, it is like form of a vase.

krodha wrote:
And now you're re-quoting an excerpt that was evoked to make a point to you, that comes from a system you don't practice, don't have transmission for, and don't understand.

This is the point that others were trying to make you understand about the two types of Buddha nature; just because you think you understand sūtric tathāgatagarbha, does not mean you understand tantric sugatagarbha.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 9:10 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Your last 3 posts to me was of you complaining and you giving me your opinions.....

krodha wrote:
As were yours.

Son of Buddha said:
And you did not provide any sources that were even relevant to our conversation whatsoever.

krodha wrote:
I did. But if I didn't, you didn't either, since when it comes down to it my "lack of sources" is simply you disagreeing with my points because they are in conflict with your view, so in that respect our positions on the matter are identical.

Son of Buddha said:
Matter of fact out of ALL those long posts you only provided 1 source and your source had zero to do with the actual topic of how Not Self is actually applied in the Tathagatagarbha Sutras.

krodha wrote:
Understand, that this is your conclusion due to the cognitive dissonance you are exhibiting in relation to the Lanka passages that overtly contradict your tired assertions.

Son of Buddha said:
Here is your source
ASTBS that the tathāgatagarbha IS, is this:

The statement "The tathāgata pervades" means wisdom pervades all objects of

knowledge, but it does not mean abiding in everything like Viśnu. Further, "Tathāgatagarbhin" means emptiness, signlessness and absence of aspiration exist the continuums of all sentient beings, but is not an inner personal agent pervading everyone".
-- Bhāviveka
And my reply to you is the Tathagatagarbha is this:

Nirvana sutra] CHAPTER TWELVE: ON THE TATHAGATA-DHATU
V417. “Kasyapa said to the Buddha: “O World-Honoured One! Is there Self in the 25 existences or not?” The Buddha said: “O good man! “Self” means “Tathagatagarbha” [Buddha-Womb, Buddha-Embryo, Buddha-Nature]. Every being has Buddha-Nature. This is the Self. Such Self has, from the very beginning, been under cover of innumerable defilements. That is why man cannot see it.
_ Buddha

krodha wrote:
Correct, I cited the Bhavya passage to demonstrate what tathāgatagarbha in fact denotes.

And in your response you've cited an example of a rhetorical device that you absurdly mistake as a literal proclamation for the existence of a self.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 8:18 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
@ASTNS I have highly sourced everything in my post and you have entirely ignored those sources thus your only "defense" against my argument you have provided is..... Your wrong because I say you are wrong.. Yep great "refutation".

krodha wrote:
Right, well, like I said your argument is flawed to begin with because you are an eternalist who chooses to make a literal interpretation of clearly subversive rhetorical devices.

Son of Buddha said:
Your two massive posts have nothing useful in them

krodha wrote:
Sounds familiar.

Son of Buddha said:
its just you providing your unsourced opinion

krodha wrote:

Since I provided adequate "sources" this same criticism applies to yourself. The issue isn't with said sources, but our disagreement regarding what constitutes a valid interpretation of said sources.

Son of Buddha said:
and a whole bunch of complaining and making up random things you cannot prove.

krodha wrote:
Again, sounds familiar.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 6:55 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
The Nirvana Sutra translation I use was Translated into English by Kosho Yamamoto in 1973 so you are incorrect

krodha wrote:
Nevertheless, it is a disingenuous translation, and is most likely severely out-dated.

Son of Buddha said:
also please stop making up lies

krodha wrote:
Projection.

Son of Buddha said:
your lying will not discredit the facts that have been presented.

krodha wrote:
Your so-called "facts" discredit themselves by virtue of the inescapable biases they are steeped in.

Son of Buddha said:
Also quit talking bad about Dr Tony Page, he us currently in the emergency room right now.

krodha wrote:
Pointing out that he has eternalist biases is not "talking bad" of him. It is simply accurate.

But may he recover quickly from whatever ails him.

Son of Buddha said:
in short you cannot refute my argument so you resort to making up lies about the sources themselves (cause if the sources are real then your whole argument goes.

krodha wrote:
Red-herring.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 6:39 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
zengen said:
Yes, but this True Self is not the Self taught in Hinduism, a point I was trying to make. I did not deny the True Self taught in Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
In truth, this alleged "true self" is a colorful translation choice. The original Sanskrit does not actually say "true self".

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 6:38 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Dude again in the CONTEXT of the Tathagatagarbha Sutras the Buddha in order to eliminate ordinary peoples false views of Self

krodha wrote:
First of all, a "self" of any kind in the tathāgatagarbha sūtras is a mere literary device that is an example of an upāya presented in the form of a subversion of Hindu principles. It is not to be taken literally, which I know is difficult for you. The fact that you blatantly ignore these crucial examples of "context" while pompously attempting to council others on how to relate to these texts with context is laughable.

But to address your assertion; no, the tathāgatagarbha is not a concept that is implemented to remove false ideas of some sort of "self" that is a ridiculous notion.

Son of Buddha said:
teaches the Buddha Nature(which is True Self) to be Not Self.

krodha wrote:
I'm sorry, but there is no "true self" in Buddhism, no matter what individuals such as Tony Page choose to say in their translations. You are simply promoting some sort of pop-Hindu non-sense that has zero credibility or foundation in the original texts.

Son of Buddha said:
And THAT is the point of the Lankavatara passage

krodha wrote:
Sadly, it is about as far from the intention of the Lanka as you can get.

Son of Buddha said:
the Buddha in the Lankavatara Sutra taught Buddha Nature as Annatman in order to remove people false concepts that they had been imputing unto the True Self(Buddha Nature)

krodha wrote:
No, this is your own deluded fantasy.

Son of Buddha said:
So this passage in the Lankavatara Sutra is a provisional teaching.

krodha wrote:
What is "provisional" or "definitive" varies from text to text and system to system. There is no such thing as an objectively definitive position, but of course you think there is actually a substantiated self that these texts are describing so it is no surprise you think your misconceptions are backed by some air of "objective definitiveness".

Son of Buddha said:
As your quote from the Lankavatara states:
O Mahāmati, with a view to casting aside the heterodox theory, you must treat the tathāgatagarbha as not self [anātman].

krodha wrote:
Correct. Otherwise people run the risk of deluding themselves into believing there is some sort of uber-self that is their true identity, like you do.

Son of Buddha said:
As you can see your own quote is in agreement with me,

krodha wrote:
Not in the least.

Son of Buddha said:
also the does not say the Buddha nature IS not Self

krodha wrote:
Are you meaning to imply that there is actually a tathāgatagarbha that IS something else?

What the tathāgatagarbha IS, is this:

The statement "The tathāgata pervades" means wisdom pervades all objects of knowledge, but it does not mean abiding in everything like Viśnu. Further, "Tathāgatagarbhin" means emptiness, signlessness and absence of aspiration exist the continuums of all sentient beings, but is not an inner personal agent pervading

everyone".
-- Bhāviveka

Son of Buddha said:
it clearly states the Buddha Nature is TREATED as not self in order to remove their incorrect view in regard to the True Self/ Buddha Nature further proving my next point.

krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha is a provisional convention that is implemented as an upāya... it is not some truly existent "thing" that is somehow capable of being "treated" as other than it somehow "IS"... apart from your complete deviation from right conventional view of course.

Son of Buddha said:
Nirvana Sutra V464. While a Bodhisattva discourses thus about the quality of the Self, ordinary people do not but impute various false concepts to the Self just as when asked about the attributes of the sword the [ministers] reply that it is like the horn of a ram.

these ordinary people generate false views in succession from one on to the other. In order to eliminate such false views, the Tathagata reveals and discourses on the non-existence of a self just as when the prince tells his various ministers that there is no such sword in his treasury. Noble Son, the True Self that the Tathagata expounds today is called the Buddha-dhatu [Buddha-Nature]. this manner of Buddha-dhatu is shown in the Buddha-Dharma with the example of the real sword.l Noble Son, should there be any ordinary person who is able well to expound this, then he [speaks] in accordance with unsurpassed Buddha-Dharma. Should there be anyone who is well able to distinguish this in accordance with what has been expounded regarding it, then you should know that he has the nature of a Bodhisattva.

krodha wrote:
And of course you are forced to again turn to your eternalist translations (Tony Page or not) to support your baseless arguments. It's quite evident that you do not understand what you're reading at all, after-all how could you?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 5:50 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Right back at you

I have highly sourced everything in my post and you have entirely ignored those sources

krodha wrote:
And as pointed out said "sources" are highly questionable, much like your quotations

from Tony Page's Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra translation that you often rely on... Page is a career eternalist and his biases burden his scholarship. The same goes for your quoting of Chinese translations, where as Malcolm pointed out, the idea of a "soul" or "self" has inserted itself like weeds growing in an untended garden. Your "sources" are biased and this discredits your entire argument.

In short, you hide behind faulty scholarship in order to promulgate your own dogmatic biases.

Son of Buddha said:
thus your only "defense" against my argument you have provided is..... Your wrong because I say you are wrong.. Yep great "refutation".

krodha wrote:
Your view has been refuted at length, the fact that (i) your aforementioned confirmation biases are so thick that you are immune to reason, and (ii) have some sort of inner-existential crisis that you are attempting to quell through inferential belief like all eternalist dogmatists, are both issues that are not examples of steep poverties on my part, quite the opposite in fact.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 5:18 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
zengen Here is what will end this debate, as according to what Buddha himself said in the Lankavatara Sutra
This is false the Lankavatara Sutra teaches that viewing the Tathagatagarbha as empty of self is a provisional teaching that is taught to new Buddhists who already have a mistaken idea of self. So the entire idea that Buddha Nature is Not Self is actually the upaya teaching.
Lankavatara Sutra Mahamati, the Tathagatas as such, in order to guide those grasping to assertions of the Self of the Non-Buddhists, will demonstrate tathagatagarbha with the demonstration of Anatman(not self)(Chinese version)

krodha wrote:
Which is a highly questionable translation when compared to this (which contradicts your entire assertion):

O Mahāmati, the tathāgatas thus teach the garbha in so far as they teach the tathāgatagarbha in order to attract those who are attached to the heterodox ātmavāda. How can people whose minds fall into the conceptual theory bearing on an unreal self (abhūtātmavikalpa) attain quickly the complete awakening in the supreme and exact sambodhi, possessing a mind comprised in the domain of the three gateways of emancipation? O Mahāmati, it is because of this that the tathāgatas teach the tathāgatagarbha.

-- Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra

Not to mention this, from the same text:

O Mahāmati, with a view to casting aside the heterodox theory, you must treat the tathāgatagarbha as not self [anātman].

Son of Buddha said:
In the end it is very very important to (1) actually have more than 1 passage to support your position

krodha wrote:
Which, coming from you turns into a barrage of shotgun argumentation wrought with quotations from bogus translations that are taken out of context.

Son of Buddha said:
And (2) actually know the CONTEXT of your 1 passage in the whole overall Tathagatagarbha Doctrine.

krodha wrote:
Which you do not. You treat tathāgatagarbha like the heterodox ātmavāda that is criticized in the very texts you cite in your attempts to substantiate your baseless theories, and so your "evidence" for your arguments betrays you every time.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 10th, 2015 at 4:14 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
zengen Here is what will end this debate, as according to what Buddha himself said in the Lankavatara Sutra
This is false the Lankavatara Sutra teaches that viewing the Tathagatagarbha as empty of self is a provisional teaching that is taught to new Buddhists who already have a mistaken idea of self. So the entire idea that Buddha Nature is Not Self is actually the upaya teaching.
Lankavatara Sutra Mahamati, the Tathagatas as such, in order to guide those grasping to assertions of the Self of the Non-Buddhists, will demonstrate tathagatagarbha with the demonstration of Anatman(not self)(Chinese version)
This is further proven by the fact that the Lankavatara Sutra clearly states that the 100% Correct teachings of Tathagatagarbha is located in the Queen Srimala Sutra

Lankavatara Sutra And for Queen Śrīmālā to whom the Buddha's spiritual power was added, the [pure] realm of Tathagatahood was expounded. This does not belong to the realm of speculation as it is carried on by the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and other philosophers, except, Mahāmati, that this realm of Tathagatahood which is the realm of the Tathāgata-garbha-ālayavijñāna is meant for those Bodhisattva-Mahāsattvas who

like you are

Okay so we have established from the Lankavatara that the correct teachings of the Buddha Nature was taught to Queen Srimala..... Okay sir SO what are the correct teachings from Quern srimala on this subject?

Queen Srimala Sutra Know that those living beings who have devout faith in the Buddha and view the Buddha as having Permanence, Bliss, Self and Purity do not stray away from the correct path. In truth it is those living beings who have the Right View Why is this? Because the Dharmakaya of the World Honored One is the perfection of permanence, the perfection of bliss, the perfection of the Noumenon Self, and the perfection of purity. Those living beings who see the Dharmakaya of the Buddha in this way are the ones who have seen correctly. Those who see correctly are called the Sons and Daughters of the Lord, born from his heart, born from his mouth, born from the Dharma, those who act as if they are a manifestation of the Dharma, heirs to the Dharma.

So as the Lankavatara states the queen srimala has the right view and the Queen srimala says the right view is The Buddga Nature is True Self. The Lankavatara further states in no uncertain terms.
Those who propound the doctrine of non-Self are to be shunned in the religous rites of the monks, and not to be spoken to, for they are offenders of the Buddhist doctrines, having embraced the dual views of Being and non-Being [existence and non-existence]."
~ Lankavatara SutraSutra
And
The doctrine of the Self shines brilliantly; it is like the rising of the apocalyptic fire [lit., the fire of the end of the world, yug-anta-agni], burning up the forest of Self-lessness, wiping away the faults of the heretics. ~ Lankavatara Sutra

As you can see CONTEXT is extremely important.
Furthermore being on the Subject of CONTEXT the rest of the Buddha Nature Sutras actually go into detail explaining why the upaya not self teachings were taught to begin with.

Nirvana Sutra V464. While a Bodhisattva discourses thus about the quality of the Self, ordinary people do not but impute various false concepts to the Self just as when asked about the attributes of the sword the [ministers] reply that it is like the horn of a ram. These ordinary people generate false views in succession from one on to the other. In order to eliminate such false views, the Tathagata reveals and discourses on the non-existence of a self just as when the prince tells his various ministers that there is no such sword in his treasury. Noble Son, the True Self that the Tathagata expounds today is called the Buddha-dhatu [Buddha-Nature]. this manner of Buddha-dhatu is shown in the Buddha-Dharma with the example of the real sword.l Noble Son, should there be any ordinary person who is able well to expound this, then he [speaks] in accordance with unsurpassed Buddha-Dharma. Should there be anyone who is well able to distinguish this in accordance with what has been expounded regarding it, then you should know that he has the nature of a Bodhisattva.

As you can see the Buddha only taught the Buddha Nature as Anatta in the Lankavatarava to help remove the false concepts imputed upon the True Self(Buddha Nature).

And
When non-Self is talked about, common mortals say that there cannot be Self in the Buddhist teaching. One who is wise should know that non-Self is a temporary existence and is not true. Knowing thus, one should not have any doubt.
And
Because of this, the Tathagata teaches and says no-self. This is to adjust beings and because he is aware of the occasion. Such non-self is, as occasion arises, spoken of, and it is [also] said that there is the Self.

In the end it is very very important to (1) actually have more than 1 passage to support your position. And (2) actually know the CONTEXT of your 1 passage in the whole overall Tathagatagarbha Doctrine.
Peace and Love

krodha wrote:
This is simply just copied and pasted from your rather ill informed post on reddit. And like I said there, you really have no idea what you're talking about, being a biased intellectual (who admitted to having no experiential insight into these matters), prone to faulty interpretation and bad logic. Why you insist on parading your half baked theories as anything that even remotely resembles a valid take on these topics is something I fail to understand.

Not to mention, the thickness of your confirmation biases is truly unparalleled.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 8th, 2015 at 4:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Yes, when I was in Tenerife last April Rinpoche said Shang Shung will be publishing the sgra thal gyur along with info from two separate commentaries, and Rinpoche's own commentary.

heart said:
Wow, any idea when?

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Not sure when, hopefully soon. I thought you were there too when he made the announcement, it was last day (or maybe second to last day) of the retreat we were at.

Although I do remember you had to leave early to catch your flight so perhaps he made the announcement after you left.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 8th, 2015 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
From Bronkhorst's preface to "Buddhist Teaching In India": The Buddha himself was clearly averse to any kind of speculation, and he positively avoided “philosophically” important questions.
Something to keep in mind, perhaps.

krodha wrote:
Right, however the Buddha chose to decline answering the fourteen 'unanswered' questions because they are non-sensical from his point of view (due to being predicated upon delusion).

The Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-śāstra explains:

To reply to the fourteen difficult questions would be to commit a fault. If you ask what type is the size or the physique of a son of a barren woman and an eunuch, that would not deserve an answer, for such a son does not exist.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 8th, 2015 at 3:01 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Jikan said:
with regard to the upcoming (starting tomorrow) webcast:

Is there a publication coming out involving (or including) this tantra? Of course receiving the transmission on its own is important. I also wonder if it's intended to make certain studies and practices possible in the future too.

krodha wrote:
Yes, when I was in Tenerife last April Rinpoche said Shang Shung will be publishing the sgra thal gyur along with info from two separate commentaries, and Rinpoche's own commentary.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 8th, 2015 at 2:31 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:

David Reigle said:
As we know, jñāna is in Tibetan ye shes. Some of the Tibetan schools, including Dzogchen if I am not mistaken, hold ye shes to be eternal.

krodha wrote:
Ye shes is not considered to be ultimately real or "eternal" (in the sense you mean) in Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 10:50 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:
Jinzang said:
Every Kagyu teacher (Drikung and Kamtsang) I've heard teaching on emptiness has presented Jamgon Kongtrul's view of the subject. However, the view presented is more nuanced than Malcolm suggests. The buddha qualities are beyond conception, neither existent nor non-existent, and thus not subject to Nagarjuna's critique.

krodha wrote:
My Drikung lama goes with Nāgārjuna when explaining emptiness... and Nāgārjuna's view does not negate Buddha qualities, it simply says they are merely conventional in nature, like everything else.

Hence his statement:

Where emptiness is possible, everything is possible.
Where emptiness is not possible, nothing is possible.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 5:41 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:
smcj said:
You're aware that Thrangu R., senior khenpo for the Karma Kagyus and teacher to all 4 regents, is solidly a Shentongpa, right?

krodha wrote:
Sure. Thrangu Rinpoche's own view does not translate to a gzhan stong majority in the Kagyu overall, however.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:

smcj said:
That's why I titled the thread "Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas"

krodha wrote:
Which is an assertion you're welcome to and entitled to make. Proving or backing up said assertion with hard evidence is a different story though.

If anything I think this thread has shown that people consider the kagyu to be a healthy mix of views... so I'm not sure where the idea of a gzhan stong majority comes from.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 3:40 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
In any case, all of this goes to show that the discussion in the other (Mipham was not gzhan stong) thread is between gzhan stong and spros bral, and not kagyu and nyingma.

smcj said:
Well, yes and no. Here I can quote Kongtrul's position as authoritative (at least for Karma Kagyupas). On the other forum even Dudjom R.'s position was discounted.

krodha wrote:
Yes, at least for karma kagyus, therefore the kagyu view is not unanimously gzhan stong in nature and varies.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 3:14 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:
krodha wrote:
In any case, all of this goes to show that the discussion in the other (Mipham was not gzhan stong) thread is between gzhan stong and spros bral, and not kagyu and nyingma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 2:42 AM
Title: Re: Kagyupas are (mostly) Shentongpas
Content:
smcj said:
Out of curiosity, if you don't mind, who is your lama?

krodha wrote:
Drubpon Gonpo Dorje Rinpoche

smcj said:
Also, since you used it to juxtapose with Shentong, I take it that you are using "spros bral" as a synonym for Madyamaka. Or are you using it in the Mahamudra sense of "simplicity".

krodha wrote:
I'm using spros bral to indicate a freedom from proliferation or extremes. And yes it accords with Madhyamaka aka Nāgārjuna etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 6th, 2015 at 2:24 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
smcj said:
I think we Kagyupas should leave these poor people alone for a while. After all we are in the Nyingma sub forum.

krodha wrote:
At this point we are discussing gzhan stong and spros bral, and not kagyu and nyingma. My kagyu lama upholds the view of spros bral, so this discussion has departed from the whole kagyu-nyingma thing now.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 10:09 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Your question has already been answered

All phenomena is the same nature of Suchness just like how all pottery are made of the same clay, however even though all pottery are made out of the same clay, there are still various different pieces of pottery. this describes the releationship between Enlightenment and non enlightenment. Like wise all phenomena merely exist in illusion; and are from the beginning, nonexistent; and from the beginningless beginning have never been united with the Tathagata-garbha.

much like how an mirage is experienced and believed to be real however in reality the mirage is just an non existent illusion.

Two relationships exist between the enlightened and nonenlightened states. They are "identity" and "nonidentity".

(1) Identity

Just as pieces of various kinds of pottery are of the same nature in that they are made of clay, so the various magic-like manifestations (maya) of both enlightenment (anasrava: nondefilement) and nonenlightenment (avidya: ignorance) are aspects of the same essence, Suchness. For this reason, it is said in a sutra that "all sentient beings intrinsically abide in eternity and are entered into nirvana. The state of enlightenment is not something that is to be acquired by practice or to be created. In the end, it is unobtainable [for it is given from the beginning]." Also it has no corporeal aspect that can be perceived as such. Any corporeal aspects [such as the marks of the Buddha] that are visible are magic-like products of Suchness manifested in accordance with the mentality of men in defilement. It is not, however, that these corporeal aspects which result from the suprarational functions of wisdom are of the nature of nonemptiness [i.e., substantial]; for wisdom has no aspects that can be perceived.

(2) Nonidentity
Just as various pieces of pottery differ from each other, so differences exist between the state of enlightenment and that of nonenlightenment, and between the magic-like manifestations of Suchness manifested in accordance with the mentality of men in defilement, and those of men of ignorance who are defiled [i.e., blinded] as to the essential nature of Suchness.

This being so, it is ludicrous to assert that the ultimate is empty of all relative phenomena. Such an assertion directly contradicts the words of the Buddha. It is one thing to claim "tathāgatagarbha is empty of adventitious afflictions." It is quite another to claim that the ultimate is empty of all relative phenomena. The ultimate is merely the emptiness of all phenomena, there is no other ultimate that can be found.
The Tathagata-garbha, from the beginning, contains only pure excellent qualities which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, are not independent of, severed from, or different from Suchness;

that the soiled states of defilement which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, are not independent of, severed from, or different from Suchness; that the soiled states of defilement which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, merely exist in illusion; are, from the beginning, nonexistent; and from the beginningless beginning have never been united with the Tathagata-garbha.

It has never happened that the Tathagata-garbha contained deluded states in its essence and that it induced itself to realize Suchness in order to extinguish forever its deluded states.

krodha wrote:
You should follow the TOS and clearly cite who, what, where, when you are quoting. Because again, as was pointed out to you elsewhere, no one can tell what is your writing and what is a quote, and I think you use this to your advantage in a sneaky way in order to make your post appear authoritative.

Cite the text or adept you are quoting and place the quote text in a box, itallics or with quotation marks around it.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 5:34 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
conebeckham said:
I mean the same thing that Sherlock means, whatever his reference term would be.....
I am assuming it is gzhi, and not kun gzhi.

krodha wrote:
Oh I see now, I missed the kun bzang smon lam reference.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
conebeckham said:
Ok. Mind is empty, and therefore there is no impediment. Display arises. We mistake display for subject/object. We reify. I'm with you. So, we purify the kleshas, bakchaks, what-have-you. When purified,reification no longer occurs. Does display still occur? If so, from where? Even if subject/object duality is exhausted by the purification of all stains, there is the base, yes?

krodha wrote:
By "base" do you mean "gzhi"?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
conebeckham said:
I agree, Sherlock, and I've tortured that poor metaphor enough, I suppose.

But--if mind is a conditioned phenomenon, like all other Dharmas, and therefore impermanent--and yet it is where Buddhahood is found, what is wisdom? Does it differ from mind? Is it newly created? Or is it a fundamental change of state? Or merely the result of purifying adventitious stains?

krodha wrote:
The way I see it, "wisdom" [ye shes] is just a moniker attributed to a mind that cognizes its own nature as non-arisen (or the nature of phenomena as non-arisen).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 4:36 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
krodha wrote:
IMO the water isn't the important aspect of the watermoon metaphor, the fact that the moon appears yet is not real is the salient part, because all phenomena are like that.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 12:42 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Honestly, this thread is an embarrassment. If anyone who actually reads the book wants to talk about it, I'll be back.

krodha wrote:
This issue goes to the very core of these traditions, systems and doctrines, and is therefore far deeper than some book that was just recently written within the last hundred years. It isn't as if this book is bringing some fresh, new and unheard of side to this argument... which is centuries old.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 12:33 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Will said:
It is wishful thinking of Buddhists who are attempting to quell their existential angst, by refusing to even look at a book which could topple their cherished views.

krodha wrote:
Except for the fact that my view on this matter is not derived from the intellect, and nothing can "topple" it. Which is to say; you cannot pass me salt and convince me it is sugar.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 12:27 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I can't seem to get you to understand that this is the Academic Discussion subforum.

krodha wrote:
And I can't seem to get you to understand that there is absolutely no hard evidence that Śākyamuni, or anyone else was teaching that there is an ātman... all there can be is extrapolated conjecture and wishful thinking.

dzogchungpa said:
The man was an extremely highly respected scholar.

krodha wrote:
Which really doesn't mean much in a context like this. Scholars are no more exempt from falling victim to their delusions and fantasies than anyone else.

dzogchungpa said:
He wrote a book.

krodha wrote:
Yes, congratulations.

dzogchungpa said:
Why don't you read it before commenting?

krodha wrote:
I'm sorry but reading this book is not a necessary prerequisite for having a discussion about whether or not Buddhism promotes an ātman or brahman.

dzogchungpa said:
You are asserting that someone is cherry picking. In this subforum, if you make an accusation like that you are expected to provide some evidence.

krodha wrote:
Like I said, the evidence is in the very fact that such a position is being argued to begin with.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
That he is cherry picking is a given.

dzogchungpa said:
Prove it.

krodha wrote:
The burden of proof in this context is placed upon the shoulders of those who wish to "prove" that the buddhadharma is teaching some form of sanatanadharma.

Since this cannot be proven, because it is little more than the wishful thinking of eternalists who are attempting to quell their existential angst, any attempts on my part to prove they are wrong would be a waste of time.

I don't have to prove that water is wet, or that fire is hot, or that the buddhadharma denies an ātman.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Are you trying to suggest that Bhattacharya engages in cherry picking in his book?

krodha wrote:
That he is cherry picking is a given.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 2:45 PM
Title: Tantra vs. Sutra Buddha Nature
Content:
Will said:
While Tathagatagarbha texts have no problem with the term 'atman', using it with a profound, impersonal sense, even Dzogchen fears it not. At least not in this text by Padmasambhava:

krodha wrote:
The tathāgatagarbha sūtras implement the term "ātman" as a literary device that is an upāya employed for the sake of ātmavādins who cling to heterodox views and fear emptiness... this is stated clearly in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra.

Also, Dzogchen rejects an ātman outright. Longchenpa states:

The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears no similarity to the self [ātman] of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 2:06 PM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:

smcj said:
Open letter to SoB;

These guys are doing some nit-picking. In saying that Shentong isn't Indian is like saying "there was no America pre-1776." Well yes and no. The land was there. There Founding Fathers were all alive. The pressure was building for independence, but it had not yet come to fruit. So no, as a nation the U.S. wasn't really formalized until the Constitution was ratified. But your (SoB's) analogous argument is that the history of America goes back further than the Declaration of Independence. Both positions are right, and to make it a contentious issue seems somewhat ridiculous.

krodha wrote:
We could play this game with Prasanga Madhyamaka as well... Nāgārjuna's treatises set the stage for what later became Prasangika Madhyamaka in Tibet, but that still doesn't mean that Prasangika is Indian. Same goes for gzhan stong, just because the tathāgatagarbha sūtras and the Yogācāra literature set the stage for the formation of gzhan stong in Tibet, does not make gzhan stong "Indian".

On another note; why you're catering to Son of Buddha's whimsical misinterpretations and misconceptions I have no idea... he is "nitpicking" just as much, except he is far less informed on these topics.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 2:41 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Then quit making false unsupported statement about Shentong(other emptiness) and I won't have to post numerous quotes showing what you are saying is incorrect.

krodha wrote:
The only texts that you can quote are tathāgatagarbha and Yogācāra sutras, which are not gzhan stong.

Son of Buddha said:
(1) the idea that Shentong is a Tibetan invention is false, Shentong is literally taught in Buddhist Indian Holy texts.

krodha wrote:
No, it isn't, the doctrines that gzhan stong piggybacks off of are taught in Indian texts, which are the aforementioned tathāgatagarbha and Yogācāra texts.

Son of Buddha said:
(2) the idea that Shentong did not exist in India is false again Shentong is literally taught in INDIAN Buddhist Holy texts.

krodha wrote:
Again, no, you are incorrect... you may find the fundamental tenets that gzhan stong was formulated from, but that is not gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Dude Shentong is simply the Buddhist teaching of Emptiness of Other which is found in Buddhist Sutras and Tantra's. The Emptiness if other(Shentong) teaching is not a Tibetan invention..I have already proven that with numerous quotes up above.

krodha wrote:
You haven't "proven" anything other than the fact that you are deluded by your own whimsical ideas that have to tangible application in reality.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 2:19 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
LoL
Sherlock stated : gzhan stong did not exist in India.

And my above quote is about Shentong(other emptiness) and that quote comes from an INDIAN sutra

krodha wrote:
No, it is not about gzhan stong... you are simply reading something that you believe loosely resembles gzhan stong and asserting that it is such.

Son of Buddha said:
which proves Shentong did exist in India.

krodha wrote:
What it "proves" is that you are seeing what you want to see, and that involves seeing something that isn't there.

Son of Buddha said:
I can also quote other INDIAN Buddhist Sutras and commentaries that prove Shentong existed in India.

krodha wrote:
No, you cannot. You can quote sūtras that speak of tathāgatagarbha and those that

speak of Yogācāra, but not gzhan stong.

Son of Buddha said:
So next time read the whole conversation before posting please.

krodha wrote:
I read the conversation. The issue is that you are plainly mistaken and deluding yourself with your own fantasies, per usual.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 1:58 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
You don't understand what you are talking about, you cannot separate Shentong from the Tathagatagarbha seeing as Shentong IS literally the understanding of emptiness in relegation to the Tathagatagarbha. Like wise the entire Third Turning is based on Shentong(other emptiness) and Tathagatagarhha and this can easily be proven.

Queen Srimala Sutra." Chapter 9: The true understanding of the meaning of emptiness V97. O' Bhagavan, the wisdom of the Buddha Nature is the World Honored One's wisdom of Sunyata[Emptiness]. The Buddha Nature is not something that has been seen or realized by any Arhat, or Pratyekabuddha. There are two types of Emptiness wisdom concerning the Buddha Nature which are as follows. (1) The Buddha nature is empty from, separate from, independent from and different from all the stores of defilement. (2) The Buddha nature is not-empty from, is not separate from, not independent from and not different from the inconceivable Buddha Attributes which are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. V98. O Bhagavan, The great Sravaka's can have faith and entrust themselves to the Buddha through the two types of emptiness wisdom of the Buddha Nature. All the disciples and Pratyekabuddhas are stuck in the domain of the four inverse views because of their incorrect knowledge of emptiness. This is why none of the Sravakas and Pratyekabuddhas have ever seen or attained the Buddha Nature. Only the Buddha's have experienced the extinction of all suffering and destroyed all the stores of defilement. They alone have practiced all the paths which lead to the extinction of suffering.

krodha wrote:
This quote does not apply to the discussion at all and says nothing about the topic at hand... it is abundantly self-evident that you are the one who does not understand what they are talking about.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 1:44 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:

smcj said:
Bottom of 300-top of 301.

When Dudjom speaks of the "3rd Turning" he's talking about "Great Madhyamaka", a.k.a. Shentong.

krodha wrote:
First point that has been discussed to death:

Malcolm said:
It is sort of ridiculous to term gzhan stong "great madhyamaka" since it is a term used to describe several different positions amongst Tibetan Madhyamakas i.e. gzhan stong; the early Sakya/Nyingma view of free from extremes that goes right back to Kawa Paltseg, and of course Tsongkhapa's formulation.

The Indian texts also show no consistency in how the term is used, the anonymous pramāṇavidhvaṃsanaṭippiṭakavṛtti refers to its adherents as "great madhyamaka" and rejects the so called cittamatra madhyamaka [that Bhava advocates in the passage you reference] as inferior.

In reality, in the Indian context, "great madhyamaka is a term mostly used in tantric treatises; even here however it is used in various different ways. The Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaṣaḍaṇgatantrapañjikā by Avadhutipāda states:
"The nature of the completion [stage] is said to be mahāmadhyamaka".
On other hand, the Śrī-ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭīkāvohitaṭikā by Padmavajra states:
So called "madhyamaka" is the dharma of the essence, the freedom from four extremes of the mahāmadhyamaka of the Mahāyāna and the awakening of the fortunate.
Dombi Heruka's Śrīhevajrasādhana states:
One should mediate on the great madhyamaka free from all signs.
And the Tantric Candrakiriti's Samājābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states
Having manifested the mahāmadhyamaka that is like space,
the sunlight of compassion benefits all sentient beings
The first person to use this term [Great Madhyamaka] in Tibet was Kawa Paltseg. He uses the term dbu ma chen po to refer to spros bral, freedom from extremes. His presentation of Madhyamaka bears no observable commonalities with gzhan stong.

The Sakyapas follow Kawa Paltseg's point of view, and refer to their Madhyamaka as great Madhyamaka also. The Gelugpas also refer to Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view as Great Madhyamaka.

So basically, everyone in Tibet refers to their preferred system of Madhyamaka as "great". The term “great madhyamaka” has been used by all three primary Tibetan presentations of Madhyamaka, i.e. Tsongkhapa’s presentation of prasangika, the extrinsic emptiness school of the Jonangpas and the Sakya presentation known as “freedom from proliferation” or “freedom from extremes”.

Though the term “great madhyamaka” is not frequently used in the Sakya school to refer to our own presentation of Madhyamaka, it does occasionally crop up. The basis of the Great Madhyamaka of the Sakya masters is to be found primarily in the writings of Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen who states in his Great Song of Experience:

Freedom from extremes is beyond knowledge, expressions and objects,
Madhyamaka, Cittamatra and so on,
expressions in words are proliferations…
That view of Great Madhyamaka
is bliss free of delusion because it is not a proposition.

Another such instance may be found in the works of Lowo Khenchen, Sonam Lhundrup [1456-1532] who most notable for his expansions on Sakya Pandita’s famed Clarifying the Muni’s Intent [thub pa’i dgongs pa rab tu gsal]. In the brief work ,Ornamenting the Intent of Manjushri [thub pa dgongs gsal gyi 'chad thabs 'jam dbyangs dgongs rgyan], Lowo Khenchen identifies three strains of Madhyamaka:

Out of the three in Madhyamaka, the prasangikas maintain that one gradually enters the practice of the ten stages according to the explanations in The Introduction to Madhyamaka. The svatantrika madhyamikas maintain that one enters into the practice of Mahayāna through three stages of practice as it is explained in the Blaze of Dialectics “Not abandoning bodhicitta, correctly relying on the strict conduct of a muni, the search for understanding reality is the practice that accomplishes all aims”.

For the position of the third madhyamika, as Master Nāgārjuna states:

The Dharma taught by the Buddha
uses two truths.

Having gathered all phenomena into two truths, [they] maintain practice is applied to two classes of intellectual capacity, sharp and dull, of persons who are practicing those [two truths]:

When seeking reality, first
one should teach “everything exists”;
having comprehend meanings, and lacking desire,
later, [teach] absence.

Master Āryadeva teaches:

First, reject what is not meritorious,
in the middle, reject the self,
in the end, reject all views.

As Jetsun Rinpoche writes in the Great Song of Experience:

The supreme view is without views…

generally, there is no object to see in reality,
now, also, the view is not a view.
As for me, I will just stick with the great madhyamaka enunciated by Kawa Paltseg:

Freedom of two extremes in the ultimate
is asserted as the great madhyamaka.

krodha wrote:
Second point that has also been discussed quite thoroughly:

smcj said:
Also Nagarjuna's "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" (the title in the English translation) is non-Prasangika text that shockingly is attributed to Nagarjuna.

Malcolm said:
That is because Nāgārjuna I did not write it. The author of the Dharmadhātustava is the same Nāgārjuna who wrote the Bodhicittavivarana and the Pañcakrama.

...The earliest reference we have to the Dharmadhātustava being a composition of Nāgārjuna is by Dharmamitra (9th century, disciple of Haribhadra) in his Abhisamayālaṃkārakārikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstraṭīkā prasphuṭapadā-nāma . Naropa considers it to be a composition of Nāgārjuna's, as does Atisha and Jagaddalanivāsin. However, a commentary on Hevajra Tantra, likely composed in the 12th century, cites a passage from the Dharmadhātustava, saying only that "some ārya said,"...." — this indicates to me some doubt in Indian circles as to the veracity of the source.

So while of course there is a late tradition that this text was composed by Nāgārjuna dating from the ninth century (Dharmamitra), the absence of any reference to it all in earlier Madhyamaka sources, especially Candrakīrti, indicates it cannot be accepted as part of Nāgārjuna I's oeuvre. David Ruegg has also cast doubt on its composition, wondering at the fact that significant portions of it are reproduced in Atisha's Dharmadhātudarśanagīti which is included in the rgyud section of the bstan 'gyur, but I think Atisha was just riffing on it.

Given that the fact that 10th-11th century Indians like Naropoa and Atisha accepted the Mulamadhyamaka-karikas and the Pañcakrama side by side as the work of the same Nāgārjuna, I think we can understand that they did not know how to distinguish the authentic works of Nāgārjuna I from works by later authors of the same name.

Then there is the fact that the Dharmadhātustava was not translated into Tibetan until the 11th century ((like the Bodhicittavivarana and so on) by Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and Lotsawa Tsultrim Gyalwa, and I think we can understand this text was probably composed in early ninth century by the siddha Nāgārjuna. Also, if you examine carefully, you will find only that Candra mentions four praises as being authentic, these are the Lokakīta, Nirupamya, Acintya and Paramārthastavas. This does not mean these four are in fact compositions of Nāgārjuna, merely that they are a restricted list accepted by the middle

period Madhyamikas (we can excluded the Madhyamakapradipa, because Bhavya and Bhavaviveka are different people).

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 4th, 2015 at 1:12 AM
Title: Re: Mipham was not gzhan stong
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Nope. What characterizes a gzhan strong pa is the literal acceptance of the empty of other teachings, all other shentong views are supportive and secondary to the Empty of other teachings.

krodha wrote:
So-called "empty of other" simply means that buddha-qualities are not negated... and nothing more.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
"This Dharmata IS the Tatahagata"

No the quotation I cited is saying the Dharmata IS the Tatgagata.....literally word for word.

krodha wrote:
Yes, if you are going to take a literal-minded stance on the excerpt, which you are known to do quite religiously.

The tathāgata is compared to dharmatā in this context in order to convey that a Buddha is completely unconditioned and free of all defilement, the nature of the tathāgata is precisely what is entailed by the concept of "dharmatā". And so one should view the tathāgata as completely unconditioned. As Malcolm pointed out just recently, the tathāgata is technically dharmakāya and should be seen as such:

[Per Malcolm] The Ārya-aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā Sūtra states:

Those who are attached to the tathāgata as a form or a name are childish and have corrupted discerning wisdom... the tathāgatas are not to be seen as the rūpakāya; the tathāgatās are to be seen as the dharmakāya.

The statement: tathāgata is dharmatā and the advice given directly above that one should view the tathāgata as dharmakāya, should be understood to have the same import.

Son of Buddha said:
Everything you just said is made up.

krodha wrote:
Are you saying that the fact that buddha-qualities and afflicted qualities have the same essence is something I, myself, have fabricated? I don't think so.

Or are you stating that defilements are not adventitious? I recall that you, yourself just wrote above that defilements are "adventurous", whether that was a typo or not I have no idea but you certainly meant to state that defilements are "adventitious", why you would charge me with fabricating such a notion in the wake of your own proclamation to that end I have no idea.

Son of Buddha said:
Of course I guess if someone told you SOB IS half Asian..... You would come to the conclusion that his statement is merely comparing the Asian and the Half in order to convey similarities.....of course OBVIOUSLY saying SOB is half Asian doesn't mean SOB IS half Asian.

krodha wrote:
This makes absolutely no sense. You will have to unpack your example here further.

Son of Buddha said:
Just like saying the Dharmata is the Tathagata doesn't mean the Dharmata IS the Tathagata.....gotta love your logic on these topics.

krodha wrote:
The nature of the tathāgata is the nature of dharmatā, but the tathāgata is not literally "dharmatā". For one, dharmatā is not even real, it is a conventional designation that is implemented in order to communicate that conditioned dharmins are in fact non-arisen and unconditioned, so we state provisionally that they have a "dharmatā". Once one experientially recognizes that dharmatā it isn't as if there is some "thing" called "dharmatā" that remains and hangs around... recognizing "dharmatā" simply means one cognizes the lack of arising in conditioned entities. Dharmatā is simply what is recognized when there is a cessation of cause for the arising of the ignorance that misconceives of conditioned entities. Much like Longchenpa communicates when describing the dharmatā of mind:

Mind itself [tib. sems nyid, skt. cittatā or citta dharmatā]... has no substance or characteristics. Since it is empty yet lucid and free of elaboration, it cannot be conceived of as 'this' or 'that'. Although it can be illustrated by a metaphor - 'It is like space' - if one reflects on space as the metaphor, it proves to have no color, no shape, or anything about it that is identifiable. Therefore, if the metaphor being used does not refer to some 'thing', then the underlying meaning that it illustrates - mind itself, pure by nature - is not something that has ever existed in the slightest.

Son of Buddha said:
Sorry I have no more time for your blatent denial of what is literally written.

krodha wrote:
Things that are written are "literal" by definition... what we are concerned with is how said literature is interpreted and processed after it is read. In your case, you interpret these texts "literally", which means you simply take them at face-value without taking any other context into consideration. And this causes issues.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Oh oh had to add this

Awakening of faith in Mahayana text

it should be understood that the Tathagata-garbha, from the beginning, contains only pure excellent qualities which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, are not independent of, severed from, or different from Suchness; that the soiled states of defilement which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, are not independent of, severed from, or different from Suchness

krodha wrote:
This is simply stating that buddha-qualities and afflicted qualities have the same essence, i.e. emptiness.

Son of Buddha said:
that the soiled states of defilement which, outnumbering the sands of the Ganges, merely exist in illusion; are, from the beginning, nonexistent; and from the beginningless beginning have never been united with the Tathagata-garbha.

krodha wrote:
This is merely stating that defilements are adventitious.

Son of Buddha said:
It has never happened that the Tathagata-garbha contained deluded states in its essence and that it induced itself to realize Suchness in order to extinguish forever its deluded states.

krodha wrote:
Again this is simply saying that delusion and affliction are adventitious.

The fact that one's nature is originally pure and naturally perfected is not in question, and is really not what we are discussing here.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
asunthatneversets,.....

Sigh your just further supporting what I have been saying all along.....

krodha wrote:
I'm really not, because I don't think you understand these principles as well as you believe you do, in fact I think you misinterpret them altogether... but you're welcome to believe whatever you like.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
So no, dharmatā is not the "fully realized tathāgata". The two terms are completely different principles.

All sentient beings have an unconditioned nature [dharmatā], however only tathāgatas have a complete and unobscured knowledge (or wisdom) of dharmatā.

Son of Buddha said:
You sure about that?Nirvana Sutra chapter 8

This “Dharmata” is the Tathagata. Hence, the Tathagata is Eternal and Unchanging. Any person who says that the Tathagata is non-eternal does not know “Dharmata”. Such a person is not one to base oneself upon. All the four persons mentioned above appear in the world, protect, realise and become a refuge [for all beings]. Why? Because they thoroughly understand the deepest points of what the Tathagata says and know that the Tathagata is Eternal and Unchanging. It is not good to say that the Tathagata is non-eternal and that he changes.

krodha wrote:
Yes, very sure. This quotation you have cited is merely comparing the tathāgata to dharmatā in order to convey that the tathāgata is unconditioned, unchanging etc.

Son of Buddha said:
“The four persons, when they are such, are the Tathagata. Why? Because such well understand and speak about the undisclosed words of the Tathagata. One who well understands what is deeply hidden and knows that the Tathagata is Eternal and

Unchanging will never, for profit, say that the Tathagata is non-eternal. Such a person is one to base oneself upon – why not on those four persons?

krodha wrote:
This is saying the same; the tathāgata is unconditioned.

Son of Buddha said:
“Basing oneself upon Dharma means basing oneself upon “Dharmata”; not basing oneself on man refers to the sravaka. “Dharmata” is the Tathagata, and the sravaka is the created. The Tathagata is Eternal, but the sravaka is non-eternal.

krodha wrote:
Again, this is merely comparing the tathāgata to dharmatā in order to demonstrate that the tathāgata is not the śrāvaka. These are common polemical assertions that are employed in Mahāyāna texts in order to delineate the differences between Mahāyāna and the Śrāvakayāna.

Son of Buddha said:
“O good man! A man might violate the precepts and, for gain, say that the Tathagata is non-eternal and that he changes. Such a person is not one to take refuge in. O good man! This is a definite rule.

krodha wrote:
This quote does not apply to the topic we are discussing, but it does run with the general theme of the others you cited in that it is making a point to state that the tathāgata is unconditioned.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 5:07 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Enlightenment/Dharmakaya is the same thing as the Buddha Nature..... I proved that in my last post to you.

asunthatneversets said:
Dharmakāya is the same as tathāgatagarbha in the sense that an oak tree and an acorn are the same thing... but at the same time an acorn is not an oak tree, it simply holds the latent possibility for an oak tree that must be ripened through fertile causes and conditions.

The same principle applies to the tathāgatagarbha, hence the iconic metaphor applied to tathāgatagarbha of the butter that is latent within milk.

Son of Buddha said:
Nope the Buddha Nature is just a WORD/TERM that is used to describe the state of Full

Enlightenment(Dharmakaya) when it is obscured by adventurous defilements. Simple as that.

krodha wrote:
And so you reiterate my point: tathāgatagarbha is to dharmakāya as an acorn is to an oak tree. The two are the same in essence, but are different in nature.

The tathāgatagarbha only becomes "dharmakāya" when it is fully ripened by way of removing adventitious defilements, otherwise sentient beings would be fully awakened Buddhas. This is why the Hevajra Tantra states:

Ordinary beings are truly buddhas, but this fact is obscured by adventitious distortions, once these are removed, truly there is buddhahood.

Son of Buddha said:
Queen Srimala Sutra] 8-9. The Dharmakaya and the Meaning of Void-ness
"Lord, the cessation of suffering is not the destruction of Dharma. Why so? Because the Dharmakaya of the Tathágata is named 'cessation of suffering,' and it is beginning-less, un-create, unborn, undying, free from death; permanent, steadfast, calm, eternal; intrinsically pure, free from all the defilement-store; and accompanied by Buddha natures more numerous than the sands of the Ganges, which are non-discrete, knowing as liberated, and inconceivable. This Dharmakaya of the Tathágata when not free from the store of defilement is referred to as the Tathágata-garbha.

krodha wrote:
This is simply a different translation of the same exact quote you cited above which states unequivocally that dharmakāya is the omniscience of a Buddha, and that all sentient beings possess a latent potentiality for said omniscience.

Son of Buddha said:
Awakening of faith in Mahayana
B. The Greatness of the Attributes of Suchness

From the beginning, Suchness in its nature is fully provided with all excellent qualities; namely, it is endowed with the light of great wisdom, the qualities of illuminating the entire universe, of true cognition and mind pure in its self-nature; of eternity, bliss, Self, and purity; of refreshing coolness, immutability, and freedom. It is endowed with these excellent qualities which outnumber the sands of the Ganges, which are not independent of, disjointed from, or different from the essence of Suchness, and which are suprarational attributes of Buddhahood. Since it is endowed completely with all these, and is not lacking anything, it is called the Tathagata-garbha when latent and also the Dharmakaya of the Tathagata.

krodha wrote:
This states the same; all sentient beings possess a latent potential for omniscience because one's nature is innately perfected yet completely obscured in the case of a

sentient being. Ergo, omniscience is a latent potentiality, much like butter is a latent potentiality within milk.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Are you trying to claim the Dharmata is NOT the fully realised Tathagata?

krodha wrote:
"Dharmatā" is the nature of a given dharma, specifically that a given conditioned dharmin is in truth unconditioned and non-arisen. So when you see the term "dharmatā" it should be considered indicative of the unconditioned nature of a given phenomena, i.e. its emptiness.

When we fail to recognize the dharmatā of dharmas we become deluded and perceive conditioned entities. As that conditioning proliferates and builds up that delusion becomes fortified and this propels cyclic existence as sentient beings. A tathāga is one who has removed all traces of delusion and conditioning, and thus possesses a complete and unobstructed knowledge of dharmatā, that omniscience is called "dharmakāya".

So no, dharmatā is not the "fully realized tathāgata". The two terms are completely different principles.

All sentient beings have an unconditioned nature [dharmatā], however only tathāgatas have a complete and unobscured knowledge (or wisdom) of dharmatā.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Out of context.....really well by all means I gave you the Sutra name, the chapter and not just one sentence but an entire paragraph.....so by all means quote the rest of the "context" that supports your position.....cricket....cricket.

krodha wrote:
You'll have to spell out what you believe the quotation is supporting. Because it certainly says nothing about how bodhi relates to any of this.

All the quotation describes is the omniscience of a Buddha at the time of the result, and then states that all sentient beings possess this potential within them.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Enlightenment/Dharmakaya is the same thing as the Buddha Nature..... I proved that in my last post to you.

krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is the same as tathāgatagarbha in the sense that an oak tree and an acorn are the same thing... but at the same time an acorn is not an oak tree, it simply holds the latent possibility for an oak tree that must be ripened through fertile causes and conditions.

The same principle applies to the tathāgatagarbha, hence the iconic metaphor applied to tathāgatagarbha of the butter that is latent within milk.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
At what point dies the beginingless unborn Enlightenment arises due to causes and conditions?

Queen Srimala Sutra Chapter 8: The Dharmakaya V96. O' Bhagavan, the extinction of suffering is not the destruction of the Dharma. Why so? Because the 'extinction of suffering' is known as the Dharmakaya of the World Honored One, which is beginningless, uncreated, unborn, undying, free from destruction, permanent unchanging, eternal, inherently pure, and separate from all the stores of defilement. The Dharmakaya is also not different from the inconceivable Buddha Natures which are more numerous than the sands of the river Ganges. The Dharmakaya of the World Honored One is called the Buddha Nature when it is obscured by the stores of defilement."

krodha wrote:
As we've discussed before: your nature is not "bodhi". Bodhi is awakening to your nature. Your nature does not arise due to causes and conditions because it does not arise at all... but the wisdom that knows said nature does arise due to causes and conditions... otherwise you'd be a fully awakened Buddha from the very beginning.

Your quote is out of context because it concerns dharmakāya, which is the result as the omniscience of a Buddha.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 4:00 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
smcj said:
I've been accused of the same thing, and I'm not sure that there isn't some seed of truth to it--although of course I'd like to think otherwise. The problem comes from what, if anything, the Buddha Nature is presented as. Saying that it is anything at all is a slippery slope that ends up like Advaita Vedanta, and much time and effort is made to keep things from going there. I'm ok with much of it, as long as it is understood to be absent of the "adventitious defilements", which is basically what we know of mundane life.

krodha wrote:
Yes there are different interpretations of tathāgatagarbha, the more literal minded tend to err towards non-Buddhist views. Such interpretations are deemed "provisional" or "worldly".

smcj said:
The Buddha Nature teachings say that "enlightenment" is not due to causes and conditions. It's a different take on things, hence all the "sudden enlightenment" traditions and teachings. How it differs from dharmata is subject to much discussion.

krodha wrote:
They state that your nature is uncaused, that nature is tathāgatagarbha. "Bodhi" [enlightenment] is something different. Bodhi is awakening to that uncaused nature, and that event of awakening does have a cause, otherwise people would be innately awakened, which is not the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 3:54 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
You just put down a direct quote from the Nirvana Sutra and proved my entire point to begin with

krodha wrote:
What I'm saying is apparently going over your head, but that is alright.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
Self governing is in reference to not being impermenant but having full control from the Enligtenened state
Which is to say Enlightenment is not governed by various causes and conditions, it is not created by samsaric influences nor is is swayed or governed by samsaric adventurous defilement hence it is self governing which cannot be removed,destroyed, controlled....ect.

krodha wrote:
Here you are confusing "enlightenment" [bodhi] which does arise due to causes and conditions, with dharmatā, which does not arise due to causes and conditions.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 3:34 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Its actually not my writing, what I wrote up above is a direct quote from the Nirvana Sutra..... I left out the fact that is was a direct quote from the Sutra to show ASNS that he is not actually complaining about my views but has actually been complaint about what is taught in the Sutras themselves.

krodha wrote:
The issue is that you misinterpret the rhetorical devices that are employed in texts such as the Mahāyāna-mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra as being literal descriptions of some sort of existent ātman.

So it makes zero difference whether it is "your writing" or not. The text itself does not communicate what you believe it does (or are suggesting it does by citing it), and that means we are dealing with your own misinterpretations, and not the "text itself".

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 3:26 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Yep you just proved my point to begin with. You see that wasn't actually my view, what I wrote was actually a direct quotation of the Nirvana Sutra chapter 3 (and can also be found found in the queen srimala sutra)...like I said before your not complaining about my views your complaining about the views/quotes from the Sutras themselves and you just PROVED IT right now when you complained about that direct quote from the Nirvana Sutra.

(The noumena part I added comes from Dolpopas view)

krodha wrote:
Why you're pretending like you're not some straight up eternalist ātmavādin I have no idea. Every quote you cite communicates your views. You misinterpret tathāgatagarbha as promoting a non-Buddhist self... and have for years.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
And again I don't present you my views, I simply quote the sutras and let them speak for themselves so you have no point whatsoever.

krodha wrote:
Acting like this is the first time we've ever interacted does not make it so.

Son of Buddha said:
Since your so keen on wanting to complain about my views which I have not provided you then here is "my views on the Self"

the Atman is true, real , eternal , sovereign/ autonomous/ self-governing , and whose ground/ foundation is unchanging , The Noumena..... Here complain away. (At least you actually have something to complain about now)

krodha wrote:
My case in point that your views are no different than the tīrthikas evoked in your quotation above.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Really last time I checked I didnt give you my view, I simply quoted and requoted the views of Dolpopa and Ju Mipham's, so if your disagreeing with anything its their views not mine.

krodha wrote:
You and I discuss your view(s) quite regularly... although in that setting you know me as krodha.

Son of Buddha said:
Likewise I have "No views" seeing as I simply only quote the views of the sutras themselves

krodha wrote:
Yet you have views. Cherry picking quotations to match your biases is one way said views are demonstrated, and the context you present those quotes in also communicates your views... for you often take quotations out of context and attribute meaning to them that is inaccurate.

Son of Buddha said:
So if you have a problem with the Sutra quotes, then again you don't have a problem with my views you have a problem with the commentary and sutra quotes themselves.

krodha wrote:
I have no issue with the sūtra quotes. They do not mean what you think they mean... ergo your views are the issue.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 3rd, 2015 at 1:42 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Yep in Tathagatagarbha Sutras and commentaries the True Self of the Buddhists was differentiated from the The two selves of the forders(self of phenoneman and persons).

krodha wrote:
It is different when understood properly, but you do not understand it properly, your view is no different than the tīrthikas you speak of.

Also, there is no "true self"... the only person who takes liberty with that term in the context of the tathāgatagarbha sūtras is Tony Page, who is clearly biased due to being an eternalist, like you.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 10:31 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Will said:
Shut Reigle down with sneers, indifference & contempt - yep - this is the academic way.

krodha wrote:
Reigle hasn't put forth anything to be shut down as of yet. The OP consists of (i) an announcement that this text is available, (ii) a quote from the preface, (iii) a bit of background on why the text was authored, (iv) and a call for people to stay open-minded about the topic. This can hardly be called "academic".

If Reigle or anyone else desires an academic discussion they should put forth a statement or argument from the book in support of X view, so that others can chime in

and discuss... this has not happened thus far, ergo, no academic discussion has occurred.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 10:18 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
Kamaleswar Bhattacharya said:
“The one request I would make of such eminent scholars as have devoted their lives to the study of Buddhism is that they adopt a genuinely Buddhist attitude and read this book before saying, ‘That is impossible.’”

dzogchungpa said:
Good luck with that.
See what I mean?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:32 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Well, that's quite an impressive mouthful, but you seem to lack the necessary prerequisites for comprehending that this is the Academic Discussion subforum.

krodha wrote:
Like speaking and reading English?

dzogchungpa said:
Why don't you just follow the discussion, maybe you'll learn something? Then again, maybe not.

krodha wrote:
I'm open to learning anything, but as for being convinced that Śākyamuni was promulgating an eternalist doctrine that posits the existence of an ātman and/or Brahman... I've witnessed many try to make successful arguments to that end, but have not encountered any compelling or substantial evidence/proof as of yet. It simply isn't in the cards.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 9:00 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
You wouldn't happen to be an Indologist, would you?

krodha wrote:
If being an Indologist was a necessary prerequisite for comprehending (either inferentially or directly) that an ātman beyond the pale of conventionality is an impossibility, then we'd all be screwed.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 8:43 AM
Title: Re: The Ātman-Brahman in Ancient Buddhism
Content:
David Reigle said:
“I have but one answer which I have tried to formulate in various ways in this book, on the basis, invariably, of a study of the Pāli canon and of the Nikāyas in particular, that is: the Buddha does not deny the Upaniṣadic ātman; on the contrary, he indirectly affirms it, in denying that which is falsely believed to be the ātman.”

krodha wrote:
A conclusion of this nature requires quite a bit of extrapolation and conjecture, there really is no evidence that Śākyamuni affirmed the Upanisadic ātman via negation. In fact the Pali Canon states in no uncertain terms that "right view" is a freedom from extremes.

The buddhadharma is not apophatic theology.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 7:22 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
All I have is my mom & siblings and after I finish paying off this house for my mom, I'm more than likely going to do solitary retreat for a while. I hate going to school and working this job because it distracts me and reading those quotes just frustrated me more because I'm not doing what i know I should be which is practice all the damn time.

krodha wrote:
It's good to spend some time learning/studying, receiving teachings and attending to worldly life prior to going for extended retreat. You'll feel better too when that time comes because you'll have everything in order. You don't want to carry the burden of outstanding responsibilities that are hanging over your head into retreat.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Longchenpa has indeed repeatedly that all these practices shall be construed as to do a retreat in solitude. For him, the practice of " the world " is a practice for beginners , who are unable to renounce the world itself. The isolation facilitates the dissipation of distraction which is the main trap into which fall those who think they can integrate their "experience" of the natural state in their daily activities.

Rise in Primordial Longchenpa said so clearly: "Preserve your samaya and commitments, remain isolated in solitude and abandon the distractions and occupations [worldly] (dam dang tshig sdom pa bsrung zhing gcig pure DBEN by ' dug rnam g . yeng dang ' the ' dzi spangs shing...).

In its conclusion the same text, he adds: "Practice carefully to practice in solitude"
(DBEN by Nyams len ' bungs)

mutsuk said:
Hi, this does not really sound like JL's phrasing, right ? Who is it from ? Or is this the result of babelfish translating ?

krodha wrote:
Yeah, could be from google translate. I know I plugged a few of his forum entries (written in French) into G.T. out of interest and ended up saving them, so perhaps it is one of those.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 1st, 2015 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
How does this hardcore practice fit in with the modern world, especially solitary retreat? Just curious.

krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc Achard said recently:

I constantly see or read from people who think they practice Dzogchen while they are practicing something which has strictly nothing to do with Dzogchen, in particular those practicing in daily working life. Khenpo Jigphün used to say : "Dzogchen is retreat and retreat and retreat. Practicing outside of retreat is not Dzogchen, it is leisure or vacations." Lopön [Tenzin Namdak] used to have practically the same wording in some of his private advice.

and,

The real core of Dzogchen is not integration of the natural state into daily life (you don't

get this in any text), the core is Thogel practice (on a Trekcho basis) and Thogel is only meaningful in retreats. People who still go on with their projections about Thogel in the daily life are just wasting their time... So to make things clear again, and all this without rage or cultist approach, what we are interested here are Bon and New Bon teachings in their traditional context. This does not mean that you have to live like a tibetan with yacks and eat butter at every meal. This means that you understand the necessity to both learn/study and practice and that correct practice is to be done in retreats. In daily life one can do one's ngöndro, four kinds of offerings, Yidam practice and some tsalung. The rest of the dzogchen teachings can only be performed during retreats.

and,

Longchenpa has indeed repeatedly that all these practices shall be construed as to do a retreat in solitude. For him, the practice of " the world " is a practice for beginners , who are unable to renounce the world itself. The isolation facilitates the dissipation of distraction which is the main trap into which fall those who think they can integrate their "experience" of the natural state in their daily activities.

Rise in Primordial Longchenpa said so clearly: "Preserve your samaya and commitments, remain isolated in solitude and abandon the distractions and occupations [worldly] (dam dang tshig sdom pa bsrung zhing gcig pure DBEN by ' dug rnam g . yeng dang ' the ' dzi spangs shing...).

In its conclusion the same text, he adds: "Practice carefully to practice in solitude"
(DBEN by Nyams len ' bungs)

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World
Content:
conebeckham said:
The four of us....and who went for coffee without me?

krodha wrote:
Crazywisdom and I quite a few times, you're more than welcome to join!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 11:32 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra in the Modern World
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
I have a fantastic new thingy I'll call it "Vajrayana." It will have four initiations, deities to visualize, mantras and yoga methods according to a text that lays out the path clearly. I'll call it a "tantra". We will inhabit a magical land called The West Coast with snow

mountains, lotus lakes and beautiful dakini like women everywhere. It will be so awesome!!! Who's a joiner?

dzogchungpa said:
I'm in. Where is this "West Coast" of which you speak?

krodha wrote:
The same west coast where all three of us live... except one of us won't get coffee with the other two.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 12:43 PM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Just out of curiosity, do you know anything about Kamaleswar Bhattacharya?

krodha wrote:
I know I have a first edition of his Vigrahavyāvartānī translation. But all in all I don't have to know anything about Kamaleswar Bhattacharya to know that one is reaching significantly when they veer down the road of arguing for an ātman (of whatever stripe) in Buddhism.

A topic like this really coincides quite well with what Malcolm mentioned earlier today about scrutinizing information that is presented by so-and-so scholar or teacher. These individuals are of course entitled to their opinions, but at the end of the day if their views are not in harmony with buddhavacana then there is no reason to accept it as valid.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 29th, 2015 at 11:52 AM
Title: Re: Universal Atman in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
A universal ātman in the context of the buddhadharma is an absurd and unfounded notion.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Did the 84 mahasiddhas practice Ngöndro?
Content:
Gyurme Kundrol said:
I try to convince myself to do Ngondro but whenever I do I find six reasons to remain where I am and not add anything to what I'm doing.

I wish to do prostrations
Then remember that visualizing Buddhas
And doing prostrations are pointless
Since everywhere I go I see Buddhas and Bodhisattvas
In a pure land helping me to integrate my enlightened awareness with all phenomena.

I wish to cultivate Bodhicitta
Then remember that its pointless
Because the ultimate nature of reality itself is completely selfless and without contrivance
And by doing nothing but remaining in that, ultimate benefit is brought to all
And compassionate activity is natural, automatic, spontaneous and as perfect as it could be
So no amount of imagining or cultivating can add anything to it
Since the movementmovement of body, speech and mind becomes the expression of ultimate Bodhicitta.

I wish to purify with Vajrasattva
Then remember that my enlightened nature is Vajrasattva already
Since the nature of mind is already pure and all phenomena are already included in that nature
There is nothing to purify, nobody who Could do the purification
And even if there was whatever might be purified is pure from the beginning
So such an activity leads nowhere.

I wish to offer the mandala of the whole universe
Then remember that visualizing all things as being given to the Buddhas of the ten directions is pointless
Because throughout the ten directions all things whatsoever are already included in the Buddha Nature
Therefore there is nothing new I could offer since all things are already offered.

I wish to do Guru Yoga in order to realize my minds nature
Then see that its a waste of effort
My enlightened nature is already identical with the enlightened nature of all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of all times
Furthermore since there is no difference between meditation and post meditation
There is no new state to achieve or create and no transition between those experiences
And finally since the four empowerments simply bring to fruition this very realization itself
There is no need to take more empowerments in order to attain whats already inherently and naturally present.

I wish to perform powa to go to Amithabhas pure land
Then see there is nowhere to go
Because the transitional state between living and dying is just one of many transitional states or bardos

Which amounts to nothing more than the modification of the array of inconceivable phenomena
Arising as empty appearances to ones own enlightened nature
Since that nature is unchanging and all pervasive
All things are already a pure land so there is nowhere else to go
in order to attain such a perception or state.

Since Buddha Nature is timeless
There is no time in which to start Ngondro
Since the three times are without self nature
There is no way to count even 1 of anything
Since beginnings and ends are conceptual designations
All concepts related to starting or finishing are delusion
Since all phenomena whatsoever are included in Buddha Nature
Even signs of accomplishment are empty displays

Since things are like this
Doing one prostration Ive done an infinite number
Cultivating one moment of Bodhicitta supreme benefit is brought to all
Saying simply "Hum" I am Vajrasattva himself
All things being encompassed in the ultimate nature
Everything is automatically offered as the supreme mandala
And doing a single moment of Guru Yoga I am awakened from the beginning

When I tell myself that since its like this
I may as well do Ngondro because it cant hurt me
I realize that because its like this
I may as well not worry about making new habits
Since things are already perfect as they are
There is really no need to change anything

Then I tell myself that in order to bring beings onto the proper path
I should show them the gradual methods that will help them with liberation
But since those methods never create enlightened awareness itself
I feel that I would be lying to them
And showing them a path I haven't walked like a hypocrite

Then I tell myself that I should do it anyways
Lie to bring them benefit, be a hypocrite for their sake
Yet then I realize that they are lazy, tired, and have no energy
And since they are lacking even Bodhicitta, the very foundation of supreme attainment
Showing them a path that requires so much effort would discourage them from Dharma
So keeping it simple, I emphasize a positive intention and mindfulness above everything else

Finally I worry that the demon of pride has reared its head
Completely taken over my spiritual path

And totally acquired all my energies for its own use
That I am completely insane and delusional
And instead of bringing Dharma to beings
I am hurling them into the depths of Samsara
Then I remember vajra pride and the all accomplishing nature
And see that even ordinary pride is included in the ultimate nature
That even insanity and delusion are nothing but its ineffable display
So without any worries I just maintain my madness

In the end I cant find any reason to do Ngondro
Nor can I find any reason to avoid it
Without any need to do or not do
Without worrying about how or when or why I can bring benefit to beings
I just follow my Gurus instruction to remain in minds true nature
And refrain from adding anything extra onto that perfection

If this can be realized, really what use is Ngondro? If our suffering and delusions dont decrease, we need to do something, why not Ngondro? If our compassion is not increasing, we need to be worried and examine our mind and intention, and purify it in some way, so why not Ngondro? These are the only signs of success or failure in Dharma, everything else is adding onto this. Even having a vision of receiving empowerment from every Buddha and Bodhisattva in the ten directions is useless if having such an experience doesnt result in greater compassion, clarity, wisdom, and so forth. Even the appearance of miraculous objects is nothing but the manifestation of demons if we don't see it as innately inseparable from minds ultimate nature, if it becomes the basis of clinging and attachment. On the other hand if all things are viewed as a pure land, there is no need to modify anything or change any phenomena whatsoever, and good or bad experiences all arise as Samarasa and never leave our innately enlightened, naturally arising awareness. Finally sometimes Ngondro itself can be an obstacle when we grasp after it in order to simply reach a certain number, or with motivations like wanting other Sangha members respect, or respect from Gurus, where we think we are special for having done it, or that those who havent done it are inferior as practitioners. These are all wrong motivations that turn Ngondro into poison rather than medicine. Finally, if we are doing it in order to acquire higher teachings we might as well just lie to our Guru about doing it because we are already lying to ourselves in thinking that there are higher teachings to acquire, and if we had that karma we would get those teachings regardless so we need not worry or even try to modify anything, but just keep our intention towards supreme enlightenment as pure as possible. Not only is the whole path found in Ngondro up to Buddhahood itself, but the ultimate nature encompasses all things and all phenomena are the basis of its practice both in the presence and absence of a person doing Ngondro.

krodha wrote:
This is acceptable advice for advanced practitioners and/or those of high capacity... but it really isn't good advice for the average practitioner of low to moderate capacity... sentiments of this nature would be little more than nihilism in their case.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: NATURE AND THE NATURAL STATE
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek asunthatneversets,

I just see here in the Namkha Truldzo that instead of Thatagata garbha we use Dharmakaya which encompasses all.
This is in Bon Tradition called : Bon sku = Dharmakaya.

krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha is a term used to convey latent and obscured dharmakāya in sentient beings. Just like the basis [gzhi] is one's nature that has not yet been recognized, once recognized the basis becomes the path [lam] and when all afflictive obscurations are dispelled, the path becomes the result [bras 'bu]. In the same way, the tathāgatagarbha is just our latent potential for omniscience, once we recognize tathāgatagarbha and completely uproot afflictive obscurations, then we actualize omniscient buddhahood as the result, which is dharmakāya.

So Bön has tathāgatagarbha too... it is just called "the basis" [gzhi]. The difference between tathāgatagarbha and dharmakāya can be explained in terms of the basis, path and result in Dzogchen, because these terms are describing the same process and principles, for instance Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche states:

To free the basis from what obscures it, we have to train. Right now, we are on the path and have not yet attained the result. When we are freed from obscuration, then the result - dharmakāya - appears... In fact, there is no difference whatsoever between the basis and result. In the state of the basis the enlightened qualities are not acknowledged, but they are manifest at the time of the result. These are not new qualities that suddenly appear, but are like the qualities of a flower that are inherent in the seed. Within the seed are the characteristics of the flower itself. The seed holds the potential for the flower's color, smell, bud and leaves. However, can we say that the seed is the result of the flower? No, we cannot, because the flower has not fully bloomed. Like this analogy, the qualities of the result are contained in the state of the basis; yet, they are not evident or manifest. That is the difference between the basis and the result. At the time of the path, if we do not apply effort, the result will not appear.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 19th, 2015 at 8:43 AM
Title: Re: NATURE AND THE NATURAL STATE
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Thanks for your replies. There is no self or somebody who thinks in Dzogchen

"meditation".

krodha wrote:
Right, because Dzogchen meditation proper is resting in a direct, experiential knowledge of dharmatā. And that means that the non-arising of the mind (that the so-called "self" is subsequently imputed onto) is directly cognized.

However in truth there's never been a "self" at any time, all that is ever occurring in this dance between ignorance and wisdom is the arising or cessation of afflictive causes and conditions. A "self" is something secondary that is imputed onto these afflictive causes and conditions after the fact, but the so-called self is never real, and never truly arises or ceases. This is why Samantabhadra clarifies that in Dzogpachenpo, there is only ever one basis, two paths and two results - and this is because Dzogchen is only concerned with the recognition and non-recognition of a certain principle (the basis), and the respective results that ensue from said recognition or non-recognition.

If we fail to recognize dharmatā we become caught up in ignorance [ma rig pa], and through exteriorizing and grasping at our own appearances [rang snang] we then reify them as objective phenomena. With the arising of what is misperceived as apparently objective, a subjective mind appears to form (because the act of grasping implies objects that are "grasped" and a subjective "grasper"). In this sense it is merely the presence of ignorance that acts as a cause for the arising of a subjective point of reference we call "mind" [sems] that is mistaken as a substantial entity. The so-called "self" is then simply imputed onto that seemingly subjective point of reference that is maintained by the continual habit of grasping.

And so when we cut through that ignorance and recognize the nature of (said) mind [sems nyid], the ignorance which previously acted as a catalyst for the arising of the entire charade, collapses... removing the misconception (and mistaken perception) of a substantial entity with it, thus removing the compelling feeling of being a "self". No 'self' is actually ever removed though, all that is undone is the ignorance that mistook "clarity" i.e. cognizance, as being a substantial reference point i.e., an abiding background substratum. Hence; the nature of mind's definition as non-dual clarity and emptiness.

Yet even that being the case; we would still say that kalden yungdrung recognizes the nature of his mind and "kalden yungdrung" is therefore a useful nominal title. So a conventional self is still accepted.

kalden yungdrung said:
This self is easily scrutinized because it is illusion.

krodha wrote:
Sure it is easily scrutinized, but actually experientially cognizing its emptiness, or its nature is a different story.

kalden yungdrung said:

In the NS there is no self but only self awareness which is causeless.

krodha wrote:
There is rig pa - which is expressed as wisdom [ye shes] when it directly knows the natural state [gnas lugs], but your rigpa is not mine and vice versa. And in that way we still conventionally impute a "self" onto those processes, even if said self is ultimately unreal.

kalden yungdrung said:
But this self awareness is connected to the self emanating visions which are not visible like a movie for everybody

krodha wrote:
Right, those visions are visible to those who have become acquainted with one of the practices that work with the subtle expressions of lhun grub.

kalden yungdrung said:
like is seen by so many different eyes on the "same" way.

krodha wrote:
Right, different people see the same type of display because as humans endowed with a mind, our minds - though different - all function the same in a fundamental sense.

kalden yungdrung said:
This does mean the NS is different experienced because the Sugata-garbha is different?

krodha wrote:
The sugatagarbha is the same from person to person, like the nature of heat is the same from fire to fire, but the heat of one fire is not the heat of another fire, and the sugatagarbha of one individual is not the sugatagarbha of another individual.

And as I"m sure you know because our teachers have said, we will have different experiences related to our respective natures because we have slightly different constitutions in our body, speech and mind. For instance, we may have different elements that are more dominant in our respective conditions that will affect our experience in many ways, even in the visionary sense pertaining to what we cognize through the aforementioned practices that work with lhun grub.

kalden yungdrung said:
The Tathagata-garbha is endless encompassing this all?

krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha becomes sugatagarbha in Vajrayāna and Dzogchen, it is essentially the same principle but sugatagarbha is a bit more nuanced. According to Malcolm; (in the context of Dzogchen) the sugatagarbha is the rgyu thig le which is synonymous with the anahata bindu or mi shigs thig le in the heart, it is composed of consciousness, the five elemental vāyus and the material from one's father and mother and is the basis of

the visions.

kalden yungdrung said:
Maybe i could make use of macro and micro cosmos ? Only as an understanding for Sugata garbha and Tathagata garbha? Only meant here as example.

krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha and sugatagarbha are synonymous I believe (someone correct me if I'm mistaken), the principle of tathāgatagarbha in sutra texts is just elaborated upon and re-named "sugatagarbha" in the context of tantra.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 19th, 2015 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: NATURE AND THE NATURAL STATE
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek A,

Thanks for your contribution to this difficult to understand topic.

Ok Ngas lugs is also the word i know for the Natural State or NS.
NS is " experienced " by a certain Mind with identity.
Visions experienced by me in the NS, are never seen by somebody else
I know there is no self identity in the NS
But if i would become a Buddha , this Buddha is not another Buddha.
So there must be a certain entity which is always the foundation of a Buddha

krodha wrote:
The "certain entity" is a conventional mind or conventional individual.

kalden yungdrung said:
Now we get Nature
Everything comes out of Nature, stays and disappears (self released / liberated) into the Nature or Emptiness which is clearness, rays, sounds.

I guess , when i am right " I " never can become Nature.
If that would be the case then Nature would be have a begin and end.

So is the experience of the NS an "individual" case based upon Tathagatagarba or Sugatagarbha or a combination?

krodha wrote:
The sugatagarbha is the basis residing in the heart of sentient beings. That 'basis' is one's nature that has not been recognized yet. If a sentient being recognizes said basis then they rest in the 'natural state'.

kalden yungdrung said:
I know there is no self based on an ego but there is a "self" which does experience the visions of the Natural State.

And that so called self entity is NOT Nature if i am right but a " part" of the Nature ?

krodha wrote:
A 'self' is conventionally delineated for the purpose of communication, but it is just a nominal inference. Which means the concept or idea of a 'self entity' can be used effectively in everyday situations, but if that 'self entity' is keenly scrutinized, it will not withstand said scrutiny (as it cannot actually be found when sought). Like Śāntarakṣita states; a convention is "something can be tacitly accepted as long as it is not critically investigated, that is characterized by arising and decay, and that has causal effectivity." And that principle applies to Dzogpachenpo as well. Both the nature and the self are conventions, but they are both useful and carry different meanings. The 'nature' is the three wisdoms as the basis of the conventional individual/mind i.e., the dharmatā of the dharmin that is the individual.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 18th, 2015 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: NATURE AND THE NATURAL STATE
Content:
tingdzin said:
"Natural state" is often used to translate the Tibetan "sems nyid", which could also be translated "mind itself" , "nature of mind", etc. "Natural state" is also sometimes used for Tibetan "rang sa" meaning "it's own place".

krodha wrote:
Actually, "sems nyid" means "nature of mind" or "mind essence" (as you mentioned), and not "natural state".

The Tibetan term that "natural state" is a translation of is "gnas lugs" which in Sanskrit is tattva or tathātva. "Natural state" isn't a very good translation of those terms but it is widely used... "gnas lugs" means something closer to "the actual way of things", or "the way things really are".

So when one is resting in a direct knowledge [rig pa] of dharmatā, meaning they are cognizing the non-arising of mind [sems nyid] or the non-arising of phenomena, that is the natural state [gnas lugs], because they are knowing the way things really are.

This also means that only first bhūmi bodhisattvas and above know the natural state proper.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
Jeff said:
Think of it more like a shared consciousness that is the Form component of emptiness, just as we all seemingly exist in the same multi universe.

krodha wrote:
This isn't taobums.com, you can't just make stuff up and pass it off as legitimate here.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 9:13 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
OK, what about this part: Because we are connected to all beings on the ultimate level, we can pervade them with love. They can actually receive our love.
?

krodha wrote:
I've probably done enough speculation for one day with that last post, but for the sake of the discussion I'm sure what is being pointed to here isn't too far off from what was mentioned before regarding the ultimate being unimpeded emptiness (which goes with compassion like water and wetness). What's to stop the altruistic deeds of wisdom from reaching others?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 8:29 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Yeah, I don't know what Ina is smoking.

krodha wrote:
For all we know Garchen Rinpoche said something like "Ultimately, the minds of all sentient beings share a single basis.", or something to that extent... which would be acceptable, like saying all fires share a single nature of heat. But it was then translated "Ultimately, there is a single ground within which all beings are one."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 8:09 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
As Garchen Rinpoche said: Ultimately, there is a single ground within which all beings

are one. Because we are connected to all beings on the ultimate level, we can pervade them with love. They can actually receive our love.
Now back to your regularly scheduled program.

krodha wrote:
You mean Garchen Rinpoche's translator said:

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 15th, 2015 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
Jeff said:
That was the nature of the question, the relative connection "framework". Why I have recently posted the question (multiple times) about the computer network analogy. Malcolm is the only one who has really voted. Stating that in Buddhadarma there is no mind to mind connection, that the mind is limited to the physical body.

I was asking if everyone else agreed with that because as I have stated many other traditions have such capability/connection framework.

krodha wrote:
Study the two-truths, it would resolve the seeming contradictions and inconsistencies you feel you're encountering.

Right now you're struggling with your attempts to reconcile these issues through a neo-nondual type approach where you're forced to posit some sort of universal substratum, and that view is refuted by the buddhadharma, for good reason.

If you simply made an effort to comprehend how conventional designations and relative cognitions relate to ultimate truth (i.e., their emptiness), then you'd undoubtably resolve these issues you are struggling with.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 10:18 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
Jeff said:
I know approximately 20 people with the capability at various levels. We used to conduct experiments at what one might call various frequencies of mind. The practioner traditions lineages included Daoism, Sufi, Mystical Christianity and I know Kashmir Shaivism also has the capability. In particular, one Daoist master I know is so clear at the human mind level visual transmissions that he actually teaches some of his advanced students that way. I have spent time with two of his students, one in Boston and one in London. But most traditions limit the connection to the guru/student bond.

krodha wrote:
Still, none of this phenomena entails one individual's mind directly affecting another individual's mind, nor does it entail minds overlapping or entering one another.

Jeff said:
I had assumed it was also part of the guru aspect in Dzogchen. I take it then that there is no concept of a guru bond either? That even advanced practioners are not capable of directly sharing presence (visited) by their guru either consciously in visions or in dreams?

krodha wrote:
Even individuals in the traditions you cited above are not capable of "directly sharing presence", sure one's guru can visit them in the dream state, but this does not involve what you are suggesting it does. Minds are not fusing and entering each other.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 8:58 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
Jeff said:
This is both surprising and disappointing that such is not known in the Buddhist tradition.

krodha wrote:
Pray tell in what tradition is such a thing allegedly known? To be frank it sounds like something straight out of the new age circles.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 14th, 2015 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: is the mind individual?
Content:
Jeff said:
And thank you for finally agreeing that Buddhas and bodhisattvas can access and know the minds of others. Now we just need to just get the rest of the group to agree to such a concept.

Additionally, understand how that knowing is really the same as being with or "in" the local mind stream of the sentient being. With such "focus" of a high level being creating the void effect I described earlier.

krodha wrote:
Curious why you seem to be so enamored with this whole mind reading/interaction business?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 29th, 2015 at 1:55 PM
Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?
Content:
Sherab said:
My argument is really quite straightforward.

Assume in the simpliest of case that B arise from A. The process of B arising from A is dependent origination.

krodha wrote:
No, that is not dependent origination. Dependent origination is a conventional view that is applied in order to reveal the non-arising [anutpāda] of allegedly conditioned existents. It accomplishes this by demonstrating that A cannot be found apart from the conditions that allegedly define and/or sustain A. The same goes for B. If you were to parse this on a way that addresses the non-arising of A and B through their alleged relationship, one would seek to recognize that A is a mere implication of B, and B a mere implication of A. Thus neither A nor B can be found to begin with, that inability to find them is their emptiness.

But analyzing them in tandem is really unnecessary, one can simply inquire into both A and B separately and arrive at the same insight, since neither have actually arisen at any point in time. The perception of their alleged "existence" in any form is avidyā. Uproot avidyā and destroy the invalid cognition that mistakenly apperceives A and/or B as valid.

You've struggled with these notions for years though so I doubt this explanation will hit home.

Sherab said:
Because of B arising from A, the existence of B is a dependent existence.

krodha wrote:
Dependent existence is when two existents exist interdependently... which is why Nagarjuna states that dependent existence [parabhāva] is simply a guise for inherent existence [svabhāva].

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 3:04 PM
Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Dependent existence [parabhāva] is not dependent origination [pratītyasamutpāda].

Sherab said:
An apple is not the same as fruit but an apple is a fruit.

krodha wrote:
This example does not apply to the parabhāva/pratītyasamutpāda difference, at all.

Sherab said:
Dependent origination is not the same as emptiness

krodha wrote:
Actually it is.

Sherab said:
but dependent origination is an emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Is an emptiness?

Sherab said:
(I am NOT going to debate this.

krodha wrote:
Clearly, since to have a healthy debate you would first need to understand these principles.

Sherab said:
I put it here just to make a point.)

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what point you were attempting or intending to make, but it did not come to fruition.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 28th, 2015 at 9:16 AM
Title: Re: Establishing a Correct Understanding?
Content:
Sherab said:
Please elaborate so that I can understand your objection.

krodha wrote:
Dependent existence [parabhāva] is not dependent origination [pratītyasamutpāda].

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 13th, 2015 at 7:36 AM
Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History
Content:
smcj said:
Let me use a personal example: I find it very very difficult to believe that Nagarjuna

wrote "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" (Skt: Dharmadhatustava). It just does not seem like the guy that wrote "Collection of Madhyamaka Reasoning" also wrote this particular "Praise" (which was one in a collection of "Praises"). It is completely different and seemingly antithetical to his Madhyamaka writings. But that's just my own incredulity, there's nothing more to it than that. So should I now dismiss the text as an anomaly because it is so different, because my worldview does not accept the discrepancy as being by the same author?

The easy answer for me is "no". Why? Because later authors that I accept as having some level of realization (such as Karmapa III) have commented on it. Does that mean that they are able to psychically confirm that there was only one Nagarjuna and only he wrote it? No. What it means is that they, having achieved some level of advanced realization, can through their own authority validate it as authentic Dharma, as useful in the path to realization. Regardless of who wrote it*, if it becomes part of the lexicon of a tradition that actually produces realized masters it is Dharma with a capitol "D".

Of course if you think that the only person that has ever become enlightened was Shakyamuni, then that kind of validation is impossible. But if someone believes that, then why should they bother to study what Shakyamuni taught at all?

****

*Given this scenario the assumption would be that whoever the author was was himself enlightened. Dharma comes from an enlightened mind, not a personality per se.

krodha wrote:
Off topic; but there are many who assert there were indeed two separate Nāgārjunas: (i) the Siddha Nāgārjuna and (ii) Ācārya Nāgārjuna.

Though their sentiments and expositions are not antithetical at all, not sure how you came to that conclusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 8th, 2015 at 9:21 AM
Title: Re: Lucid dreaming and rigpa
Content:
Saoshun said:
Ass and carrot on the stick.

krodha wrote:
If you want to insist that dualistic mind is primordial wisdom then be my guest, it makes no difference to me.

Saoshun said:
There is no beings to become awakened

krodha wrote:
From the ultimate standpoint of the highest wisdom there are no beings to awaken or be liberated, but clinging to such a view from the standpoint of the relative is nothing more than nihilism.

The fact that all things are ultimately devoid of inherency and free from extremes does not mean one is in recognition of that fact, and it certainly does not mean one has a complete knowledge of it. Even then, principles such as awakening, the basis, path and result etc., are never negated on the conventional level.

Saoshun said:
Thinking that you can remove your confusion is symptomatic of the confusion.

krodha wrote:
Confusion must be overturned through direct recognition of dharmatā, and then habitual tendencies and karmic traces must be exhausted, only then is one free of affliction.

In any case, you are either unfamiliar with Atiyoga or your view is simply lacking, but in either case your sentiments are not in line with this teaching. What you are advocating for is called allowing the view to overtake the conduct, a crippling error that if uncorrected can compromise your chances of liberation altogether.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 8th, 2015 at 8:11 AM
Title: Re: Lucid dreaming and rigpa
Content:
Saoshun said:
the idea of practicing non-dual awareness is like idea of keeping ocean wet. Let go of this idea that there is something to keep, you are always in non dual awareness no matter what you doing or non doing.

krodha wrote:
In terms of Dzogpachenpo, one does not always have a knowledge of non-dual wisdom, which is something that must be initially recognized, and then familiarized with. Aspirants who are beginning on the path (and sentient beings in general) are endowed with a dualistic cognition that is burdened by affliction, that is why their noetic capacities are referred to as vijñāna [rnam shes]... only awakened beings possess non-dual jñāna [ye shes].

This is why Longchenpa states [per Malcolm]:

The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained.

Saoshun said:

It's like hearing, can you practice hearing? No. It's happens, the hearing can be only clearer if awareness will not be absorbed in the mind chit-chat which springs from false idea of "me"

krodha wrote:
You are simply describing the clarity of mind [gsal ba]... this is not the so-called "non-dual awareness" of Dzogchen, at least not until it is recognized as non-arisen and purified of afflictive obscurations.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 6th, 2015 at 11:42 AM
Title: Re: Reiki
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
What was that like?

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 12:32 PM
Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual
Content:
smcj said:
I have always said that Great Madhyamaka is just one presentation.

krodha wrote:
"Great Madhyamaka" is a truly undefined title that has been applied to practically any and every Madhyamaka view at one time or another, as Malcolm has demonstrated more than a few times.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 12:26 PM
Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual
Content:
smcj said:
I have nothing but respect the classical way of looking at things and encourage whoever wants to see things that way to continue. However the teachings did change over time in Tibet. Very slowly, but they did change. No point in denying it.

krodha wrote:

There is no "classical vs. contemporary" dichotomy. Dudjom Rinpoche's personal views on Madhyamaka do not constitute evidence for some sort of contemporary or undeniable renaissance in Tibetan views.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 2nd, 2015 at 12:09 PM
Title: Re: Gradual vs. Nongradual
Content:
krodha wrote:
Glad to see this discussion is happening yet again (for what is probably the tenth time), and smcj is still adhering to the same positions, the main few being: (i) gzhan stong is the correct dzogchen view, (ii) Dudjom Rinpoche said this and that, (iii) gzhan stong has the exclusive and true rights to the title "great Madhyamaka", (iv) so-called contemporary sources have it correct, whereas the adepts of old (were really old and thus) didn't do it as well as the contemporary lamas.

All of these points have been contested, addressed and shown to be merely one way of looking at things... they are certainly by no means the "correct™" way.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History
Content:
Malcolm said:
Yes, ultimately. Still, Nāgārjuna accepts karmic ripening conventionally...

krodha wrote:
Jayarava rejects the two truths, and therefore robs himself of the ability to comprehend Nāgārjuna's reasoning (and then when Nāgārjuna's expositions no longer make sense, Jayarava places the fault with Nāgārjuna rather than himself, which is quite convenient).

https://jayarava.blogspot.com/2011/08/not-two-truths.html

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 22nd, 2015 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: The Very Idea of Buddhist History
Content:
Jayarava said:
But I do adduce reasons in an earlier essay. My bad for not linking to it. I can sum that argument up for you in a few quick words. Pratītyasamutpāda says:
imasmiṃ sati idaṃ hoti, imass' uppādā idaṃ uppajjati;
imasmiṃ asati idaṃ na hoti, imassa nirodhā idaṃ nirujjhati. (My emphasis)
None other than Nāgārjuna points out the problem with any version of karma that requires effects to ripen after the conditions have ceased:

tiṣṭhaty ā pākakālāc cet karma tan nityatām iyāt /
> niruddhaṃ cen niruddhaṃ sat kiṃ phalaṃ janayiṣyati // MMK_17.6 //
Which translates as:

"If the action remains until the time of maturation, then it would be eternal
If it ceases, being ceased, how does it produce a fruit?"

Now, Nāgārjuna has a particular solution in mind when he makes this criticism. And Indrajala has already pointed out that other Buddhist sects had their own solutions. Which goes to show that this is not something I've simply made up. It was a problem widely acknowledged in the Buddhist world and many solutions were proposed, and polemics were written criticising them all by Buddhists of different sects. Far from being a shocking modern discovery, this is a boring 2000 year old argument. Though in my view it was never settled satisfactorily.

So I'm sorry that you felt the need to go on the offensive, but you are simply mistaken. The facts are very much on my side. Does this change your mind at all?

krodha wrote:
I see you're revisiting this misconception yet again, Jayarava... you and I [krodha] were just discussing the absurdity of this conclusion (of yours) yesterday on reddit.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 14th, 2015 at 10:23 AM
Title: Re: Building a modern and/or western Buddhism
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
inconceivable.jpg

krodha wrote:
You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.
-- Inigo Montoya

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 6th, 2015 at 12:26 AM
Title: Re: in search of a ethical way to deal with spiders
Content:
krodha wrote:
I use one of those orange prescription pill bottles to capture them and release them outside.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 7:34 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?

Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Who said anything about an epigraph?

krodha wrote:
Oh yes, I forgot about all those other contexts and instances where Elio is tied to Ramana Maharshi...

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 7:19 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Why don't you ask Elio and Adriano?

krodha wrote:
Elio admitted he was off base with the Ramana Maharshi epigraph last April in Tenerife.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 28th, 2015 at 7:12 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Malcolm said:
Frankly, it amazes me that people think view does not matter when it comes to awakening, or that awakening does not have causes and conditions.

dzogchungpa said:
OK, perhaps you can explain what you meant by https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=15030&p=209120#p209120:
Malcolm said:
The Dzogchen perspective is that a liberation based on causes and effects is incoherent.

krodha wrote:
It is imperative to separate Dzogchen and Dzogchenpa, dzogchungpa.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 12:45 PM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:
When did I say nonduality implies a substantiated essence?

krodha wrote:
Here:

Still, none of this has any bearing on nonduality itself. Nonduality is beyond "this is" and "this is not," like those scriptures I quoted earlier say.

Boomerang said:
Not the Advaita concept of nonduality, but ineffable nonduality?

krodha wrote:
So you're advocating for a perrennialist view of non-duality?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 27th, 2015 at 12:07 PM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:
How is this any different than what I've been saying the whole time about nonduality being beyond words?

krodha wrote:
Well for one, you've been continually positing a reductive "non-duality" as some sort of substantiated essence... which makes everything you've been saying vastly different.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 8:44 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Ironically, you are the one who isn't understanding.

Boomerang said:
I'm certainly not omniscient. I can only do the best I can, motivated by love an sincerity. Up to this point you've given me no reason to believe that you understand Advaita Vedanta better than I do. Until you can do that, it doesn't matter to me if you say I don't understand the nuances of both religions.

Love.

krodha wrote:
The point of a statement like this:
The point is that in Buddhadharma, nondual consciousness is subjective and personal, not objective and universal. You can't simply cherry pick what you like.
Is to illustrate that in Vedanta, non-dual consciousness is a transpersonal, ontological principle, whereas in the buddhadharma said non-dual consciousness is a personal, epistemic insight.

Further, it is your comprehension of Buddhist tenets that is lacking. I too used to make

the mistake of seeing Advaita and Buddhism as ultimately agreeing on principles such as non-duality and so on... and I too was quite certain that I had it all figured out. Eventually however I delved deeper into the meaning of the buddhadharma and discovered that the meaning of both systems is not the same at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 8:29 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:
I already said that there can be no objectivity in a nondual reality, but I don't think you understood.

krodha wrote:
Ironically, you are the one who isn't understanding.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:
I'm only participating in this thread so that everyone knows that it is possible to be Hindu and Buddhist, regardless of what some people may think.

krodha wrote:
It really isn't possible, and despite what you may think; your argument (that it is possible to practice both simultaneously) hasn't been very convincing since you don't appear to comprehend the subtle nuances of both views.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:47 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
I don't see any far reaching implications or controversial statements there.
How Great Madhyamaka relates to secret mantra; ground, path and result in both its causal and resultant aspects; and the ground, path and result of the "uncommon definitive order" (which I think here means Dzogchen) aren't "far reaching implications"? Geez, what more do you want?

Tough room.

krodha wrote:
How are they "far reaching implications"? And how do those alleged implications

contradict the view or result championed by Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka (for example)?

The answer is: they don't.

Sure you can argue the praxis of both systems is different. But there are no "far reaching implications" apart from that, and the implications of the praxis are ultimately only pertinent to the basis and path of each system. The result is the same (buddhahood).

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:24 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
From Dudjom R.'s "Big Red Book" p.185:
It is wrong to refer to the mere emptiness, which is nothing at all, as the ultimate truth.

Thus, absolute reality is the pristine cognition of the non-dual nature of just what is. It is indicated by the words of buddha-body of reality or essential buddha-body which genuinely transcends the phenomena of consciousness. yet, also comprised within this doctrine, which is mis-represented as the philosophical system knows as the Mind Only, are: the definitive order of the three continua as taught in the way of secret mantra; the definitive order of the ground, path and result of purification ands forth which are adhered to by followers of the treater vehicle in both its causal and resultant aspects, and which include [the terminology] of deities, mantras, embodiments of indestructible reality, supreme bliss, emptiness endowed with all supreme aspects, the imperishable seminal point which is the fundamental support of the body, speech and mind; and also the uncommon definitive order of the ground, path and result.
Don't ask me to explain what all that means. You just wanted a citation for "far reaching implications". That quote seems to fit the bill.

krodha wrote:
I don't see any far reaching implications or controversial statements there.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:17 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In the buddhadharma, "non-dual" can mean either (i) a freedom from the extremes of existence and non-existence, and/or (ii) dharmin and dharmatā are neither the same nor different. Both (i) and (ii) being essentially synonymous.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
That is one version. There are quite a few variations with far ranging implications.

krodha wrote:
Can you cite an example of another version with "far ranging implications"? Because I haven't seen any... unless you're referring to the varying misinterpretations out there which err into ātmavādin waters.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
So these sweeping generalizations you are making are a bit reckless.
All generalizations are generalizations, not absolute rules.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what that means.

smcj said:
I can't even say that all Gelugpas hold Nagarjuna to be definitive anymore whereas I once could do so. I've seen some HHDL quotes recently that are very sympathetic to some forms of Shentong. That is remarkable!

krodha wrote:
I don't quite understand the fixation on gzhan stong, especially since it only states that Buddha qualities are innate to wisdom... which is something so-called traditional Madhyamaka promotes as well. It's really a false dichotomy... there's just more room for eternalist wriggle room with gzhan stong if it is misinterpreted.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 5:38 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
Boomerang said:
Is Buddhist nonduality something that humans are able to perfectly describe through language? Is Advaita nonduality something that humans can perfectly describe through language?

krodha wrote:
That argument is a slippery slope being that words are going to ultimately fail to capture the direct experience of any and everything... the taste of sugar for example. That being said, there are accurate and inaccurate descriptions of such things, for instance; sugar

is not sour, it is sweet. The same goes for descriptions of "non-dual" in Buddhism and Vedanta.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 26th, 2015 at 5:33 AM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
I have understood the significance of Madhyamaka, but as per the Kagyu and Nyingma schools I see it as provisional, and the Great Madhyamaka/Shentong as definitive.

krodha wrote:
Kagyu and Nyingma do not collectively uphold gzhan stong as definitive over Madhyamaka proper. The majority of key Nyingma adepts actually prefer Prasanga Madhyamaka over gzhan stong... and not all Kagyus consider gzhan stong to be definitive, for instance my [Drikung] Kagyu lama states outright that Nāgārjuna's view is definitive. So these sweeping generalizations you are making are a bit reckless.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 25th, 2015 at 3:59 PM
Title: Re: Is is possible to be Buddhist and Hindu?
Content:
smcj said:
However I also see a pronounced bias towards a classical interpretation in your position.

krodha wrote:
I know this is really between Malcolm and you, but just curious; "classical" as opposed to what? You've mentioned this alleged "classical interpretation versus a more contemporary interpretation" issue before but (to my knowledge) the evidence for this dichotomy has never reared its head.

smcj said:
What I do not accept is you dismissal of major authorities, generally from the late 19th-20th century Tibet, that do not agree with you.

krodha wrote:
I know Malcolm can defend himself, but from an outside perspective: I've never seen this alleged "dismissing" occur. Nor have I seen any evidence of major authorities disagreeing with what Malcolm has clarified or pointed out in these instances. Not to throw you to the wolves, but what I have seen is a continual theme of misinterpretation on your part... and I think the blowback and objections that have arisen in response to your misinterpretations may have been wrongly transposed onto the aforementioned 'major authorities' instead of being isolated to where they rightly belong: which is between you and Malcolm... and not Malcolm and these 'major authorities'.

smcj said:
Even with all of your remarkable accomplishments, credentials, and pure motivations you simply do not have the credibility to dismiss the teachings of major Shentongpas as something other than legitimate Dharma.

krodha wrote:
Again, has this occurred?

smcj said:
I understand you're trying to hold the line with classical orthodoxy.

krodha wrote:
Again, "classical orthodoxy" as opposed to what? I don't see any evidence of this dichotomy and/or biases towards an orthodox or contemporary interpretation. If I were to propose a dichotomy it would simply be (i) correct interpretation, vs. (ii) misinterpretation.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 20th, 2015 at 12:06 AM
Title: Re: emptiness wisdom, conceptual understanding, stepping sto
Content:
smcj said:
The Prajnaparamitat Sutras are about self-emptiness, so yes.

krodha wrote:
No, the prajñāpāramitā sūtras simply discuss emptiness properly and in general... both self and other. The whole 'self-empty' versus 'other empty' thing is nothing more than a gzhan stong straw man - and gzhan stong is possibly a useful view for some but it has nothing new to offer that isn't covered in the prajñāpāramitā etc.

smcj said:
The paradigm I'm advocating for places Nagarjna (Prajnaparamita, Prasangika Madhyamaka, self-emptiness, 2nd Turning of the Wheel, Tsongkhapa/Chandrakirti, etc.) as provisional teachings only. They are not definitive or final. This is the position of Kongtrul R. and Dudjom R. However both K.R. & D.R. say that the 2nd Turning needs to precede 3rd Turning teachings, that is why I called them a stepping stone.

krodha wrote:
If anything it's the other way around, but in general the entire 'second turning', 'third turning' scheme is doctrinally unfounded and extraneous in general. Really all it has become in the west is a platform for baseless oneupmanship that primarily involves eternalists and ātmavādins who don't understand the teachings.

I can understand the differentiation between Vajrayāna and the Mahāyāna of Nāgārjuna etc., in terms of praxis, but to state that traditional Madhyamaka is a provisional "stepping stone" in relation to the so-called "third turning" teachings of the

tathāgatagarbha sūtras, Yogācāra, gzhan stong etc. doesn't make much sense since the view of traditional Madhyamaka surpasses the view of Yogācāra and gzhan stong (and tathāgatagarbha is simply a nice view that does not render anything inferior - unless it is being misinterpreted).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 16th, 2015 at 4:04 PM
Title: Re: Spirits - are these considered to be formless beings?
Content:
prsvrnc said:
How are spirits classified in Tibetan Buddhism?

krodha wrote:
What we usually think of as "spirits" in the west are called bhutas in India... I'm not sure what the Tibetan translation of that term would be.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 15th, 2015 at 4:45 AM
Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa
Content:
White Lotus said:
if rigpa is the natural state then it is vijnana

krodha wrote:
The so-called "natural state" is (an attempt at) an English translation for the Tibetan term gnas lugs [skt. tattva, tathātva], which is not equivalent to vijñāna but is rather quite the opposite since it entails a direct experiential knowledge [rig pa] of jñāna [tib. ye shes].

White Lotus said:
if rigpa is emptiness then it is not vijnana

krodha wrote:
Rig pa is also not emptiness, although it can be a (direct, experiential) knowledge of emptiness - and is so, in its definitive expressions.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 14th, 2015 at 12:34 AM
Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Everything is rigpa (Dharmakaya), we are just unaware of the fact.

krodha wrote:

Appearances are the rtsal of rig pa, but rtsal is not always wisdom. Dharmakāya is the result and occurs at the level of the individual (the mind completely purified of affliction and fully omniscient)... because of that, saying 'everything is dharmakāya' is held to be incorrect;
Designating appearances as the dharmakāya obscures me,
designating whatever appears as mind obscures me,
designating wisdom as mind obscures me.
- Samantabhadra-citta-ādarśa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 13th, 2015 at 3:28 AM
Title: Re: Vijnana vs. Rigpa
Content:
krodha wrote:
Rigpa in its coarsest and most afflicted expression is precisely the vijñāna skandha.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 7th, 2015 at 5:06 PM
Title: Re: Pure Land Contradicts Buddha Teachings....
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
instead the unconditioned Dharmakaya from which the Pure Land is supported is the 4 virtues of Nirvana 'True Self, Bliss, Permanence, and purity.'

krodha wrote:
For thr record, the sūtras themselves never use the term "true self" in the context of the four virtues, you simply took the liberty of embellishing and adding that yourself in order to suit your ātmavādin agenda. The term 'self' is found in that context, but never "True Self" (with the unnecessary capitalizations and so on).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 10:22 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
taking refuge in our real nature, although since theres nowhere else to go

krodha wrote:
There is elsewhere to go if you are ignorant of said nature.

gad rgyangs said:
theres really nothing you need to take refuge from.

krodha wrote:

That is true from the ultimate standpoint while yogins dwell directly in wisdom... but the vast majority are unable to rest in that wisdom at all times (presupposing they even know that wisdom to begin with), therefore it is crucial that practitioners take refuge, upholding view and conduct to the best of their ability. Denying relative appearances (and principles like refuge) on the path is nihilism.
Some say: 'Cause and effect, compassion and merits are the dharma for ordinary people, and it will not lead to enlightenment. O great yogis! You should meditate upon the ultimate meaning, effortless as space.' These kinds of statements are the views of the utmost nihilism, they have entered the path of the most inferior. It is astonishing to expect the result while abandoning the cause.
- Longchenpa | rdzogs pa chen po sems nyid ngal gso

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
the quote is perfectly clear unless you can't read.

krodha wrote:
For the sake of the discussion, what do you feel are the core and salient issues that remain unaddressed from Rinpoche's quote?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 8th, 2014 at 1:03 PM
Title: Re: Mahayana opinions of Theravada?
Content:
Kasina said:
What (besides the obvious fact that the Buddha found the path and Nirvana on his own) are the differences between the Buddha and regular Arahants in Mahayana?

krodha wrote:
Mahāyāna states that arhats realize the emptiness of personal identity [pudgalaśūnyatā], but not emptiness of so-called external phenomena [dharmaśūnyatā].

It is also said that an arhat attains either (i) nirvāṇa with residue [sopadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa] or (ii) nirvāṇa without residue [nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa] however the nirvāṇa of Mahāyāna is called non-abiding nirvāṇa [apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa], which is (by the standards of Mahāyāna) a superior liberation to that of an arhat's (liberation).

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 7th, 2014 at 2:39 PM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen only accidentally Buddhist?

Content:
gad rgyangs said:
For example, is Heidegger's seinsfrage a step towards Dzogchen in a western tradition? Are some of Meister Eckhart's late sermons expressing what amounts to a Dzogchen view? I don't think these are easy "yes" or "no" questions (although I expect an avalanche of "no"s any minute...

krodha wrote:
Avalanche of no's.

In general though, those who struggle with tradition tend to be very literal-minded due to having a intense poverty in any ability to comprehend (i) conventional devices, (ii) skillful means, and (iii) provisional, supplementary support structures.

For example; there are some out there who push the idea of a "radical Dzogchen" that defies tradition etc., it is such a ridiculous notion. One's nature is always one's nature, originally pure and naturally perfected; the relative structures that aid the aspirant in realizing that nature are simply provisional methods. There's absolutely no reason to swat them away in the name of a "more pure" relative structure... whatever new approach one would abandon the structures of old for would be nothing more than another relative structure - only the newfound structures would not have the time-tested and proven efficacy of refined systems and unbroken lineages.

One's nature is innately pure and free of relative structures, and when one has a direct, experiential knowledge of that nature its primordial purity is overtly evident... this means that fixating on rejecting relative structures because one's nature is originally pure is nothing more than the mind accepting and rejecting. One should be able to use traditions and structured systems as useful tools that can be implemented and set down when the job is done.

Not directing this at anyone here, just making a broad observation; but worrying about traditions, structures and systems is simply the relative mind clinging to an idea of original purity - because authentic wisdom is originally pure by nature and needn't accept or reject. The ultimate view is simply free (innately), and no tradition, structure or system can bind it... but traditions, structures and systems surely aid one in realizing that nature. It all comes back to upāya.

Lashing out at tradition, structure and system is akin to cutting off leaves and branches - rather than severing the issue at the root (which is avidyā). Traditions, structures and systems do not bind, only ignorance binds. So why not use the traditions, structures and systems to one's benefit, relate to them skillfully, sever delusion, and realize that it has all been originally pure and naturally perfected since time without beginning?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 4th, 2014 at 11:46 AM
Title: Re: Hello from San Jose, California

Content:
krodha wrote:
Also Reddit /r/Buddhism moderator extraordinaire:

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 3:57 PM
Title: Re: Request for something super specific
Content:
Paul said:
Okay, I'll look. BTW I think a full exposition of this subject is going to be more common in Mahamudra texts as the techniques of Mahamudra are more gradual and based on meditative analysis when introducing the view.

krodha wrote:
It is also part of khorde rushan practice in Dzogchen, and a full exposition can be found in that context as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 9:47 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
smcj said:
It is my impression/suspicion that things did change over time. Who, why and when I have no idea, but the modern period seems to be different than the classical period. I'm ok with that.

krodha wrote:
You mentioned this the other day, can't say I agree. I don't see it.

smcj said:
If enlightened teachers teach it,

krodha wrote:
That's a big "if".

smcj said:
and students following it become enlightened, then what's the purpose of criticizing?

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure that students are following some sort of renaissance as you suggest, in terms of Vajrayāna they are simply receiving the blessings of the lineage and following their teacher's instruction. Whether that involves a divergent modernization / reinterpretation of the classical view I highly doubt.

smcj said:

Once you get to the "other shore" it's time to get out of the dharma boat anyway.

krodha wrote:
Well yes but those firmly planted on the allegorical "other shore" are quite rare, and even then the fact that they are beyond the need for the instructions, view and conduct that accompany the basis and path does not mean they throw those principles to the wind.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
krodha wrote:
*double post

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
Lotus_Bitch said:
I believe the Nyingmapas follow a standardized interpretation following that of Rongzom, Longchenpa, and Mipham in that order.

krodha wrote:
The latter two openly stating that they are primarily thal 'gyur pas (i.e., consider Prasangika to be a definitive view) Rongzom may as well. To be fair Longchenpa states it is his opinion that the tathāgatagarbha sūtras are definitive sūtras, but at the same time is able to state that Prasanga is the definitive view - which makes for a nice balance that is sure to avoid extremes.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 2nd, 2014 at 8:02 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The main elements of the so-called third turning that are applicable in Atiyoga are the eight consciousness model and the tathāgatagarbha, apart from that there really isn't anything that stands out as notably worthy of substantiating an argument for the supremacy of the 'third turning'. And the fact that Atiyoga only borrows the eight consciousnesses and gives its interpretation of sugatagarbha really shows that an exclusive association of Dzogpachenpo with the 'third turning' is unwarranted.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 1:58 PM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
smcj said:
This gets into the different interpretations of Nagarjuna between Chandrakirti and Tsongkhapa. I was raised on Tsongkhapa, so my version of dependent arising has a provisional existence. And if I could find my book on "The 3 Principle Aspects of the Path" by Tsongkhapa I could give a quote about emptiness and interdependent arising being the same thing. But then again that's Tsongkhapa, who isn't universally well regarded here, and I can't find the book anyway. So here's a quote lifted from a post by Malcolm on p.3 of this thread:
Āryāṣṭadaśasahasrika-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Dependent origination should be known as emptiness.

krodha wrote:
I never said dependent origination and emptiness were antonymous, and Nāgārjuna pointed out that dependent origination and emptiness are clearly one and the same far before Tsongkhapa's reiteration.

smcj said:
Who ever said that?

krodha wrote:
It is the natural consequence of the three natures and has been pointed out numerous times here.

smcj said:
Madhyamaka has jurisdiction over the phenomenal universe. Shentong jurisdiction is that which cannot be taken as a subject by consciousness, the unborn, etc.

krodha wrote:
That is a patent fallacy. Gzhan stong simply says the three kāyas are innate, however this is the implication of traditional Madhyamaka as well. When it comes down to it, gzhan stong really does not offer anything that cannot be found in traditional Madhyamaka.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 1:09 PM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
smcj said:
As for Nagarjuna, I find that his arguments can end up leading people (e.g. Garfield) to argue that Nagarjuna was basically saying that the ultimate of everything is dependent origination. In other words, there is nothing that is unborn, unbecome, unmade,

unfabricated. This directly contradicts Udana 8.3 and fatally impacts the soteriology of Buddhism. I doubt that this was the conclusion intended by Nagarjuna.
Actually my current understanding Is that is exactly what Nagarjuna meant. When Gelugpas talk about their "non-affirming negation" they are specifically not affirming that there is anything more to it. You have to leave Madhyamaka and enter Yogacara or Shentong to get any kind of "nothing-yet-more-than-nothing".

krodha wrote:
Nāgārjuna never says "the ultimate of everything is dependent origination", Madhyamaka simply says that so-called conditioned dharmas originate dependently and therefore do not actually originate at all, hence they are unborn, unbecome, unmade, unfabricated etc. This is the heart of the soteriology of Buddhism.

So no, what you are asserting is not what Nāgārjuna meant. And one can actually argue that Yogācāra is an inferior view to Madhyamaka since it ends up a realist view. Gzhan stong is nothing more than a post-meditative interpretation and does not contradict Madhyamaka if properly understood.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 1st, 2014 at 8:34 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
LastLegend said:
If I understand you correctly, there are two separate 'things.' That is emptiness of phenomena and emptiness of emptiness (which is this empty mind basically).

Sherab said:
No, you did not understand me correctly. I said that dependent arising can only be a subset of emptiness if the liberation from samsara as taught by the Buddha is to make any sense.

Therefore, the emptiness of phenomena is a member of the emptiness set. The emptiness of the emptiness of phenomena, i.e., the emptiness of dependent arising itself is also a member of the emptiness set. Emptiness of emptiness when applied to the emptiness set implies a nihilistic view.

To understand what I said, you have to understand set theory.

krodha wrote:
There is no "set theory" involved with dependent origination, emptiness, etc., this is a wrong view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 28th, 2014 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: Before teaching to somebody...

Content:
smcj said:
But I do not see anything wrong with respectfully pointing out that he is speaking from a specific perspective (and with a pronounced conservative agenda) that is not universally shared in modern (19th/20th centuries) times.

krodha wrote:
Often it seems to be more-so the case that so-called 'unorthodox' views (that contrast so-called 'orthodox' views) are simply misinterpretations. Not to mention that many aspects of these systems are still coming to light, which means the common western understanding is in a provisional state of constant refinement and evolution. The common topic regarding the conflation of Atiyoga with Hindu systems like Vedanta is a perfect example of this; certain translational choices based on unrefined or flowering comprehension, along with a limited selection of English translations has bred flawed trends in understanding.

smcj said:
I am comfortable with the presentations of Dudjom R. and Kongtrul R. that Malcolm disapproves of.

krodha wrote:
I've never seen Malcolm disapprove of Dudjom Rinpoche's or Jamgon Kongtrul's presentations, any disapproval or critique I've witnessed has been directed towards misunderstandings of their teachings rather than the teachings themselves.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 26th, 2014 at 3:35 AM
Title: Re: Did the historical Buddha taught Vajrayana Tantra?
Content:
odysseus said:
I don´t agree totally. They´re not the direct opposite of the 5 heaps (how is that possible to have an opposite anyway). Perhaps some people mean they are an antidote, but they don´t exactly hang together with them. Dhyani Buddhas don´t represent anything special about the skandhas, they´re saints representing 5 different qualities of enlightenment.

krodha wrote:
The five skandhas in their natural expression are the five wisdoms i.e. the five dhyani buddhas.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 10:58 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
odysseus said:

I like this. Other than that, the rest of your talking is gibberish. lol

krodha wrote:
Authentic frontier gibberish, to be exact.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 10:24 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
From "On The Nature Of Samantabhadra: A Conversation with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu":
Question: Is the state of Adibuddha, or Kunjed Gyalpo, something universal, present in all beings?
Answer: The state of Kunjed Gyalpo is knowledge, and in knowledge there is not even the concept of "one and two," otherwise we have already entered into dualism. Also the concept of "individual" presupposes dualistic vision. But Samantabhadra is beyond all this, isn't he?

krodha wrote:
Right, because Samantabhadra is dharmakāya i.e. emptiness free from extremes. The adibuddha is universal in the sense that all sentient beings endowed with a mind have a mind-nature (e.g., all fires have heat), but not 'universal' in the sense that said nature is a single, transpersonal essence pervading everything (e.g., every fire shares the exact same heat). That fire-heat example (mentioned by Malcolm directly above) is also why there isn't a concept of one or two.

From the point of view of Samantabhadra there is no 'individual' but then again there isn't anything findable that accords with the extremes of existence or non-existence from that standpoint. This does not contradict conventional distinctions, nor does it suggest a transpersonal, single nature of mind pervading everything.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 6:20 AM
Title: Re: Rebirth (split topic: "Ornament o.t. Great Vehicle Sutra
Content:
krodha wrote:
Andrew108?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 3:36 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
Karma Dorje said:
That's simply incorrect when discussing Shankaradvaita. Jiva and Ishvara are the appearance of Brahman under the veil of maya. Jiva is a confused appearance only, not a subset of anything. Paramatman is jiva freed from confusion.

krodha wrote:
This still means that an existent, unconditioned purusha is being realized once confusion is dispelled.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 24th, 2014 at 12:49 AM
Title: Re: what makes Buddhist deathlessness not eternalism?
Content:
Karma Dorje said:
However, the terms point to the same basis.

krodha wrote:
Definitely not.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 10th, 2014 at 11:15 PM
Title: Re: Instant Mindfulness
Content:
krodha wrote:
I side with this Tibetan aphorism:

"The marmot ostensibly cultivating meditative stabilization is actually hibernating."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 10th, 2014 at 10:12 PM
Title: Re: Tilopa's Six Advices
Content:
rachmiel said:
Dependent origination is one of the key things I've learned from Buddhism. It helped me see the grand web of intercausality and connection we live in.

krodha wrote:
Although you do realize that the "neti-neti" in your signature is a Hindu method used to point to something that (allegedly) defies dependent origination?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 7th, 2014 at 1:50 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
krodha wrote:
Speaking of carrots,

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 1:27 PM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
lorem said:
You can't just get direct introduction then remain in rig pa.

krodha wrote:
Right, I don't think anyone suggested that. Only cig car bas are capable of non-regressive buddhahood upon receiving introduction. Most of us are ('bras bu) thod rgal bas or ('bras bu) rim gyis pas which means we traverse the path swiftly or slowly depending on our respective capacities.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 12:38 PM
Title: Re: can buddhist smoke anerican spirit organic ciggeretes
Content:
krodha wrote:
Smoke inhalation pollutes and corrupts your channels, it is better to avoid smoking if one is serious about practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2014 at 10:57 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
lorem said:
Yeah "ground of being" actually does sound Christian or Hindu. "foundation" or "base" is better, imo.

krodha wrote:
It is termed the 'basis' because the species of epistemic insight it denotes serves as the foundation for the path.

Hence; basis [gzhi], path [lam], result ['bras bu].

That is why "ground of being" really makes no sense; it suggests some type of abiding, ontological foundation for existent phenomena. Whereas the basis [gzhi] is simply a conventional term used to convey that one's nature has not been recognized.

Once the basis is recognized it is no longer the 'basis' but instead becomes the 'path' [lam] because the direct, experiential knowledge [rig pa] of that wisdom [ye shes] (the term 'basis' is meant to denote) is what the practitioner familiarizes with and gains confidence in. Then, continuing in the fully realized and unobscured, direct knowledge of that wisdom is the result ['bras bu].

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 2:05 PM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
It is neither revolutionary of heretical, except to Gelugpas and some Sakyapas.

krodha wrote:
What is "it"? Gzhan stong? Gzhan stong isn't the issue, it is simply a post-meditative view; useful in certain cases, but never indicative of the implications you appear to believe gzhan stong carries; e.g. monism, transpersonal ontological realities, orthodox contradiction, etc.

Also, Gelugpas and "some Sakyapas" are not the only ones who do not adhere to gzhan stong. Many Kagyus and Nyingmapas do not consider gzhan stong to be definitive. Bönpo lamas such as Lopon Tenzin Namdak and the late Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen disagree with gzhan stong as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 1:13 PM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
I guess you haven't read the whole thread, or many of my posts for that matter. Back to one of my favorites from Dudjom R.

krodha wrote:
I've been following it from the beginning, hence why you see my posts early on in the thread. Your quotes may serve to substantiate your own interpretations in your own eyes, however I respectfully disagree that your interpretation is sound, and therefore do not find that said quotes confirm or substantiate the views you believe they do. To each their own.

smcj said:
This is a monistic presentation of reality.

krodha wrote:
You see literal descriptions of a monistic reality, I see eloquent literary devices.

smcj said:
So basically--I hate to be a jerk about this--but you're wrong.

krodha wrote:
Yes you've made it quite apparent that you disagree with the opinions of a few people on this matter, and that is alright.

smcj said:
In some quarters this is heresy to the hilt. Q.E.D.

krodha wrote:
You seem gleefully hellbent on assuring yourself that you are shedding light on a heretical and revolutionary view found nestled right in the heart of the Nyingma. Why I'm not sure, but I'm not seeing it.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 12:44 PM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
I'm going to say that by the late 19th century Nyingma and Kagyu tenets would have been dismissed as heresy at Nalanda circa 900 A.D. The slippery slope towards "heresy" happened in Tibet pre-invasion, not here, and not by me. Although I must admit it doesn't bother me in the least.

krodha wrote:
The point is that there is no "heresy" because no one is advocating for whatever it is you believe they are. At no point in time has any Nyingma lama sponsored any view that resembles anything remotely close to a transpersonal, monist, ontological, ātmavāda.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 9:30 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
But that doesn't mean that contemporary Nyingma orthodoxy (as per the Big Red Book) doesn't embrace it.

krodha wrote:
It's your position that the modern Nyingma view dispenses with its entire centuries-old tenet system and embraces heterodox ātmavāda, all because Dudjom Rinpoche

exhibited a predilection for modernized gzhan stong ala Kongtrul?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 9:30 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
krodha wrote:
*double post

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 9:05 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
The pivotal point here is what is meant by "limitless mind beyond extremes". Malcolm says that it is each individual's mind. I say that our minds are not real, and that Ultimate Reality is transpersonal and fecund.

krodha wrote:
So what then differentiates your view from Advaita Vedanta or Samkhya yoga?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 8:40 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
Yes, and Dujom R. is on record as saying that for discussing emptiness from an experiential perspective Great Madhyamaka is best.

krodha wrote:
When it comes down to it gzhan stong (what you are referring to as 'great madhyamaka') is simply a post-meditative view advocating for the validity of buddha-qualities, and says buddhahood is not denied qualities which are innate to it. Prasangika doesn't say anything different (which is why gzhan stong contrasting so-called rang stong i.e. traditional Madhyamaka, doesn't really make sense). Atiyoga doesn't deny buddha-qualities either. Prajñāpāramitā doesn't deny buddha-qualities. Mahāmudrā doesn't deny buddha-qualities. The buddhadharma in general doesn't deny buddha-qualities, so why the fixation on gzhan stong is necessary I'm not sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:

smcj said:
The (current) view.

krodha wrote:
I see you claiming there is a "current view" that allegedly deviates from what you perceive to be orthodox (Ati), however the purported validity of this distinction is precisely what many are questioning at the moment.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
I wholeheartedly agree. However Dzogchen realization and practice is not what is being discussed here. It is a straw man argument to say otherwise.

krodha wrote:
What aspect of Dzogchen is being discussed then?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:41 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
Check out Guy Newland's videos on Madhyamaka.

krodha wrote:
He explains how the onset of gzhan stong in Tibet simultaneously served to herald a renaissance in Atiyoga? Honestly I'm not on board with the validity of such a (dzogchen) revision to begin with, so I'm not sure how Guy Newland substantiates this alleged refinement of Ati by way of gzhan stong Madhyamaka.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 6:19 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
Well for one thing the whole "empty of other" view, regardless of sect, seems to have been a Tibetan development. It seems to have gained traction in the last few hundred years. Guy Newland has some YouTube videos that go over all that.

krodha wrote:
How does this development translate to the modernized treatment of Dzogpachenpo you're claiming it catalyzed?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 5:59 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
My dilettante's understanding is that this is a fairly modern interpretation/presentation of Dzogchen. If you want to stick with a more classical presentation that's ok too.

krodha wrote:
What is the basis for this theory of Atiyoga modernity leaning towards gzhan stong?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 4th, 2014 at 4:30 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
Dudjom R. said that Madhyamaka was great for an intellectual approach to emptiness, and Great Madhyamaka/Shentong was good for discussing emptiness from a meditational/experiential perspective. Great Madhyamaka is not subject to intellectual analysis the way Prasangika Madhyamaka is, and is approached through faith.

krodha wrote:
Semi off-topic, but just to point out; the association of gzhan stong with the moniker "Great Madhyamaka" is an arbitrary equivalence (since many other views have also received the title 'Great Madhyamaka'). You and Malcolm have discussed great Madhyamaka quite a few times:

Malcolm said:
It is sort of ridiculous to term gzhan stong "great madhyamaka" since it is a term used to describe several different positions amongst Tibetan Madhyamakas i.e. gzhan stong; the early Sakya/Nyingma view of free from extremes that goes right back to Kawa Paltseg, and of course Tsongkhapa's formulation.

The Indian texts also show no consistency in how the term is used, the anonymous pramāṇavidhvaṃsanaṭippiṭakavṛtti refers to its adherents as "great madhyamaka" and rejects the so called cittamatra madhyamaka [that Bhava advocates in the passage you reference] as inferior.

In reality, in the Indian context, "great madhyamaka is a term mostly used in tantric treatises; even here however it is used in various different ways. The Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaṣaḍaṇgatantrapañjikā by Avadhutipāda states:
"The nature of the completion [stage] is said to be mahāmadhyamaka".
On other hand, the Śrī-ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭīkāvohitaṭikā by Padmavajra states:

So called "madhyamaka" is the dharma of the essence, the freedom from four extremes of the mahāmadhyamaka of the Mahāyāna and the awakening of the fortunate.
Dombi Heruka's Śrīhevajrasādhana states:
One should mediate on the great madhyamaka free from all signs.
And the Tantric Candrakiriti's Samājābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states
Having manifested the mahāmadhyamaka that is like space,
the sunlight of compassion benefits all sentient beings
The first person to use this term [Great Madhyamaka] in Tibet was Kawa Paltseg. He uses the term dbu ma chen po to refer to spros bral, freedom from extremes. His presentation of Madhyamaka bears no observable commonalities with gzhan stong.

The Sakyapas follow Kawa Paltseg's point of view, and refer to their Madhyamaka as great Madhyamaka also. The Gelugpas also refer to Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view as Great Madhyamaka.

So basically, everyone in Tibet refers to their preferred system of Madhyamaka as "great". The term “great madhyamaka” has been used by all three primary Tibetan presentations of Madhyamaka, i.e. Tsongkhapa’s presentation of prasangika, the extrinsic emptiness school of the Jonangpas and the Sakya presentation known as “freedom from proliferation” or “freedom from extremes”.

Though the term “great madhyamaka” is not frequently used in the Sakya school to refer to our own presentation of Madhyamaka, it does occasionally crop up. The basis of the Great Madhyamaka of the Sakya masters is to be found primarily in the writings of Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen who states in his Great Song of Experience:

Freedom from extremes is beyond knowledge, expressions and objects,
Madhyamaka, Cittamatra and so on,
expressions in words are proliferations…
That view of Great Madhyamaka
is bliss free of delusion because it is not a proposition.

Another such instance may be found in the works of Lowo Khenchen, Sonam Lhundrup [1456-1532] who most notable for his expansions on Sakya Pandita’s famed Clarifying the Muni’s Intent [thub pa’i dgongs pa rab tu gsal]. In the brief work ,Ornamenting the Intent of Manjushri [thub pa dgongs gsal gyi 'chad thabs 'jam dbyangs dgongs rgyan], Lowo Khenchen identifies three strains of Madhyamaka:

Out of the three in Madhyamaka, the prasangikas maintain that one gradually enters the practice of the ten stages according to the explanations in The Introduction to Madhyamaka. The svatantrika madhyamikas maintain that one enters into the practice of Mahayāna through three stages of practice as it is explained in the Blaze of Dialectics “Not abandoning bodhicitta, correctly relying on the strict conduct of a muni, the search for understanding reality is the practice that accomplishes all aims”.

For the position of the third madhyamika, as Master Nāgārjuna states:

The Dharma taught by the Buddha
uses two truths.

Having gathered all phenomena into two truths, [they] maintain practice is applied to two classes of intellectual capacity, sharp and dull, of persons who are practicing those [two truths]:

When seeking reality, first
one should teach “everything exists”;
having comprehend meanings, and lacking desire,
later, [teach] absence.

Master Āryadeva teaches:

First, reject what is not meritorious,
in the middle, reject the self,
in the end, reject all views.

As Jetsun Rinpoche writes in the Great Song of Experience:

The supreme view is without views…
generally, there is no object to see in reality,
now, also, the view is not a view.
As for me, I will just stick with the great madhyamaka enunciated by Kawa Paltseg:

Freedom of two extremes in the ultimate
is asserted as the great madhyamaka.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 3:44 AM
Title: Re: Interview with Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje
Content:
Malcolm said:
Huh?

Most Madhyamakas before Tsongkhapas time were spros bral pas, and the Sakya school still is representative of that view, as is Mipham and Khenpo Shengga (who both studied Madhyamaka with Sakyapas).

I would not say that the main gsar ma view is represented by Gelug and Jonang approaches, since the Kagyus in general (Karma, Drugpa, Drikung, etc.) are all over the place when it comes to how they understand Madhyamaka.

krodha wrote:
Ah ok, makes sense. My Drikung Kagyu lama teaches spros bral and its true that the only view I've seen from the Sakya is spros bral… for some reason I was under the

impression that the other Kagyu schools leaned toward gzhan stong, but perhaps it is more mixed than I thought.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 3rd, 2014 at 12:52 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
smcj said:
You are welcome to your view. It is valid Dharma--no question about it. And you are welcome to not accept and criticize other views as being too close to Advaita Vedanta and therefore heresy, which is my understanding of your objection. You are trying to be protective of your understanding of orthodoxy.

krodha wrote:
It's called upholding samyag drsti.

If even my correct view is to be ultimately abandoned,
How much more incorrect views?
- Śākyamūni

smcj said:
That is fine. But it is not universally accepted, and there are masters that disagree with you. Mostly it seems the experts that disagree with you are more modern, as the view seems to have evolved over time (from my limited perspective).

krodha wrote:
Patently false.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 3:16 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
lorem said:
Dharmakaya. Tathāgatagarbha.

krodha wrote:
Though the sugatagarbha is latent, unrealized and/or unripened dharmakāya. All beings have sugatagarbha, few realize dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 2nd, 2014 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
krodha wrote:

Choiceless awareness by itself would be the mere cognizance [clarity] of mind. The point is to recognize the (definitive) nature of mind i.e. the nature of cognizance [clarity], as empty. Hence; nondual clarity and emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 3:44 PM
Title: Re: Trungpa, Tathagatagarbha, and "True Self"
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
I directly quoted the Buddha, and I didn't give you my opinion or interpretation.

krodha wrote:
That is highly debatable. Especially given that such a position blatantly ignores a great deal of the Buddha's views that directly contradict the position you are apparently proposing he solely advocated for. The complete disregard for the indisputable amount of evidence clearly showing that the buddha was very much involved with positions contrary to yours, comes off as very disingenuous and manipulative. But this is sort of your M.O.

Son of Buddha said:
so your question should say:
"Why should I trust your direct quote from Buddha Shakyamuni over those of any credible teacher of Buddha Dharma?"

krodha wrote:
This is really reaching.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I can attest to the fact that his vibrations are truly outstanding.

krodha wrote:
Like the Boys of Beach...
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 1st, 2014 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being

Content:
krodha wrote:
"...it explains in the text that this nature equally encompasses everything from dharmakāya right down to the hells. This means that the qualities or characteristics of nature are the same, but the nature itself is not the same at all. (So the misinterpretation is that) without knowing and distinguishing between these two, (you think that) there is one thing which pervades everything from dharmakāya down to the hells. That is mistaken. It says many things here. Vedanta has this idea, too. It is the characteristics which are the same... If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen view. Hopefully you have understood clearly."
-- Lopon Tenzin Namdak

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 11:41 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone here use reddit?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The ātmavādin agenda.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Btw, I have heard Anam Thubten use the word "brahman" in this context.

krodha wrote:
whatareyousomesortoftirthika.jpg

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
rachmiel said:
and he uses "ground of being" all the time, says that it is who we really are.

krodha wrote:

"Ground of being" is just a bad translation of 'gzhi', there's also a horrid Wikipedia page about the gzhi as a "ground of being", just goes to show how rampant misconceptions can become.

rachmiel said:
But, as I wrote in the OP, he also says the ground cannot be found, and does not exist (or NOT not exist).

krodha wrote:
Rhetoric like that is pointing to a freedom from extremes, but that means the middle is ultimately negated as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 31st, 2014 at 12:40 AM
Title: Re: Residing in the ground of being
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is no "ground of being".

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 30th, 2014 at 9:54 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone here use reddit?
Content:
PorkChop said:
Well, not sure if songhill is lumped in with them, but he apparently has a long history on Buddhist forums.

krodha wrote:
Then he's a senior high ranking officer in the True Self mob.

Removed quoted Ad Hom ~~Dan74

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 30th, 2014 at 8:45 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone here use reddit?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Son of Buddha posts there too, as well as others. Collectively they are the "r/Buddhism True Self mob".

Removed ad hom. ~~Dan74

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 29th, 2014 at 10:39 PM
Title: Re: Does anyone here use reddit?
Content:
krodha wrote:
r/Buddhism is fairly lively.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 28th, 2014 at 10:01 AM
Title: Re: Interested in Information about the Drikung Kagyu
Content:
M.G. said:
I have practiced it since, and took some playful teasing about it from my Dharma friends (who are mostly Nyingmapa)

krodha wrote:
Interesting being that Drikung Kagyu and the Nyingma have quite a bit in common.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 25th, 2014 at 1:43 PM
Title: Re: Interview with Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje
Content:
lorem said:
Even Dolpopa and Tsongkhapa. Does it really matter from the side of a practitioner? I actually like Dolpopa's view but Tsongkhapa's rings true also. I've never thought it nihilistic as such. Just not conceptually available and who can describe the undescribable. Can't be put into words.

krodha wrote:
Tsongkhapa and Dolbupa represent both the main gsar ma views; (i) gelug, and (ii) gzhan stong. The rnying ma view that Khenchen Rigdzin Dorje is discussing is (iii) spros bral, which is different from Tsongkhapa's Gelug and Dolbupa's gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 25th, 2014 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: Chapa Chökyi Senge refutes Prāsaṅgika?
Content:
lorem said:
Was it Nalanda who was in debate and had to call on Padmasambhawa as Senge Dongma.

krodha wrote:
Nālandā was the university/monastery the debate was held at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nalanda, and Padmasambhava emanated as Senge

Dradog (not Senge Dongma) because the debate between Padmasambhava and the tīrthika scholars escalated to a display of siddhis and magic. The non-buddhists made a threat with their magic, and Padmasambhava warned them that whatever provocation they had made was a bad idea, but the tīrthikas (underestimating Padmasambhava) scoffed at his remark and attacked anyway... so Padmasambhava emanated as Senge Dradog and destroyed them.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 22nd, 2014 at 11:47 AM
Title: Re: Is Buddha different from a rock?
Content:
smcj said:
Dudjom R.
Ultimate Reality is the mandala of the perfectly pure expanse of voidness. it is like a "magic" mirror. What unimpededly appears on it are all the things (dharmas) of relative reality, your mind included. (formatting mine)

Thus our minds are not the foundation for appearances, but are merely a type of appearance among all other appearances on the ultimate reality of this "magic mirror".

Dudjom R. continues:
There is not third reality of a truly existing mind or objets juxtaposed to the ultimate reality of the mirror and the relative reality of the images on it.

So everything is of this one nature, being nothing more than appearances on the ultimate reality of the "magic mirror". (Personally I believe that the correct term for this in English is monism.) And since Dudjom R. is commenting on Longchenpa who just equated ultimate reality with Buddha-nature, we can also call the magic mirror Buddha-nature. So you can say that a rock has the same fundamental Buddha-nature as a Buddha or sentient being, but obviously it is being expressed as an inanimate object, not an aware object.

Having said that I have no idea if that is the same as what Garuda is trying to say. I haven't really been able to figure out what his point is.

krodha wrote:
Ah, the iconic smcj Dudjom Rinpoche quote.

Monism would be a wrong view though, that conclusion is taking the mirror metaphor a little too literally IMO.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 21st, 2014 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Is Buddha different from a rock?
Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:
"I don't have to affirm or deny anything, therefore I am correct"..this is a highly questionable way of using notions of non duality or emptiness to further your own aims on the forum IMO, it's a way of avoiding defense of your positions.

krodha wrote:
It's called eel wriggling [amaravikkhepa].

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 20th, 2014 at 12:44 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
garudha said:
There can not be any "empting", "decohesion" or any "insubstantiality", etc etc, of that which does not exist.

krodha wrote:
And what are you suggesting does not exist?

garudha said:
Emptiness is just a teaching in relativity and not Buddha's absolute truth.

krodha wrote:
What is the buddha's absolute truth according to you? In general, emptiness is never considered to be a relative principle.

garudha said:
Shall we start with the sutra quotes? I'll be quoting Buddhist Sutra and not commentary or modern literature which I do not consider authoritative.

krodha wrote:
It would indeed be strange if you quoted text you don't consider to be authoritative.

garudha said:
In any case; if it can't be explained in normal, everyday, language then it's likely that the advocate does not have any idea what the words actually mean.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, perhaps not... something like this would really be contingent on context.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 20th, 2014 at 12:29 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:

This is literally the crux of the entire disagreements on the subject of Tathagatagarbha.

krodha wrote:
Not really.

Son of Buddha said:
Yogacara/Shentong Hold that the Unconditioned Tathagatagarbha/Trikaya are not illusions or unreal.
and only conditioned phenomena/Samsara are illusions and unreal.

krodha wrote:
No, they actually don't. The Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra, a Yogācāra text states:
Good son, the term 'unconditioned' is also a word provisionally invented by the First Teacher. Now, if the First Teacher provisionally invented this word, then it is a verbal expression apprehended by imagination. And, if it is a verbal expression apprehended by imagination, then, in the final analysis, such an imagined description does not validate a real thing. Therefore, the unconditioned does not exist.
Apart form the fact that the logic behind your suggestion of 'unreal conditioned phenomena opposing a truly real unconditioned nature' is atrocious and a massacre of the buddhadharma, gzhan stong merely states that the unconditioned is endowed with innate qualities, which is really no different than the so-called rang stong position they are allegedly contrasting. For if there is a truly existent and substantiated unconditioned nature, then qualities are impossible, mirroring Nāgārjuna's sentiments:
For those whom emptiness is possible, everything is possible, for those whom emptiness is not possible, nothing is possible.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 20th, 2014 at 7:23 AM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
garudha said:
I dispute there is any knowledge attainable.

Rephrasing the statement I made earlier, I show the Self is the only realm and conventional, already experienced, dimensionality is the absolute...

One who speaks about a knowable empty dimensionality, i.e. One who claims to be presently aware, necessarily voids the claimed emptiness-of-dimensionality by their very presence.

It follows, logically, that truly empty dimensionality is ultimately false and the true finality could only be the self which is already being experienced.

Therefore "emptiness" is not a teaching of the absolute and self is the ultimate dimensionality.

krodha wrote:
You appear to be misunderstanding what "emptiness" [śūnyatā] means. Rather than understanding emptiness to be denoting a lack of inherency, lack of substantiality, freedom from extremes etc., you seem to be mistaking it for a state of formless absorption [ārūpyadhātu] like the non-analytical cessations brought on through formless meditations [ārūpyadhyāna].

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 20th, 2014 at 6:32 AM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
garudha said:
When you're sure yourself why you're asking these questions, and you have a question that relates to Self / Non-self, I'm very happy to answer if you ask politely, courteously and show the necessary respect which one should have for oneself when communicating with others in public.
If you're not prepared to have a discussion based upon your own ideas then I see no point in continuing.

krodha wrote:
What's with the ultimatums and movements to establish (what you deem to be) acceptable conditions/boundaries that must be met in order to engage in further interaction (i.e., addressing people like they're five years old)?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 20th, 2014 at 3:16 AM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
garudha said:
You say that all "things" are like mirages, and as such I presume these things do not exist in true-reality.

krodha wrote:
Stating that all things are like mirages can hardly be called my own idea. The Ten Upamānas and Eight Examples of Illusion [skt. aṣṭamāyopamā, tib. sgyu ma'i dpe brgyad], from which the example of a mirage [skt. marīci] is originally derived, are fairly iconic metaphors found throughout the buddhadharma. Some of the earliest appearances of these metaphors appear in the Pheṇapiṇḍūpamasutta of the Saṃyuttanikāya:
Form is like a mass of foam, feeling like a bubble of water, perception is like a mirage, volition is like the trunk of a banana tree, consciousness is like a magic show: this is what the Buddha, a relative of the sun, has taught.
and the Dhammapada, v. 170:
See the world as a bubble of water, see it as a mirage. The lord of death does not see the person who considers the world in this way.

A mirage is used as an example of illusion in the Pañcaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra and is also used quite often by many of the prominent Madhyamaka luminaries; for example Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka:
Existence is like a burning brand brandished in a circle, a creation, a dream, a magic show, the moon reflected in water, a fog, an echo in the midst [of the mountains], a mirage, a cloud.
and from Nāgārjuna:
According to cognition of truth, [however], You maintain that there is no annihilation or permanence. [You] assert that the entire world is empty of substance, like a mirage.
-- Acintyastavaḥ
Those who see with their mind
That existence is like a mirage and an illusion,
They will not be corrupted
By views [grasping at] beginning and end.
-- Yuktiṣāṣṭikakārikā
Consciousness occurs in dependence on the internal and external sense-fields. Therefore consciousness is empty, like mirages and illusions... Karma-formations are like the city of gandharvas, illusions, mirages, nets of hair, foam, bubbles, phantoms, dreams, and wheels made with a firebrand.
-- Śūnyatāsaptati
Even the Laṅkāvatāra sūtra uses the mirage analogy:
Tell me how is the world like a magic show, a dream, like [a city] of the gandharvas, like a mirage and the moon reflected in water?
The Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra describes the logic (behind implementing the notion) of a mirage in communicating the view of emptiness:
When the light of the sun and the wind stir up the dust, there is a mirage; in the desert, it appears as if there were gazelles and, on seeing them, not knowing, we assume the presence of water. It is the same for the characteristics of male and female [strīpuruṣa]: when the sun of the fetters [saṃyojana] and the afflictions [kleśa] has heated up the dust of the formations [saṃskāra] and the wind of bad thoughts [mithyā manasikāra] swirls in the desert of transmigration [saṃsāra], the person without wisdom asserts the characteristics of male and female. This is a mirage.

Furthermore, if the sight of the mirage from afar calls up the notion of water, from close up this notion disappears. In the same way, when the ignorant person is far away from the holy doctrine [āryadharma], he is ignorant of the non-existence of self [anātman], the emptiness of dharmas [dharmaśūnyatā], and the attributes to the aggregates [skandha], the elements [dhātu] and the bases of consciousness [āyatana] the characteristics of a person, male or female [which are foreign to it]. But when he has come close to the holy dharma, he discovers the true nature of dharmas [dharmasatyalakṣaṇa] and scatters the illusions and false notions. This is why bodhisattvas regard dharmas as a mirage.
In Longchenpa's sgyu ma ngal gso he uses eight examples of illusion [sgyu ma'i dpe brgyad] (including a mirage) to explain the non-arising nature of phenomena, stating:
Like a dream, objects perceived with the five senses are not there, but they appear through delusion. Like a magic illusion, things are made to appear due to the temporary coming together of causes and conditions. Like a hallucination, things appear, yet there

is nothing there. Like a mirage, things appear, but they are not real. Like an echo, things can be perceived, but there is nothing there, either inside or outside. Like a city of gandharvas, there is neither a dwelling nor anyone to dwell. Like a reflection, things appear, but have no reality of their own. Like an apparition, there are different types of appearances, but they are not really there.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 19th, 2014 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
Sherab said:
In short you are merely saying that the conditioned and the unconditioned being mere conventional designations are in the end illusions or unreal.

krodha wrote:
I said more than that, that was simply the last point I mentioned. However yes if you're in a desert and see a mirage that you mistake to be an oasis; the oasis does not actually have a conditioned and/or unconditioned nature because the oasis is ultimately a figment of your confusion. Conventionally sure, there is an oasis which has an unconditioned mirage-nature, but not ultimately.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 19th, 2014 at 1:44 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
Sherab said:
I have come to loathe the using of mutually exclusive terms such as conditioned and unconditioned in an explanation of a buddhist term. It is makes no sense to speak of a thing as both conditioned and unconditioned.

krodha wrote:
The 'conditioned' is the allegedly existent thing, which is of course ultimately a misconception. In the context of the application of the buddhadharma (which intends to reveal the unreality of the allegedly existent thing), the appearance of the existent thing (to s/he who perceives said thing due to being under the influence of ignorance), is given the conventional title of being 'conditioned'. It is conditioned because for the ignorant sentient being, it appears to be a thing which has originated, endures in time, and will eventually cease. A buddha knows that there is no such thing, and that said thing is merely a misconception. Meaning; a buddha knows that the supposedly conditioned thing is in fact unconditioned... and so it is said that the conditioned thing possesses an unconditioned nature. Because in truth, said thing has never truly originated to begin with. Realizing the unreality of the conditioned thing, is cognizing its unconditioned nature.

In short; the 'conditioned' is the thing, the 'unconditioned' is the emptiness of said thing.

Both are merely conventional designations, because something that has never truly arisen in the first place cannot actually have a conditioned and/or unconditioned nature. The conditioned is a misconception, and the unconditioned is an epistemic insight regarding the fact that the conditioned is a misconception.

Sherab said:
The question then is, what does the term tathagatagarbha refers to? Something unconditioned, or something pure but conditioned, or something impure and conditioned? Until this is sorted out, the debate will continue to go round in circles.

krodha wrote:
The tathagatagarbha is one's unrealized, innate, unconditioned nature. It is like saying milk has a butter-nature... latent within the milk is the potential for it to become butter and if the right conditions are met, it can indeed become butter. So the milk is neither the same nor different than its nature.

Tathagatagarbha is the innate potentiality for buddhahood that all sentient beings possess. All beings possess that potentiality, however only buddhas have fully actualized that potential so that it is omniscient wisdom.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 3:16 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
your quote deals in relation to those who already belong to a hindu sect and hold heterodox self views for these people who hear about the Tathagatagarbha already hold mistaken views, which is why the counter medicine of Selflessness is applied for them.

krodha wrote:
It is addressing individuals like you who are drawn to an ātmavādin view, yet nevertheless are interested in the buddhadharma. One could argue you are exhibit A when it comes to demonstrating the upāya of the tathāgatagarbha. Although I still believe you err into a crypto-Vedanta type view.

Jigme Lingpa essentially echoes the same insight the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra addresses:
"In the lower vehicles this [ālaya] is taught as the buddha nature [tathāgatagarbha] for the sake of temporarily guiding the immature ones who are eaten by doubts regarding the stainless true condition."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 12:23 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
krodha wrote:

O Mahāmati, the tathāgatas thus teach the garbha in so far as they teach the tathāgatagarbha in order to attract those who are attached to the heterodox ātmavāda. How can people whose minds fall into the conceptual theory bearing on an unreal self (abhūtātmavikalpa) attain quickly the complete awakening in the supreme and exact sambodhi, possessing a mind comprised in the domain of the three gateways of emancipation? O Mahāmati, it is because of this that the tathāgatas teach the tathāgatagarbha.
-- Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 18th, 2014 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
The dharmakaya appears for the first level bodhisattvas, not only to Buddhas:

krodha wrote:
First bhūmi bodhisattvas can see the basis dharmakāya, Buddhas know the result dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 17th, 2014 at 11:46 PM
Title: Re: So what is the Tathagatagarbha?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tathāgatagarbha only becomes an issue when people interpret it literally and end up advocating for a crypto-Vedanta type view where dharmatā is suggested to exist separately from conditioned dharmas.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 17th, 2014 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Mastering phowa
Content:
krodha wrote:
Relevant outtake from "Looking for ancient Tibet" about Phowa. Briefly discusses the signs of successful practice and the use of the kuśa grass blade to signify said success:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 17th, 2014 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Mastering phowa
Content:
zenman said:
Does the swelling mean that the skin has swelled a bit on the crown area? How big can this swelling be? Like finger tip size or something like that?

krodha wrote:
Out of curiosity, are you practicing this at home without the guidance of a teacher?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 13th, 2014 at 10:37 AM
Title: Re: First time questions
Content:
tiagolps said:
...and i'm not sure if its true but also heard tibetan temples used to fight each other for young monks? Not sure about that one though.

krodha wrote:
Anti-Tibetan propaganda, no doubt.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 8:49 AM
Title: Re: What should kin do during First Bardo?
Content:
veryken said:
I'm still curious to learn (now 13 days after my Grandmother's death and funeral was yesterday) about the further details of the intermediate states.

As I understand, the circumstances of her passing matters. This is what I've always believed even before studying Buddhism. She was peaceful and quiet on her last day, or so I'm told. I did not witness it. She died in bed after suffering painful paralysis with complications requiring drugs that included morphine at some point, all of which I did eyewitness (sadly). She then apparently eased into a near-comatose condition after more days, barely recognizing family and not able to eat, drink, etc.

But I'm told the moment of death was peaceful, and her mouth was naturally closed. So I'm told.

My burning questions relate to the first intermediate state after death. First, what's the duration of the First Bardo? Then more importantly, what should the family do during this period to help the "consciousness" find the proper path? Or what would monastics do in assistance to the family?

As for her merits, it would be obvious to anybody that she was a very good person her entire life. Those who really knew her may occasionally catch a few moments of regret — maybe trivial to others who rationalize their own nonvirtue, but sadly remembered by a 98-yr old woman with fading memory. I try to take everything into account.

krodha wrote:
There's four, six or seven bardos depending on the system concerned.

The Four Bardos:
1. the natural bardo of this life (Skt. jatyantarābhava; Tib. རང་བཞིན་སྐྱེ་བའི་བར་དོ་; Wyl. rang bzhin skye ba'i bar do) which begins when a connection with a new birth is first made and continues until the conditions that will certainly lead to death become manifest.

2. the painful bardo of dying (Skt. mumūrṣāntarābhava; Tib. འཆི་ཁ་གནད་གཅོད་ཀྱི་བར་དོ་; Wyl. 'chi kha gnad gcod kyi bar do) which begins when these conditions manifest and continues until the 'inner respiration' ceases and the luminosity of the dharmakaya dawns.

3. the luminous bardo of dharmata (Skt. dharmatāntarābhava; Tib. ཆོས་ཉིད་འོད་གསལ་གྱི་བར་དོ་; Wyl. chos nyid 'od gsal gyi bar do) which lasts from the moment the dharmakaya luminosity dawns after death and continues until the visions of precious spontaneous perfection are complete.

4. the karmic bardo of becoming (Skt. bhāvāntarābhava; Tib. སྲིད་པ་ལས་ཀྱི་བར་དོ་; Wyl. srid pa las kyi bar do) which lasts from the moment the bardo body is created and continues until the connection with a new rebirth is made.
The six bardos include the above four plus these two which are part of the first bardo listed above (the natural bardo of this life):
5. the bardo of meditation (Skt. samādhyantarābhava; Tib. བསམ་གཏན་གྱི་བར་དོ་, Wyl. bsam gtan gyi bar do)

6. the bardo of dreaming (Skt. svapanāntarābhava; Tib. རྨི་ལམ་གྱི་བར་དོ་, Wyl. rmi lam gyi bar do)
The seven bardos are found in the Bönpo teachings and closely resemble the sixfold model above.

By the "First Bardo" I take it you mean the 'bardo of dying' mentioned above? Once death has occurred the bardo of dying consists of the dissolution of the elements, which is apparently quite painful and that will cause most people to lose consciousness or 'faint'. That loss of consciousness causes one to miss the arising of the bardo of dharmatā and regain consciousness again either (i) in the midst of the bardo of dharmatā, or (ii) in the bardo of becoming. Even those who do not lose consciousness (in the bardo of dying) are not guaranteed to recognize the bardo of dharmatā when it arises if they are not trained to recognize it. In order to remain lucid throughout the entire process one must be very stable in their practice. Essentially, if one is not able to recognize dreams while sleeping and dream lucidly, then there is not much hope of maintaining awareness in the bardo. When you see the Bardo Tödrol Chenmo [The Great Liberation through Hearing in the Bardo] being read to those who have passed, the first two bardos are addressed and the aim is to help the individual

become aware and recognize their nature... however after that the goal is to help them traverse the bardo of becoming.

Here is a link for the bardos:
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Bardo

And the Bardo Tödrol Chenmo:
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Bardo_Th " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;ödrol_Chenmo

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 7:48 AM
Title: Re: Why Buddha rejected the concept of Higher Self
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Laṅkāvatāra sūtra states:
"Tathāgatagarbha, known as 'the all-base consciousness' [ālayavijñāna], is to be completely purified."

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 5:41 AM
Title: Re: Buddhapalita's Mulamadhyamakavrtti Translation Project
Content:
Bakmoon said:
What a coincidence. I was just thinking today about whether or not Buddhapalita's commentary had been translated. I'm looking forward to finally reading Buddhapalita's commentary.

Have any other major Indian commentaries on the Mulamadhyamakakarika been translated into English, such as Bhavaviveka's commentary or Chandrakirti's commentary?

krodha wrote:
Candrakīrti's commentary titled the Prasannapadā has been translated into english by Mervyn Sprung; "The Essential Chapters from the Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti" first published in 1979 by Prajñā Press... and also a translation by J.D. Dunne and S.L. McClintock titled "Lucid Words: A Commentary on Nāgārjuna's Wisdom by Candrakīrti", which is apparently a draft translation from 2001.

Bhāvaviveka's Prajñāpradīpa [Prajñāpradīpamūlamadhyamakavṛtti] has been translated into english by William L. Ames it seems, circa 1986-1989, although it appears to be a dissertation or monograph... perhaps partly published (six chapters) through the University of Washington, 1986.

There may be others.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 12th, 2014 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: Why Buddha rejected the concept of Higher Self
Content:
krodha wrote:
Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche addressing the 'higher self', he essentially says it is the pinnacle of samsara (which is still samsara):

"Then the monkey discovers that he can go beyond the sensual plea-sures and beauties of the god realm and enter into the dhyana or concen-tration states of the realm of the formless gods, which is the ultimate refinement of the six realms. He realizes that he can achieve purely men-tal pleasure, the most subtle and durable of all, that he is able to maintain his sense of a solid self continuously by expanding the walls of his prison to seemingly include the whole cosmos, thereby conquering change and death. First he dwells upon the idea of limitless space. He watches limit-less space; he is here and limitless space is there and he watches it. He imposes his preconception on the world, creates limitless space, and feeds himself with this experience. Then the next stage is concentration upon the idea of limitless consciousness. Here one does not dwell on limitless space alone, but one also dwells upon the intelligence which perceives that limitless space as well. So ego watches limitless space and consciousness from its central headquarters. The empire of ego is com-pletely extended, even the central authority cannot imagine how far its territory extends. Ego becomes a huge, gigantic beast.

Ego has extended itself so far that it begins to lose track of the bound-ary of its territory. Wherever it tries to define its boundary, it seems to exclude part of its territory. Finally, it concludes that there is no way of defining its boundaries. The size of its empire cannot be conceived or imagined. Since it includes everything, it cannot be defined as this or that. So the ego dwells on the idea of not this and not that, the idea that it cannot conceive or imagine itself. But finally even this state of mind is surpassed when the ego realizes that the idea that it is inconceivable and unimaginable is in itself a conception. So the ego dwells on the idea of not not this, and not not that. This idea of the impossibility of asserting anything is something which ego feeds on, takes pride in, identifies with, and therefore uses to maintain its continuity. This is the highest level of concentration and achievement that confused, samsaric mind can attain."
-- Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 11th, 2014 at 1:23 AM
Title: Buddhapalita's Mulamadhyamakavrtti Translation Project
Content:
krodha wrote:
A project to translate Buddhapalita’s Commentary to Nagarjuna’s Fundamental

Wisdom of the Middle Way

Project website:
http://www.buddhapalitavrtti.com/index.php

Link to download a draft translation of chapters 1 and 2:
http://buddhapalitavrtti.com/BUDDHAPALITAVRITTI_CHAPTERS_1_%20AND_2.pdf

About the text:

Buddhapalita Mulamadhyamakavritti
The translation of the Commentary to Fundamental Wisdom called Buddhapalita (Buddhapalita-mulamadhyamakavrtti; dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa Buddhapalita) by Buddhapalita (sangs rgyas bskyangs) will be based on the version translated by Jñanagarbha and Cog ro klu'i rgyal mtshan (Derge 3842, mdo 'grel, tsa 158b1-281a4) with reference to the critical edition prepared by Max Welleser (editor) Buddhapalita. Mulamadhyamakavrtti. Motilal Banarsidas. India, 1992.

The structure of the text:

Buddhapalita's work is a word commentary to the Fundamental Wisdom (MMK) of Nagarjuna also translated by Jñanagarbha and Cog Ro Klu'i Rgyal Mtshan (Derge 3824, mdo 'grel, tsa 1a1-19a6). The Fundamental Wisdom has twenty-seven chapters dealing with a variety of subjects. Buddhapalita has maintained the structure of Nagarjuna's text without adding further categories or subdivisions, implying that Buddhapalita was satisfied with the structure as it stood, and he did not elaborate a more detailed exegetical framework. The only structural divisions found in the text are the ten sections (bam po) which divide the text into ten parts of equal length.

The twenty-seven chapters of the Fundamental Wisdom cover a variety of metaphysical and ordinary categories:

1. Investigation of conditions (rkyen)
2. Investigation of coming and going (’gro ‘ong)
3. Investigation of sense powers (dbang po)
4. Investigation of aggregates (phung po)
5. Investigation of realms (khams)
6. Investigation of attachment and the attached person (’dod chags dang chags pa)
7. Investigation of generation, abidance, and destruction (skye ba dang gnas pa dang ‘jig pa)
8. Investigation of agents and actions (byed pa po dang las)
9. Investigation of prior existence (snga rol nas gnas pa)
10. Investigation of fire and firewood (me dang bud shing)
11. Investigation of former and latter limits (sngon dang phyi ma’i mtha’)
12. Investigation of made by self and made by other (bdag gis byas pa dang gzhan gyis byas pa)
13. Investigation of compositional factors (’du byas)

14. Investigation of meeting (’phrad pa)
15. Investigation of essence (rang bzhin)
16. Investigation of bondage and liberation (bcings pa dang thar pa)
17. Investigation of actions (las)
18. Investigation of self and dharma (bdag dang chos)
19. Investigation of time (dus)
20. Investigation of collections (tshogs pa)
21. Investigation of arisal and destruction (’byung ba dang ‘jig pa)
22. Investigation of the tathagata (de bzhin gshegs pa)
23. Investigation of distortion (phyin ci log)
24. Investigation of arya truths (’phags pa’i bden pa)
25. Investigation of nirvana (mya nga las ‘das pa)
26. Investigation of the twelve links of existence (srid pa’i yan lag bcu gnyis)
27. Investigation of views (lta ba)

History of the project:

During his visit to Sydney in December 2009, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama spoke of the importance of understanding Nagarjuna’s presentation of emptiness through relying on the commentaries of Buddhapalita and Candrakirti. In particular he mentioned that Buddhapalita’s Mulamadhyamakavrtti was an excellent commentary to Nagarjuna’s Fundamental Wisdom. But when I inquired about this work it became increasingly clear that to date no complete English translation has been undertaken.

We contacted Thubten Jinpa who is the Principal Translator for His Holiness The Dalai Lama and he said "taking on this project is a very worthy project. Traditionally too, according to the legend, it is at a crucial point of reading of chapter 18 of this text, that Tsongkhapa gained sudden insight into the ultimate nature of reality." So with his encouragement we set about to address this omission and to produce and publish a complete and accurate translation of this highly regarded commentary. Through this website, we hope to raise awareness about the project and provide the opportunity to actively sponsor this meritorious undertaking.

Following the success of this project we plan to sponsor additional key works within the Tibetan Buddhist Tradition. This website provides a simple means for those interested in supporting this project to make donations and receive current information on the progress of the project. The estimated total cost for translation, preparing a critical edition, foreword and introduction is AU$27,800. For information on the cost breakdown please click here or if you require any additional information about this or other potential future projects please contact me.

Alan Carter
Project Coordinator

About the translator:

Dr Ian Coghlan (Jampa Ignyen) is currently engaged in research on a range of Buddhist

topics. His qualifications include completion of the traditional fifteen year Geshé Degree course in Tibetan Buddhism, covering the five core topics: middle way view, perfection of wisdom, logic, ethics, and metaphysics, at Sera Monastic University, India (1980-1995) and a PhD in Asian Studies at La Trobe University focusing on Tibetan Buddhist metaphysics.

He is a translator for the Institute of Tibetan Classics (ITC), Montreal, Canada. This body is one of the peak institutions for the translation of Tibetan Buddhist works, and its director Professor Geshé Thubten Jinpa is the principal translator to the Dalai Lama. The ITC is primarily engaged in producing a series called "The Library of Tibetan Classics" (LTC) which involves the preparation of critical Tibetan editions, their English translations, and introductions.

His contribution to this series will be volumes 22 and 23, which are currently being finalized for publication by Wisdom, Boston. He is also a translator for the Segyu Foundation, California and an adjunct research fellow at Monash Asia Institute, Monash University, Melbourne.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 10th, 2014 at 5:48 AM
Title: Re: Concept-free Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Malcolm shared this quote some time ago, which is relevant to this issue:

Malcolm said:
In addition, a so called “pandita” is described as “A scholar in the foundation of outer and inner objects of knowledge.” A so called “kusali” is described as “One who has the most dedication inwardly after severing all outer distractions.”
In terms of actual perfect Buddhahood: the first, having become knowledgeable about all objects of knowledge, has severed doubt through hearing, reflection and meditation. Then, because of severing doubt through meditating which makes samadhi essential, the pandita gradually attains Buddhahood after actualizing the Dharma of realization. A kusali necessarily has the same basis, but when considered alone, a pandita is closer to Buddhahood.
-- Sakya Pandita

krodha wrote:
The point being that a so-called "pandita" has an advantage over the kusali because the pandita has the benefit of having severed doubt in relation to all three prajñās [hearing, reflection, meditation]. Whereas the kusali does not possess the benefit of the prajñā of hearing or the prajñā of reflection to the same degree that a pandita does, and that creates a disadvantage for the kusali.

Also, regarding the 'conceptual' versus the 'non-conceptual' aspects of practice; Dudjom Lingpa addresses the claim that involvement with (provisional) conceptual

views and practices is a hindrance to the ultimate non-conceptual view. He attests that it is not, and uses the analogy of an ear which has water trapped in it, citing that one of the most effective ways of removing that trapped water is actually pouring more water into the ear, which will successfully wash out the water which is initially trapped leaving the ear free of water. His point being that in the same way, the use of concepts and learning (within the context of the buddhadharma), serves the same purpose.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 9th, 2014 at 1:49 PM
Title: Re: When you die, do you go to Heaven? Why or why not?
Content:
veryken said:
They "simply go through the bardo." Yes.

But...

Afflicted aggregates? Illusion of consistency? Habitual tendencies creating the appearance of a sentient being? DELUDED sentient beings for that matter? Ignorant ones, sure. An unreal charade?!

If I wasn't already middle-aged, successful enough, and steadfast on the path to enlightenment, I would be totally scared out of my mind! Surely there has to be more encouraging words? I'm still heart broken for the loss of my Grandmother.

krodha wrote:
Ah, sorry man you seemed like you wanted to delve deeper into the topic than the basic stuff that had been shared so far, my apologies.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 9th, 2014 at 10:55 AM
Title: Re: When you die, do you go to Heaven? Why or why not?
Content:
veryken said:
Thank you for the replies.

Your respectful quotation of my word "heaven" makes it even more elusive (for me to understand). I've actually always thought that there was "no heaven" — that even the word "heaven" is a misnomer in Buddhism, not to speak of its impermanence.

krodha wrote:
I mean, yes it is essentially a misnomer but there's no problem with referring to the deva realm as 'heaven' in a conventional sense (in the same way we conventionally refer to the lowest realm of the Naraka, as the 'hell realm' [avīci]).

veryken said:

And upon looking up the terms you used, I'm more referring to people rather than Devas in the Samsara cycle. Surely nobody (living today) has direct personal experience of heaven. But in a rephrase of my question (which actually isn't my own question but one for sake of discussion) — is it wrong/ imprecise/ misguided to say "now that she has died, we want her to go directly to heaven?" (and therefore we must do this and that yadda yadda yadda during the Buddhist funeral, etc.)

krodha wrote:
At death sentient beings simply go through the bardo. If they fail to recognize the nature of their mind in the bardo (which would liberate them) then they are reborn. So you can say 'now that she has died, I hope she has a swift and high rebirth'... but in the context of the buddhadharma there is no heaven in the bardo.

In the ultimate sense however the entire process is illusory...

Essentially all that is reincarnating (or being 'reborn') are causes and conditions, which is the only thing that is ever occurring. Afflicted aggregates beget afflicted aggregates, each serving as simultaneous cause and effect. So there is no individual 'soul' or entity as such that is being reborn... and ironically, the fact that there is no inherent soul or permanent entity is precisely why rebirth is possible. The buddhadharma simply states that by way of pratītyasamutpāda [dependent co-origination]; causes and conditions proliferate ceaselessly where there is a fertile basis for said proliferation. These factors create the illusion of consistency in conditoned phenomena (phenomena capable of existing and/or not-existing), and the illusion of an enduring entity which was allegedly born, exists in time and will eventually cease. Ultimately, the so-called entity is simply patterns of afflicted propensities, habitual tendencies etc. however over time, these factors become fortified and solidified creating the appearance of an autonomous sentient being. The point of the buddhadharma is to cut through this dense build up of conditioning and ideally dispel it altogether.

Rebirth is the result of unceasing karmic (cause and effect) activity. If ignorance of the unreality of that activity is not uprooted, then said activity simply persists indefinitely. An easy example is the fact that we wake up in the morning with the feeling that we are the same individual who fell asleep the night before, however all that has persisted are aggregates that appropriate further aggregates, ad infinitum. We as deluded sentient beings do not realize that there is no actual continuity to the appearance of these so-called aggregates, and so that ignorance acts as fuel for further unfolding of the illusion of a substantiated, core, essential identity in persons and phenomena (and the habitual behavior and conditioning predicated upon that ignorance serves as the conditions for the continual arising of said illusion). If these causes and conditions are not resolved then the process simply goes on and on through apparent lifetimes, the entire process being akin to an unreal charade.

From Nāgārjuna's Pratītyadsamutpādakarika:
"Empty (insubstantial and essenceless) dharmas (phenomena) are entirely produced from dharmas strictly empty; dharmas without a self and [not] of a self. Words, butter lamps, mirrors, seals, fire crystals, seeds, sourness and echoes. Although the

aggregates are serially connected, the wise are to comprehend nothing has transferred. Someone, having conceived of annihilation, even in extremely subtle existents, he is not wise, and will never see the meaning of ‘arisen from conditions’."

and In his Pratītyasamutpādakarikavhyakhyana, Nāgārjuna states in reply to a question:
Question: "Nevertheless, who is the lord of all, creating sentient beings, who is their creator?"
Nāgārjuna replies: "All living beings are causes and results."

And in the same text:
"Therein, the aggregates are the aggregates of matter, sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness. Those, called ‘serially joined’, not having ceased, produce another produced from that cause; although not even the subtle atom of an existent has transmigrated from this world to the next."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 9th, 2014 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: When you die, do you go to Heaven? Why or why not?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In buddhism, "heaven" is essentially a peaceful higher realm called a 'deva loka'. It is the highest realm among the six realms of samsara, however being that it is still part of samsāra it is viewed as a relative state and it therefore (i) does not last, and (ii) in the grand scheme of things is really no better than any of the five other realms. Devas live much longer than humans but they too eventually die. Samsara is unceasing, meaning the rounds of birth and death never end unless one is liberated. Buddhas are no longer reborn in samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 9th, 2014 at 8:27 AM
Title: Re: When you die, do you go to Heaven? Why or why not?
Content:
krodha wrote:
These documentaries may help explain the Tibetan Buddhist view on death:

The Tibetan Book Of The Dead: The Great Liberation
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

and,

Secret Tibetan Book Of The Dead

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

and,

The Tibetan Book of The Dead: A Way of Life
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 8th, 2014 at 11:38 AM
Title: Re: Death, Karma, Heaven, Rebirth
Content:
veryken said:
However, in anybody interested in offering a direct reply for purposes of discussion? I asked very specific questions after having searched and researched. I won't get offended if you use my Grandmother as an example, but some background info on her has been provided if you might find yourself off base.

krodha wrote:
I'm sure you'll get some more replies soon, it's midnight U.S. east coast time and 4 or 5am in Europe so it's sort of a dead zone timewise for people to be active online and posting.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 8th, 2014 at 9:54 AM
Title: Re: Death, Karma, Heaven, Rebirth
Content:
krodha wrote:
The bardo is what you're looking for:
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bardo

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 7th, 2014 at 9:03 AM
Title: Re: Eyes open meditation question
Content:
blackghost said:
...as I understand it there should be some kind of soft focus in the space between the eyes and the floor, possibly with the eyes half closed. I'm finding this a bit tricky even

after a few weeks with not knowing how much focussing/lack of focussing to do and how much visual blur is normal when doing this practice as when I relax the eyes I tend to go somewhat cross-eyed and everything seems to start moving around which doesn't seem ideal. Does anyone know of a link to some detailed instructions regarding what to do regarding eyes-open sitting or any suggestions from anyone who has some good experience with this would be welcome. Many thanks.

krodha wrote:
This is a gazing technique that is used in certain systems in order to use space as a support. In terms of śamatha [tib. zhi gnas] this would usually follow a period of time where an external object is used for support. So first śamatha with support (focus on an object), then śamatha without support (focus on space). There are other practices (besides śamatha) that implement gazes like this but they require transmission.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 6th, 2014 at 9:21 AM
Title: Re: Back problems
Content:
Greg_the_poet said:
Has anyone used this approach and has it helped with any back pains?

krodha wrote:
That method is commonly used by yogins doing practices that involve sitting for extended periods of time. They use meditation belts [gom tag] though rather than tying fabric. You can also get a meditation stick [gom ten] to lean on as well.

I'm not sure where you're located but here in the U.S. drug stores like Walgreens carry walking canes, retractable metal ones and or the full size wooden kind. The retractable metal ones are generally the right size for sitting when fully collapsed (the handle tucked under the armpit), however the wooden canes can be cut to the right size as well.

As for the belts I know certain online stores carry them, or perhaps certain dharma events (I bought mine at a retreat).

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 6th, 2014 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Concept-free Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
A1 and A2 are essentially synonymous. A1 is addressing the individual who has knowledge of their ultimate nature and A2 is addressing the nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 6th, 2014 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Concept-free Buddhism
Content:
rachmiel said:
Is there a school of Buddhism that sees realized existence as existence without concepts? (Including such foundational conceptual structures as: reincarnation, karma, the Noble Truths, etc.)

krodha wrote:
All schools of Buddhism teach that one's ultimate nature as free of all concepts. Karma, rebirth, the path laid out by the four noble truths, all apply to the relative condition of afflicted sentient beings (which is all of us)... only Buddhas are free of karma, rebirth and have no need for the path.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 6th, 2014 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: Concept-free Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Lists, practices, paths, doctrines, laws, dogma, etc., are all conventional supports to help realize your non-conceptual nature. Since they're ultimately merely conventions (like everything else) they shouldn't be an issue and there's really no reason to actively pursue a 'concept free' route. Besides, they're just tools and it's useful to implement tools, we have no problem using our computer in a light and free manner... one should be able to relate to paths, doctrines etc., in the same way. In most cases one ends up making a job far more difficult without the proper tools, same goes for practicing the buddhadharma.

Really if you're looking to dispense with lists, practices, paths, doctrines, laws, dogma, this means you're looking at these things as something inherent that needs to be abandoned instead of viewing them as conventional supports. Alot of secular type paths fall victim to this mistake, they see some elements of the dharma as unnecessary and seek to transform the teachings into something perhaps more "modern" etc., and all they end up doing is eviscerating the teaching so it is crippled beyond hope of repair and unable to produce its intended results. Those individuals have been conditioned all their lives to see things inherently and therefore cannot relate to doctrine, paths, lists, practices in a free and easy way. Anders is right the freedom is in how you relate to those concepts, not in rejecting them.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 4th, 2014 at 2:57 AM
Title: Re: American tulku gets Ebola
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also found this info:

NBC cameraman Ashoka Mukpo, 33, has been infected with Ebola in Liberia. He is the son of Buddhist monk Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche and Lady Diana Judith Mukpo, however, his biological father is Dr. Mitchell Levy whom Lady Diana had been sleeping with at the time. Ashoka's mother married the Tibetan Buddhist lama when she was just 16. Trungpa identified Ashoka as a 'tulku', a reincarnation of a Tibetan teacher. NBC's Dr. Nancy Snyderman and her crew have quarantined themselves for 21 days over fears they they might have contracted Ebola, as well.

Dailymail article:
http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2779257/NBC-cameraman-Ebola-reincarnation-Tibetan-teacher-mother-married-Buddhist-guru-16.html

Shambhala Times article:
http://shambhalatimes.org/2014/10/02/important-news-about-ashoka-mukpo/

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 1st, 2014 at 4:13 AM
Title: Re: Endless lives, past and ahead
Content:
Lindama said:
edit: this is not zen, for sure.

krodha wrote:
It surely is, but believe whatever you'd like...

Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō:

5.386 "If people who study Buddha Dharma have no genuine faith or true mindfulness, they will certainly dispense with and ignore [the law of] causality."

7.504 "Tathagatas [Buddhas] never go beyond clarifying cause and effect"

7.510 "Students of the way cannot dismiss cause and effect. If you discard cause and effect, you will ultimately deviate from practice-realization."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 27th, 2014 at 3:09 PM
Title: Re: What are the signs of a successful spiritual practice?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"What are the signs of progress in our practice? What can we expect? Should we wait for a signal from the guru – or an award? According to Karma Chagme Rinpoche, we will have no experiences, no special dreams, no pure visions. The 'king of all signs,' also known as the 'sign of no-sign,' which was highly prized by the Kagyupa masters of the past, is when renunciation mind, sadness and devotion blaze in your mind. The signs to

be cherished most include an escalating appetite for dharma practice; noticing the futility of everything you do; everincreasing conflicts as a result of old habits; and while you may still have the urge to party with your friends, to be plagued by the unwelcome sense that the whole thing is a useless waste of time.

Therefore do not constantly aim to finish the practice. Instead, try to accept that your spiritual journey will never end. Your journey began with the wish that you, personally, bring all sentient beings to enlightenment, so until that wish is fulfilled, your activities as a bodhisattva will never cease."
- Dzongsar Jamyang Khyentse Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 6:28 AM
Title: Buddha Ken Doll
Content:
krodha wrote:
Apparently an artist couple are making Ken and Barbie doll religious figures, including Buddha Ken...

http://www.sienteamerica.com/posts/10312-polemica-en-argentina-por-barbie-y-ken-religiosos

And Kali Barbie:
http://www.upi.com/Odd_News/2014/09/23/Plastic-prophets-Barbies-become-religious-icons/1581411483771/

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 6:02 AM
Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni
Content:
garudha said:
What exactly is this "nescience entrenchment" ?

krodha wrote:
Ridding Oneself of the Two Sets of Obscurations in Sutra and Highest Tantra According to Nyingma and Sakya:
http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/sutra/level4_deepening_understanding_path/path/eliminating_2_sets_obscurations.html

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 26th, 2014 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: Contesting constant non-dual awareness of Shakyamuni
Content:
garudha said:

According to Doctrine of Buddhism such feelings are non-existent and cannot be apprehended.

krodha wrote:
That should say: "According to Doctrine of Buddhism such feelings are ultimately non-existent and cannot be apprehended."

However if we grasp at the ultimate then all we end up doing is advocating for a nihilist view.

Jigme Lingpa calls this type of view 'being sealed by a definitive view of emptiness', it can potentially be a major deviation if uncorrected.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 13th, 2014 at 5:08 AM
Title: Re: H.H. XIV Dalai Lama says he should be the Last Dalai Lam
Content:
krodha wrote:
Stephen Colbert on "The Dalai Lama Drama":

http://thecolbertreport.cc.com/videos/lqm25y/dalai-lama-drama

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 12th, 2014 at 2:32 PM
Title: Re: The Secret Drugs of Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Interesting, never heard of that theory.

Apart from their feathers symbolizing visionary appearances (thigles, etc., which are not drug induced), the association of the Peacock in Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna is traditionally interpreted in this way:

All of us experience states of mind that cause us to feel anxious, depressed, fearful, uncertain, insecure, envious, doubtful, impatient. These feelings can seem so powerful at times that we try to eradicate them as quickly as possible through the usual methods: we try to repress them, drink them away, shop them away, frak them away, blame them away, or whatever it is we do when we experience sensations that aren’t pleasing to us.

Following are the first three verses from a teaching called "The wheel of Sharp Weapons", written by Dharmaraksita:

1. In jungles of poisonous plants strut the peacocks, though medicine gardens of beauty lie near, The masses of peacocks do not find gardens pleasant, but thrive on the essence of poisonous plants.

2. In similar fashion the brave Bodhisattvas remain in the jungle of worldly concern. No matter how joyful this world's pleasure gardens, these Brave Ones are never attracted to pleasures, but thrive in the jungle of suffering and pain.

3. We spend our whole life in the march for enjoyment, yet tremble with fear at the mere thought of pain; thus since we are cowards, we are miserable still, but the brave Bodhisattvas accept suffering gladly, and gain from their courage a true lasting joy.

While preparing for a dharma talk about this subject last week, I learned that peacocks aren't very particular with regard to what kinds of food they'll eat: the brighter in color the object is, the better. They are drawn to a variety of plants and insects, and in fact they will even eat poisonous snakes if they come across one that's colorful enough. What's even more interesting is that just for the sake of amusement they will follow around a slithering, poisonous snake for a while, just observing it curiously before they devour it. And it is said that the poison they ingest from plants and snakes actually makes the colors of their plumage all the more vibrant and beautiful.

What if changed our approach to difficult, poisonous states of mind and met them with the same courage and curiosity as a peacock?

Instead of running away from every mind state and emotion that feels threatening, we could simply observe the thoughts and sensations attached to these states of mind without getting caught up in the story about how they came about and who or what is to blame.

Fixating on our stories only serves to inflame the poisonous feelings. Of course it is important to acknowledge what kinds of circumstances in our lives might be contributing and creating the conditions for suffering, and we should work to alter those circumstances whenever appropriate. But eventually we have to take responsibility for our own states of mind and realize that external events should not be able to dictate when we feel well and when we do not.

We mustn't be our brain's bitch.

We liberate ourselves by simply resting our minds on the challenging feelings we experience without the usual overlay of our thoughts about how good or bad it feels, or why we feel this way, or who is to blame for how we feel. We can drop the storyline, drop the constant inner commentary, drop the ideas and concepts about what we are experiencing and instead directly experience the reality of our life as it is at any given moment. We don't have to obsess over negative emotions and we don't have to chase them away either--we can simply notice them the way we notice our thoughts when we meditate: with bare, brave attention.

When we do this we can further cultivate qualities of love and compassion that we can apply towards ourselves and other people. We can make use of our painful mind states and transform them into something that opens our hearts and allows us to be of more

service to others.

By immersing ourselves in the reality of our moment to moment experience we can make friends with impermanence and ride it's wave rather than have it crash over us and cause us to drown.
-Lawrence Grecco

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: time for a long sleep.
Content:
krodha wrote:
Incidentally, today is World Suicide Prevention Day...

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 11th, 2014 at 12:22 AM
Title: Re: H.H. XIV Dalai Lama says he should be the Last Dalai Lam
Content:
krodha wrote:
China tells Dalai Lama again to respect reincarnation
BEIJING Wed Sep 10, 2014 5:31am EDT

(Reuters) - China repeated a call on the Dalai Lama on Wednesday to respect what it said was the historic practice of reincarnation, after the exiled Tibetan spiritual leader implied in a newspaper interview he may be the last to hold the position.

The Dalai Lama, in an interview with German newspaper Welt am Sonntag, said the tradition of the post could end with him, adding the Tibetan Buddhism was not dependent on a single person.

The Dalai Lama, 79, has stated previously that he will not be reborn in China if Tibet is not free and that no one, including China, has the right to choose his successor "for political ends". China has previously warned the Dalai Lama he has no right to abandon the tradition of reincarnation.

China, which regards the Dalai Lama as a dangerous separatist, has ruled Tibet with an iron fist since Communist troops marched in 1950. The Dalai Lama fled into exile in India in 1959 after an abortive uprising against Chinese rule.

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Hua Chunying told a daily news briefing that when it came to the reincarnation of living Buddhas, including the Dalai Lama, China had a "set religious procedure and historic custom".

"China follows a policy of freedom of religion and belief, and this naturally includes having to respect and protect the ways of passing on Tibetan Buddhism," Hua said.

"The title of Dalai Lama is conferred by the central government, which has hundreds of years of history. The (present) 14th Dalai Lama has ulterior motives, and is seeking to distort and negate history, which is damaging to the normal order of Tibetan Buddhism."

In 1995, after the Dalai Lama named a boy in Tibet as the reincarnation of the previous Panchen Lama, the second highest figure in Tibetan Buddhism, China put that boy under house arrest and installed another in his place.

Many Tibetans spurn the Chinese-appointed Panchen Lama as a fake.

Traditionally, high lamas, Buddhist priests, can take years to identify a child deemed to be a reincarnation of the Dalai Lama, a search usually limited to Tibet.

Tibetans fear that China will use the issue of the Dalai Lama's religious succession to split Tibetan Buddhism, with one new Dalai Lama named by exiles and one by China after his death.

China says its rule has brought much needed development to poor and backward Tibet. Exiles and rights groups accuse China of failing to respect Tibet's unique religion and culture and of suppressing its people.

(Reporting by Ben Blanchard; Editing by Nick Macfie)

http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/09/10/us-china-tibet-idUSKBN0H50ST20140910?feedType=RSS&feedName=worldNews

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: H.H. XIV Dalai Lama says he should be the Last Dalai Lam
Content:
krodha wrote:
Allegedly related to the fact that the Chinese government has announced that they will have sole authority over approval of the next Dalai Lama. So possibly a smart move on HHDL's part, he is clearly looking to thwart potential conflict which could arise as a result of controversy over who the authentic Dalai Lama is once the Chinese government has proclaimed a successor. China's govt. would no doubt love the controversy and contention which would result from two contending Dalai Lamas.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 9th, 2014 at 3:53 AM
Title: H.H. XIV Dalai Lama says he should be the Last Dalai Lama
Content:
krodha wrote:
September 7th 2014:

The Dalai Lama has told a German newspaper that he should be the last Tibetan spiritual leader, ending a centuries-old religious tradition from his Himalayan homeland.

His comments to the Welt am Sonntag newspaper echo his previous statement that "the institution of the Dalai Lama has served its purpose", but were even more explicit.

"We had a Dalai Lama for almost five centuries. The 14th Dalai Lama now is very popular. Let us then finish with a popular Dalai Lama," he said.

"If a weak Dalai Lama comes along, then it will just disgrace the Dalai Lama," he added with a laugh, according to a transcript of the English language interview.

He also said: "Tibetan Buddhism is not dependent on one individual. We have a very good organisational structure with highly trained monks and scholars."

China has governed Tibet since 1951, a year after invading, and the Dalai Lama fled across the Himalayas to India after a failed 1959 uprising against Chinese rule.

The Nobel Peace Prize winner in 2011 retired from political duties and has upgraded the role of prime minister of the Tibetan exile community.

But he is still the most powerful rallying point for Tibetans, both in exile and in their homeland, and remains the universally recognised face of the movement.

Asked by the German newspaper how much longer he may carry on his advocacy duties, the 79-year-old said: "The doctors say I could become 100 years old. But in my dreams I will die at the age of 113 years."

"I hope and pray that I may return to this world as long as sentient beings' suffering remains. I mean not in the same body, but with the same spirit and the same soul."

On the question of whether he may ever be able to return to Tibet, he said: "Yes, I am sure of that. China can no longer isolate itself, it must follow the global trend towards a democratic society."

http://news.yahoo.com/dalai-lama-says-no-successor-215550161.html

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 6th, 2014 at 1:37 PM
Title: How Throma Practitioners Die: Death of Shiva Lodro Rinpoche
Content:
krodha wrote:
HOW T'HROMA PRACTITIONERS DIE

SEP 05 2014

Today we received a phone call from Nepal informing us of the unexpected death of Shiva Lodro Rinpoche. Shiva Rinpoche is the reincarnation of Golok Serta Rinpoche, a great T'hroma Chod practitioner and lineage holder of the T'ho-Luk, or Northern school of Dudjom Lingpa' s T'hroma Chod – which comes from Degyal Rinpoche. Lama Dawa's father was a student of Golok Serta Rinpoche and when Lama Dawa was a child, he and his family used to travel around like gypsies with Serta Rinpoche's group. Lama Dawa tells many fantastic stories of Serta Rinpoche and the amazing Chod practices they used to do in the wilds of the Himalayas.

Shiva Rinpoche was recognized as the reincarnation of Golok Serta Rinpoche by HH Dudjom Rinpoche. He maintained a monastery and residence in Humla, a remote region of Nepal, where he had many students. He also lived in the Kathmandu valley and traveld a few times to the west, most recently to Russia, to teach.

He had been sick in the hospital in Kathmandu with liver disease. Apparently he knew he was going to die, and he told his attendants that he wanted to return to Yang Rig, in Humla, where his father (the second Degyal Rinpoche) passed away.

Yesterday, Sept. 4, on Guru Rinpoche day, he called his students to perform the Guru Tsog, then gave them extensive teachings and advice about their practice. Then he told them that this would be his last teaching to them as he was going to die. He told them that if they do good practice, they will die like this – with no pain or suffering, or any single belongings. He instructed them to leave his body for five days, then after that they could do whatever they like.

With that, he took off all his clothes. sat in meditation, then after two or three minutes, rainbow lights and spheres of light began to fill the room, and he entered into t'hug-dam. He remains there now, and we are told the whole valley is now filled with rainbows. Many people are starting to come from all over to witness this amazing event. His brothers, Tulku Pema Rigsal, and Gyewa Rinpoche and Sangye Rinpoche are arriving to begin the ceremonies. Now there is talk to leave his body for longer than the five days, and Lama Dawa fully expects his body to start shrinking. "This is how the T'hroma practitioners die," he said when he heard the news.
Although it is so sad that he has left us at such a young age (49), it is also a great inspiration to the power of the blessings of the Dudjom lineage and for those who follow it's path.

We look forward to hearing more news over the next week…….

http://saraswatibhawan.org/how-throma-practitioners-die/

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 4th, 2014 at 6:27 AM
Title: Re: No live teacher no problem
Content:

krodha wrote:
Seems to be a reoccurring theme...

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=16905&start=180#p244257

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 3rd, 2014 at 1:34 AM
Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL
Content:
krodha wrote:
Informative video on the origins of ISIS:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 2nd, 2014 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Kayas
Content:
Hieros Gamos said:
If possible to tell, could anyone clarify what

"sahajakaya"

and

"mahasukha prajnakaya"

signify?

krodha wrote:
Sahajakāya is from the Kālacakra tantra, and appears to be related to the Kālacakra interpretation of the svābhāvikakāya.

The only thing that came up on the mahāsukhaprajñākāya was a claim by Yogi C.M. Chen that the mahāsukhaprajñākāya is equivalent to the rainbow body [ja lus], although whether that is a substantiated assertion I have no idea. Yogi Chen also appears to claim that a Buddha has five kāya's and named the sahajakāya as the fourth... I'm not sure how much Yogi Chen's writings can be trusted. Perhaps someone else knows?

Sahajakāya is discussed here:
https://books.google.com/books?id=yKrG6QdXtMgC&pg=PA211&lpg=PA211&dq=sahajakaya&source=bl&ots=r3p1UwPI-e&sig=d-

4wcrpE_f07F46eiOo8qr_c2aA&hl=en&sa=X&ei=mCwFVMukNar1iwLIpIHABg&ved=0CBQQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=sahajakaya&f=false

and here:
https://books.google.com/books?id=i_KOOn0BaCoC&pg=PA170&lpg=PA170&dq=sahajakaya&source=bl&ots=FvGQs42nc4&sig=4CJbktyJIQbkeQhW2QW4zKdZE4I&hl=en&sa=X&ei=mCwFVMukNar1iwLIpIHABg&ved=0CBYQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=sahajakaya&f=false

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 2nd, 2014 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
"skyabs rje" literally means something like "lord of refuge". I'm not sure that it is what is being translated as "His Holiness" in the case of HH the DL.

krodha wrote:
Kyabjé (wyl. skyabs rje) is a mark of respect reserved for the seniormost lamas of the tradition, whose realization and powers are extraordinary. For example among today's Nyingmapa lamas it is used for the likes of Trulshik Rinpoche, Penor Rinpoche, Chatral Rinpoche, Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche and Minling Trichen Rinpoche. The term means lord (jé) of refuge (kyab), signifying someone who, on account of his or her extraordinary realization, has the capacity to protect us from the suffering of samsara and its causes, the disturbing emotions. It is sometimes rendered into English as 'His Holiness' or 'His Eminence'.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 2nd, 2014 at 2:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
narraboth said:
A story from the traditional Chinese version of 'brilliant moon'
(I have been told that it is not in the other language versions. The translator in Taiwan visited Namkhai Nyingpo rinpoche, a major student of kyabje Dilgo Khyentse, for some more stories about Kyabje rinpoche)

Kyabje Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche was invited to give Dzogchen teaching to HH Dalai lama. One day, HH asked Kyabje rinpoche:
'It is also possible to understand Dzogchen by reading Dzogchen texts, I think?'
Kyabje rinpoche replied:
'What you said is ture. If one prays to guru and read Dzogchen text slowly at the same time, it is possible to understand Dzogchen this way.'

So HH did. At the night, HH had a dream of Kyabje Rinpoche. In the dream Kyabje

Rinpoche looked at HH with eyes wide opened and pointed at HH.

Next day, HH reported to Kyabje Rinpoche the dream, also the 'understanding' he got, and Kyabje Rinpoche approved it.
Thus Kyabje Rinpoche became the uncommon root guru of HHDL.

krodha wrote:
At the same time this interaction with Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche most certainly was not HHDL's first encounter with Dzogpachenpo. Aside from being the Dalai Lama, he had already received pointing out instruction, the four empowerments etc., and as Malcolm has pointed out before...

Malcolm said:
There is a Dzogchen tantra which states "It is not necessary to hear it, obtaining the text is enough."

But this presumes that one has already been ripened by the four empowerments:

If this king of intimate instructions is given to improper recipients, both will be burned.
May it be acquired buy those trained suitable recipients with good karma!
Through that may secret mantra remain for a long while!
May the darkness of the ignorance of migrating beings be dispelled!

M

krodha wrote:
Also, not that it really matters but 'His Holiness' is the english translation of skyabs rje.
Which means this sentence:

"So HH did. At the night, HH had a dream of Kyabje Rinpoche. In the dream Kyabje Rinpoche looked at HH with eyes wide opened and pointed at HH."

Is the same as saying:

"So Kyabje did. At the night, Kyabje had a dream of Kyabje Rinpoche. In the dream Kyabje Rinpoche looked at Kyabje with eyes wide opened and pointed at Kyabje."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 1st, 2014 at 12:57 PM
Title: Re: Why do people believe the news?
Content:
M.G. said:
Hmmmm....
OK, moving away from the Middle East, what would you consider a conspiracy hidden in plain sight?

krodha wrote:
I'm not familiar with it enough to name specifics, I've just read that it allegedly occurs.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 1st, 2014 at 12:40 PM
Title: Re: Why do people believe the news?
Content:
M.G. said:
I could see a conspiracy where events simply went on and were unquestioned, but the Israel-Palestine conflict and the events of 9/11 are two of the most talked about, debated, researched, fought over subjects one could imagine. If there were really a powerful shadowy conspiracy, I wouldn't expect constant academic and media debates, streams of publications, endless commentators and punditry opining, etc.

krodha wrote:
Yes I meant in general, not in reference to any specific events or circumstances.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 1st, 2014 at 12:09 PM
Title: Re: Why do people believe the news?
Content:
M.G. said:
The fact that Western media focusses so much on Israel is exactly how one knows there is no all-powerful Zionist conspiracy pulling the press strings. Any real conspiracy would keep things close to its heart very, very quiet

krodha wrote:
I'm not taking sides in the topic at hand, but regarding the idea that a real conspiracy would be very, very quiet; that may not necessarily be the case. Some claim that the tactic of "hidden in plain sight" is often employed in association with such endeavors.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 31st, 2014 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: Which of these two is more accurate about buddhanature?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Buddha nature can definitely become obscured by delusion... that is what samsāra is.

To summarize, the basic nature of things, Samantabhadra's wisdom mind of great equality, pervades the whole of samsaric existence and nirvana's peace. It encompasses everything, yet sentient beings still fail to acknowledge this, their own nature, obscuring this fact from themselves. Hence they go through the illusory endless circle of samsara's three realms. Though they suffer in this way, their basic wakefulness, dharmakāya, never undergoes any change or transformation, increase or decrease.

Even while beings experience the infernal suffering of the deepest hell, their buddha-nature's basic wakefulness remains unimpaired and vividly present. Their momentary experiences are merely the reflected images of suffering - the expressions of dependent origination that are the consequence of having engaged in unvirtuous actions - while in reality they have not separated from dharmakāya by as much as a hair's tip.

It is for this reason that under the dense veil of ignorance we only experience samsara's distorted, karmic displays. As the veil grows gradually thinner through familiarity with the pith instructions, the experience of basic wakefulness becomes increasingly clearer. Finally, when the obscuring factors are permanently eliminated, the kāyas and wisdoms, buddhafields and enlightened qualities that are all perfectly present within us become evident. The phrase 'awakening to enlightenment' is just a label for this and a buddhafield is not some faraway place that you must undergo an arduous journey to reach."
- Erik Pema Kunsang

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 10:44 AM
Title: Re: Why do people believe the news?
Content:
krodha wrote:
For the most part every major news outlet is clearly told what (and what not to) to report on. Hence why you can see the same narratives repeated from station to station. You'll see every station cover and sensationalize a certain trivial news story to take the attention away from other events that may be occurring at the same time, it's all b.s. best to take it with a grain of salt. There's without a doubt an interest in shaping public opinion, but this is nothing new.

Luckily nowadays in the age of information, thanks to the internet and what not, there is far more transparency and less dependency on those news sources.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 30th, 2014 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: Is Contemplation the same thing as Mindfulness?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche has said if you are a practitioner and can enter the state of contemplation [tib. ting nge dzin, skt. samādhi] for even a few seconds you are doing well. And that the state of contemplation is precisely the state of Dzogchen, also called the state of tregchö (as someone else mentioned above).

Tsoknyi Rinpoche has shared sentiments to that same effect; that when one sits for a meditation session, in the context of Dzogchen that practitioner may sit for an hour or two hours and only truly meditate for a matter of seconds. He said this is because the meditation of Dzogchen is resting in those instances of non-conceptual prajñā which

may only flash forth for mere seconds as beginners. So the point is to familiarize with those instances.

His father Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche describes contemplation (specifically the difference between the deliberate training of śamatha and the effortless state of contemplation) here:

The glimpse of recognizing mind-essence [sems nyid] that in the beginning lasted only for a few seconds gradually becomes half a minute, then a minute, then half an hour, then hours, until eventually it is uninterrupted throughout the whole day. You need that kind of training. I mention this because, if [you believe] the goal of the main training is to construct a state in which thoughts have subsided and which feels very clear and quiet, that is still a training in which a particular state is deliberately kept. Such a state is the outcome of a mental effort, a pursuit. Therefore it is neither the ultimate nor the original natural state.

The naked essence of mind [sems nyid] is not known in shamatha, because the mind is occupied with abiding in stillness; it (mind essence) remains unseen. All one is doing is simply not following the movement of thought. But being deluded by thought movement is not the only delusion; one can also be deluded by abiding in quietude. The preoccupation with being calm blocks recognition of self-existing wakefulness and also blocks the knowing of the three kayas of the awakened state. This calm is simply one of no thought, of the attention subsiding in itself while still not knowing itself.

But deliberate mindfulness and śamatha practice are essential prerequisites to contemplation for most. Khenchen Palden Sherab Rinpoche and Khenpo Tsewang Dongyal Rinpoche describe the contrived mindfulness of śamatha etc., as the "practitioner chasing the meditation", whereas the uncontrived state of contemplation is "the meditation chasing the practitioner".

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 10:42 AM
Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?
Content:
Karma Dorje said:
I think that Buddhism provides a particularly clear conceptual framework and corpus of methods to discover the natural state. However, I don't believe those conceptual frameworks to deal with our confusion are of themselves a necessary precursor to realization.

Jikan said:
Elsewhere on DharmaWheel, especially in the Dzogchen forum, I've seen members take a similar position: it's not necessary for someone to identify as a Buddhist or be trained in Buddhist doctrine to accomplish the path. How different is that claim from the one quoted above?

krodha wrote:
Those frameworks are necessary for those whose paths are gradual in nature. In the context of Dzogchen when it is stated that the aspirant needn't be versed in Buddhist tenets and principles, that only is the case because (i) Atiyoga is an experiential view which is not acquired through logic, and (ii) the relationship with the guru ensures that the practitioner is on the right path (the path following the experiential view the guru points out). So the Buddhist doctrine is only extraneous if those factors are present - in the context of the path itself.

This doesn't mean Dzogchen lacks a correct conceptual view, it simply means that in terms of the view and praxis: the irrelevancy of the enumerated view is contingent upon the presence of the unenumerated view and the guru.

For all of us who are here in this web forum, discussing, comparing and contrasting different systems, this is a completely different context and it is important to uphold the correct conceptual view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 7:17 AM
Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
The quote of Manjusrimitra I did above gives me a different impression. Besides, I'm just talking about vision, the practices of Dzogchen go beyond.
[Tantra, Upadeshas and Karma]

In my perception Mahamudra and Dzogchen are esoteric version of sutric teachings thus Mahamudra is similar to the view of Madyamakha and Dzogchen is similar to the view of Yogacara. This is confirmed by the statement Manjushmitra::
”The direct, hard to understand, subtle field of knowing, the Great Path, is non-conceptual (akalpana), and entirely beyond the grasp of intellectual thought. Divorced from verbal ideation, it is difficult to point out and as difficult to enquire into. It cannot be communicated through words and [therefore] is not within the scope of the neophyte (adikarmika). Nevertheless the path is to be approached through studying scriptures (sutra) of the World-Teacher and following the personal instructions (upadesa) of one's Guruji.”. [5]
Thus, the difference between the vision of the tradition of upadeshas and sutras is the importance of guru transmission in the first.

krodha wrote:
I do not see how this quotation from Mañjuśrīmitra states, alludes to, or necessarily leads to the conclusions that (i) Mahāmudrā is similar to Madhyamaka and (ii) Dzogpachenpo is similar to Yogācāra.

Although apparently Mañjuśrīmitra was somewhat of a proponent of presenting the Atiyoga view in the context of the Yogācārin view, as discussed by John Myrdhin

Reynolds [in his Dzogchen, Chinese Buddhism and the Universal Mind: Dzogchen and Chinese Buddhism]:

Moreover, in terms of content, it is quite clear that the early Dzogchen Movement of the eighth and ninth centuries did not teach the Chittamatra doctrine of the Yogacharins, even though it borrowed some of the terminology of the earlier school. But it understood these terms in a different manner than did the Yogacharins. The precepts of Dzogchen are found in the Dzogchen Tantras of Atiyoga and not in the Mahayana Sutras of the Third Turning of the Wheel of the Dharma, although later Lama scholars in Tibet noticed the existence of certain similarities in terminology between Dzogchen and Chittamatra. This may be due to the activities of the scholar Manjusrhimitra who wrote a book on Garab Dorje's teaching from the Yogachara perspective.

In the Bodhicittabhavana quotation you are citing, it begins:
Mañjuśrīmitra said:
The direct, hard to understand, subtle field of knowing, the Great Path, is non-conceptual (akalpana), and entirely beyond the grasp of intellectual thought.

krodha wrote:
Which is a normal statement regarding the view of Dzogchen, and is even a common statement found in the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras among others. I don't think such as statement is necessarily indicative of a view similar to Yogācāra, in fact you can see teachers touch on this same principle while referencing Madhyamaka as an appropriately supportive view in engendering this species of understanding.

The quote continues:
Mañjuśrīmitra said:
Divorced from verbal ideation, it is difficult to point out and as difficult to enquire into. It cannot be communicated through words and [therefore] is not within the scope of the neophyte (adikarmika).

krodha wrote:
This again is a common description of the Dzogchen view (naturally), and is found quite commonly in various Buddhist systems when discussing the view of the unenumerated ultimate.

Your citation ends with:
Mañjuśrīmitra said:
Nevertheless the path is to be approached through studying scriptures (sutra) of the World-Teacher and following the personal instructions (upadesa) of one's Guruji.

krodha wrote:
Cintamayī-prajñā i.e. wisdom-knowledge acquired through reflection and studying scripture (whether the sūtras, tantras or other writings) is another common theme and important aspect of most every system, spanning every yāna. The upadeśa aspect of Vajrayāna on the other hand, along with the indispensable role of the guru (involving transmission in the form of empowerment or pointing out instructions) are of course a

different story... both are undoubtably vital and defining aspects of the Secret Mantra that are not found in Sūtrayāna. However that does not draw any direct correlations between Atiyoga and Yogācāra, nor Mahāmudrā and Madhyamaka.

The 5th footnote which is cited at the end of the quote you cited does mention Yogācāra in order to put the term 'vāsanā' into context. Although the author of that translation sort of spins into a bit of an ontologically influenced scientific explanation of vāsanā (I'm not sure why). He states:

"Manjusrimitra introduces the concept of Vasana into his text without prior comment, because he assumes that his reader is already familiar with Yogacara Theory. Vasana, here translated as vestigial-imprint, describes the information content of the resonant field proceeding from the first point of Creation. A given phenomena contains a set amount of information. To define the smallest possible amount of information we use the term 'bit.' We know that any given phenomena is made up, therefore, of bits of information. Every elementary particle, atom, and molecule registers bits of information. Every interaction between particles processes information by altering those bits; since the altered bit is distinct from its original bit, the available bits proliferate ceaselessly. Each bit is a 'trace' of information, or in other words, a vasana, a vestigial imprint. In modern physics the fundamental bits that make up the Universe are described as 'quantum-bits' or qubits - each containing within itself both alternatives (thesis and antithesis) to any bit of information. Information, or in other words the total number of qubits making up the Universe, is constantly proliferating and evolving, as the event horizon expands. The intrinsic information-processing nature of Existence necessarily generates complexity. Until the formation of atoms, virtually all information in the Universe existed at the level of elementary particles and the density of energy throughout was everywhere almost the same. Nevertheless even in the first billionth of a second the Universe as we presently understand it, must have been on the order of some 100 million billion billion billion billion billion billion bits. The present measurement of total information stored in the Universe at the present time is phenomenal: if (following the modern Margolus-Levitin theorem) we take the amount of energy present within the event horizon of the knowable Universe, multiply that by 4, and divide by Planck's constant, it is possible to estimate that over the 15 billion years since the first point of Creation, the Universe has now expanded its information content to some 100 billion billion billion billion billion billion billion billion billion quantum bits of information."

The above really seems like an unnecessary way of describing vāsanā; which is a behavioural tendency or karmic imprint which influences the present behaviour of a person. Obviously vāsanā in this context is more accurately related to the ripening of bījas present in the ālāyavijñāna (or bījavijñāna), rather than a representation of 'quantum-bits'.

Either way I'm not seeing these correlations [between (i) Mahāmudrā and Madhyamaka, or (ii) Dzogpachenpo and Yogācāra] (in the theme of 'vision' or otherwise). If that is your opinion that is one thing, and you're of course entitled to that opinion, but I do not find evidence for that conclusion present in the information cited.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 29th, 2014 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: Mixing Buddhist and non-Buddhist Practices?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Samyag-dṛṣṭi [right view] is the first principle of the Noble Eightfold Path, which would naturally imply that it takes precedence.

Even in Vajrayāna, Atiyoga etc., samyag-dṛṣṭi is what transmissions and direct introduction ultimately represent. Except rather than an inferential view the guru seeks to experientially introduce the definitive view. The view [lta ba] introduced by the guru is 'right view' or 'correct view' [yang dag pa'i lta ba].

In both cases the path follows in the wake of the view.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 11:12 PM
Title: Re: Karma in Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Apart from Atiyoga adopting a few Yogācārin principles, I still do not agree that the two are as similar as you claim them to be.

Also, aside from the nature of their respective paths, and the presence or absence of the ālayavijñāna, the view of karma between the different yānas really isn't all that different.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 4:19 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
Paul said:
Interestingly, in the Zhang Zhung Nyengyud lineage, the first master of the lineage was a deva called Lhabon Yongsu Dagpa and the second was a naga, Lubon Banam. Everyone after that was a human.

krodha wrote:
There's also the Twelve Dzogchen Buddhas [rdzogs chen ston pa bcu gnyis]

Twelve Teachers: Rigpa Wiki
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twelve_teachers

Twelve Dzogchen Buddhas
http://www.himalayanart.org/search/set.cfm?setID=2694

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 12:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
Concordiadiscordi said:
Just to clarify.

I initiated this thread in order to gauge the extent to which those who populate the Dzogchen community on this forum cling to and insist upon rigid traditionalism,

krodha wrote:
It's more the case that the majority of us have no issue with relating to a conventional system and taking advice from those who have applied that system (including living transmission) who are realized because of it. Insistence grounded in clinging to views, traditional or not, can come in many forms... your move to reject the tradition being no different.

Concordiadiscordi said:
thereby denying all other possibilities and narrowing the scope of potential exchange between heterogeneous agents.

krodha wrote:
You are describing yourself, are you not?

Concordiadiscordi said:
I have noticed that many Tibetan Buddhists tend to be quite touchy about the guru-shishya subject, which is why I wanted to see If there is anybody here with a more liberal perspective on the matter, Also, it is just interesting to understand other perspectives - but I have had trouble gaining insight into the insistence upon the guru-shishya relationship as conceived within the Tibetan tradition, as I have never really received a thorough explanation of the matter; rather, I have only received reproaches for asking, as well as dogmatic statements which simply reiterate the vox populi of Tibetan traditionalism without actually explaining or substantiating it.

krodha wrote:
Well you certainly do not appear to approach the subject with an open mind, and also appear to take the rational high ground when addressing these principles. This is often

due to western conditioning where one's 'modern' ways are considered to be the most refined and reasonable in comparison to other cultures and systems.

Even the way you term these principles (or statements in their defense) "dogmatic" speaks volumes about your frame of mind in this respect.

Concordiadiscordi said:
I find it very difficult to communicate with Tibetans for this very reason, as I typically end up running into rigid barriers.

krodha wrote:
And they probably sit around saying the same thing about their interaction with you. It takes a rigid barrier to run into rigid barriers.

Concordiadiscordi said:
I do not deny that many of these barriers may be my own, for which I apologise. I did approach this thread with my own prefabricated conviction, which itself has emerged throughout my own sojourn through the boundless ocean of Dharma. I may be wrong about everything, in which case I apologise once more for my ignorance.

krodha wrote:
Your ability to consider that this is a possibility on some level is a very positive trait that will serve you well.

Concordiadiscordi said:
One way or another, however, this thread has provided me with useful insight into the boundaries which occupy this space.

krodha wrote:
I would hardly call a self-deconstructing conventional methodology a "boundary".

Concordiadiscordi said:
Thus, I now know that certain questions will inevitably be rendered redundant due to lack of a receptive audience, whereas certain others might be tolerated.

krodha wrote:
Receptivity again, goes both ways.

Concordiadiscordi said:
This will aid in the skilful avoidance of similar instances in the future.

krodha wrote:
You should seek to grow and adapt in the way you are able to relate to these things, avoiding 'instances' like this (whatever that means) is not expanding (or dissolving) your own boundaries, but rather is fortifying them.

Concordiadiscordi said:

Finally, I have been generalising as to the typical opinions and inclinations of 'Tibetan Buddhists' in a very careless manner, so to those who may feel misrepresented by my generalisations, please be aware of the fact that I have no intention of condemning the Tibetan tradition in toto.

krodha wrote:
You can condemn all you like, no one takes offense here trust me. As I said the majority of people here are able to understand the benefits of a conventional system which has produced unbroken lineages of awakened individuals for centuries. If you want to play the game of 'my modern skepticism is the more refined route' then that is on you.

Concordiadiscordi said:
In fact, I have not set out to condemn anything at all, as I have only probed and pushed a little. Please do not mistake the admission of my frustrations with wholesale attacks... they are merely fallible admissions.

krodha wrote:
I feel the sooner you can drop the subtly patronizing and condescending narrative the sooner you won't have to preemptively apologize for what you yourself clearly perceive as some species of condemnation.

Concordiadiscordi said:
Knowing where the boundaries lie - this has been my intention.

krodha wrote:
The boundaries are your own mind.

Concordiadiscordi said:
Avoiding useless clashes with rigid boundaries in the future - this has been my reward.

Kind regards.

krodha wrote:
But you haven't addressed the root of where these boundaries arise from, therefore you are only reinforcing your own and putting off engaging with others in a productive manner where you might be able to learn something. You are limiting yourself, sadly under the guise of being the one who is free of limitations.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 3:27 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
krodha wrote:
At any rate, intimate instructions from a qualified guru are necessary and cannot be bypassed:

To exert yourself in study and so forth without attending a master and without having received the empowerments, you will have no result and your efforts will be wasted. Empowerment is the entrance to the Secret Mantra. To enter the Secret Mantra without the empowerments being conferred is pointless, since it will yield no result and your stream of being will be ruined.
- Padmasambhava

Unless we have such devotion for our kind teachers that we consider them as greater than the Buddha, we will not receive even a single portion of their blessings. Without genuinely receiving blessings, the tender shoots of experience and realization will not grow.
- Longchenpa

All spiritual attainments of the profound Secret Mantra arise from nowhere else but through reliance on the Lama.
- Dudjom Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 12:31 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
Concordiadiscordi said:
Is not the very distinction between the relative/conventional and the absolute/ultimate to be surpassed? According to my understanding, they are 'not two, not even one.'

krodha wrote:
Only if you're resting in direct experiential knowledge of that nature. Otherwise you are in the relative condition.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 11:41 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
Concordiadiscordi said:
All things return to the one. To where does the one return?

We say, 'Our nature,' but who is it that thinks thus, and what is indicated thereby?

Could this ever be clarified by means of effort or reliance? Giving rise to a mind which abides nowhere, there is neither teacher nor Dharma on which to rely. Abandoning oneself, exertion is mere vanity. With all supports thoroughly exhausted, how can notions of realisation be contrived?

krodha wrote:
It isn't 'one' like a single ontological essence. Sāṃkhya Yoga for example posits an

unconditioned, singular, transpersonal ultimate, as does Vedanta with its Brahman. The 'nature' spoken of in Dzogchen isn't like that, it is only 'one' in the sense that each phenomenon has that nature as a common characteristic, but each conventional phenomenon is partitioned and has its own nature. Meaning your nature is not my nature and vice versa. So it isn't like a 'one' or 'oneness' that things return to, it is an epistemic recognition and you either know that nature or you don't.

As Lopön Tenzin Namdak states:
If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View.

As for the rest of your questions, you should look into how conventions relate to ultimate truth. Conventionally, things like means, effort, reliance, mind, teacher, supports, realization etc., are valid. Ultimately, they are empty and therefore are unreal.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 8:25 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
krodha wrote:
Is "The Dharma" capitalized (as used in the Padmasambhava quote above) an honorific orthographical rendering of 'dharma' used to denote phenomena (collectively) in general?

Another translation of the same passage states:
Do not seek to cut the root of phenomena, cut the root of the mind. Because if you cut the root of the mind, by accomplishing one, you accomplish all.

Is "Dharma" [capitalized] synonymous with 'dharmas' or 'dharmins' [plural]?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 7:28 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Query Regarding the 'Guru'
Content:
Malcolm said:
"gcig shes kun grol"

Knowing one thing liberates all things.

dzogchungpa said:
What is this one thing?

krodha wrote:
Do not resolve the Dharma, resolve your mind.

To resolve your mind is to know the one which frees all.
Not to resolve your mind is to know all but lack the one.
- Padmasambhava

A common notion in Atiyoga texts, but it is also found elsewhere... for example the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra states:

What is called "knowledge of all things" is the result of knowing one thing: the true nature of phenomena, which has the attribute of peace.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 27th, 2014 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: Practices "for" ISIL
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's a shame the notable hostility some Muslims may have towards Buddhism is merely a reaction to that 969 group from Myanmar (which may in fact be a political front disguised as a Buddhist radical group).

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 24th, 2014 at 6:31 AM
Title: ISIS Threatens to Destroy World's Largest Buddhist Temple
Content:
krodha wrote:
Islamic State (extremist group formerly known as ISIS) is threatening to destroy Borobudur Temple in Indonesia:

http://www.pangeatoday.com/isis-threatens-to-destroy-worlds-largest-buddhist-temple/?orderBy=popular

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 16th, 2014 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Dharma Ink, Buddhist Tattoos
Content:
krodha wrote:
I did a short lived tattoo apprenticeship for awhile (right around the time I became interested in the buddhadharma) and I remember a man came in for an appointment with my teacher one day, and the piece they were working on was Dza Rahula. I distinctly recall the bow and arrow, the nine heads, four arms and the eyes all over Rahula's body. It was a beautiful tattoo. About a month later I learned of Chögyal Namkhai Norbu's teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Destruction and/or annihilation has nothing to do with emptiness, whatsoever.

Sherab Dorje said:
EVERYTHING has to do with emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Right you're making this statement in a different context though (and I agree with you).

My comment was regarding the context that queequeg alluded to where it appeared s/he was comparing emptiness to an utter annihilation or destruction, which it isn't.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
We are saying the same thing in principle. I just disagree that appearances can be liberating because it isn't the appearances themselves but the nature of one's knowledge of them [appearances] which either binds or liberates.

Sherab Dorje said:
You can't seperate them. If there were no appearances, what would you have insight into???

krodha wrote:
Their inseparability isn't what ultimately counts, it is knowledge or ignorance of that inseparability that makes the difference. If you are ignorant of that inseparability then you do not know it, and appearances take on the guise of conditioned dharmins. So while it is true those dharmins are misconceptions (due to the fact that they are actually empty) if we are ignorant of their non-arising [dharmatā] then they do not appear to be empty.

There is no soteriological value to be found in the mere idea that appearances and emptiness are inseparable, the liberating factor is a direct unmediated recognition of that inseparability. Otherwise appearances appear to be real objects and entities.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 4:41 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Clarity or appearance divorced from insight into their emptiness (or non-arising) is just conditioned clarity appearing as afflicted mind and appearances misconstrued as conditioned objects/entities.

Sherab Dorje said:
Not that this statement actually makes any sense, but I'll take your word for it.

Going back to my original statement: "Appearances can be liberatory too, if we see their true nature."

Quite clearly you are barking up the wrong tree (ie we don't disagree).

krodha wrote:
We are saying the same thing in principle. I just disagree that appearances can be liberating because it isn't the appearances themselves but the nature of one's knowledge of them [appearances] which either binds or liberates.

For instance from Tsoknyi Rinpoche:
Sometimes I say emptiness in the clarity and sometimes emptiness in the appearance. These mean exactly the same thing because emptiness is emptiness in each case and because the clarity part and the appearance part come down to the same meaning. Clarity is the knower and appearances are what it knows.

Now, when we do not know this emptiness and appearance we stay in duality and staying in duality we are confused. The definition of confusion is: "Not directly seeing the actuality of things."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 4:33 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
Ignorance and negative actions.

Sherab Dorje said:
Well I am not going to chase your tail any longer. I leave you to your ignorance and negative actions which are (according to you) independent of emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Ignorance [avidyā] is delusion about the nature of appearance because the non-arising of said appearance is unrecognized. The negative actions (or just action) [karma] which ensues while under the influence of ignorance then fortifies and sustains that ignorance.

So ignorance and karmic formation are said to be the mother and father of samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
My point being that knowledge of appearance alone does not liberate, but knowledge of the emptiness of appearance does liberate.

Sherab Dorje said:
Please define "knowledge of appearance", you mean the dualistic process of perception?

krodha wrote:
Yes because clarity is what becomes conditioned.

Clarity or appearance divorced from insight into their emptiness (or non-arising) is just conditioned clarity appearing as afflicted mind and appearances misconstrued as conditioned objects/entities.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 1:46 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Because one will liberate you and the other will not.

Queequeg said:
Right. Opening Shiva's third eye is a wonderful liberation. Destruction is so cathartic.

krodha wrote:
Destruction and/or annihilation has nothing to do with emptiness, whatsoever.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 1:43 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Appearances can be liberatory too, if we see their true nature.

krodha wrote:
Right, which is their emptiness i.e. non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 1:41 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Because one will liberate you and the other will not.

Sherab Dorje said:
Emptiness does not liberate, it is just the way things exist. It is neither liberatory nor enslaving.

krodha wrote:
There are only three doors to liberation, emptiness being one of them: (i) emptiness [śunyatā], (ii) absence of characteristics [alakṣana], (iii) absence of aspiration [apranidana].

My point being that knowledge of appearance alone does not liberate, but knowledge of the emptiness of appearance does liberate.

It is liberating from the standpoint of the individual, which is the point of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 15th, 2014 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: "Eternal" Buddha?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Emptiness and appearance are not seperate.

Queequeg said:
Indeed. But people make the mistake of emphasizing one over the other all the time.

krodha wrote:
Because one will liberate you and the other will not.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 1st, 2014 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Rainbow body attainments of non-buddhists
Content:
krodha wrote:
Important to differentiate: (i) "rainbow body" as the disappearance of the body, with (ii) "rainbow body" as knowing only wisdom display at the time of the result:

Malcolm said:
No, but I have heard (from ChNN among others) that the disappearance of the body is

not necessarily a sign of the body of light.

Hindus also gain control over the four elements, also Arhats can gain control over the four elements. Gaining control over the four elements is mundane siddhi, it is not excellent siddhi, nor is it reserved for Vajrayana and Dzogchen people. However, if someone has not studied in detail, they might think that many mundane siddhis are profound. So yes, what I am telling you is that I do not consider the so called rainbow body to much more than a display of mundane siddhi to create faith.

I am glad you have faith in the teachings, but as I said, I do not derive my faith in the teachings through illusions and phantasmagoria.

N
KDL [Kunzang Dechen Lingpa] went though all four visions to the end. He told me this personally. Not only me, but others. He did realize rainbow body. Rainbow body, in Dzogchen, does not mean that your body disappears. This is a huge misconception... it is stupidly simple -- once you reach the end of the fourth vision, everything is a display of the five lights, as it is put in the classical text earth, rocks, mountains and cliffs vanish and instead one sees only the five pure lights.

Sometimes, your body vanishes. Mostly, it just shrinks after death. For example, Thangtong Gyalpo achieved rainbow body. His kudung is still shrinking. It exists in a small monastery in somewhere in Nepal. A Lama friend of mine knows where it is and has seen it.

In other words, rainbow body in essence is actually a realization.

N

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 27th, 2014 at 6:12 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Arhats only have knowledge of "one-fold" emptiness, so they have full knowledge of the emptiness of self but lack (or have incomplete) insight into emptiness of phenomena.

zenman said:
The eighth bhūmi, the Immovable

The eighth level is called the "Immovable" because bodhisattvas overcome all afflictions regarding signs and their minds are always completely absorbed in the dharma. At this stage, an Arya Bodhisattva has attained realization equivalent to a full Theravada Arhat. At this level, a bodhisattva has achieved nirvana. According to Nargarjuna,
The eighth is the Immovable, the youthful stage,

Through nonconceptuality he is immovable;
And the spheres of his body, speech and mind's
Activities are inconceivable

From:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhumi_%28Buddhism%29#The_eighth_bh.C5.ABmi.2C_the_Immovable " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

krodha wrote:
Eighth bhūmi is the first pure bhūmi and means that individual's realization is irreversible (will not regress - even after rebirth). The kleśas are exhausted and root of samsara is severed, but there are still subtle knowledge obscurations present.

Apparently the Kagyus hold that sixth bhūmi marks arhathood.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 8:46 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is the traditional buddhahood actualized in Mahāyāna, then 13th bhūmi in Vajrayāna as the level of Vajradhara, and 16th bhūmi in Dzogpachenpo as uttarajñāna (as Malcolm has mentioned before).

Degrees of omniscience being what the extended bhūmis (12 - 16) are representative of. However buddhahood is achieved by each of them at the 11th bhūmi.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 8:29 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?
Content:
krodha wrote:
So "full buddhahood" is being defined as the full omniscience of the svābhāvikakāya... but really this is just a difference in degrees of omniscience because those who realize dharmakāya are also liberated.

It is just that the omniscience of those who fully realize the rūpakāya is greater. When it comes down to it buddhahood is actualized either way.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 7:58 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?

Content:
Jikan said:
According to Vajrayana. Your mileage may vary in some Mahayana schools.

krodha wrote:
Curious which Mahāyāna schools are considered to provide limited mileage? I would agree that mileage varies when it comes to degrees of omniscience, but I'm unfamiliar with the mileage in general being in question.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?
Content:
Emakirikiri said:
Vajrayana says that the realisation of common Mahayana is that of two-fold emptiness, equivalent to the 1st bhumi of a bodhisattva (with the 1st bhumi realisation of emptiness being equivalent of that of a buddha's, however the further up the bhumis you go the less obscurations you have until you reach zero obscurations aka samyaksambuddhahood or full Buddhahood, which is possible only through Vajrayana methods).

krodha wrote:
Common Mahāyāna also actualizes full buddhahood, just isn't as rapid as Vajrayāna and doesn't work with energy like Vajrayāna does.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 25th, 2014 at 3:34 AM
Title: Re: Dogen's quote: arhathood or buddhahood?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Arhats only have knowledge of "one-fold" emptiness, so they have full knowledge of the emptiness of self but lack (or have incomplete) insight into emptiness of phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 11:02 AM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Both books I recommended support a different view on Madhyamakha and Yogacara. Which text and which source you are using as the basis for your argument?

krodha wrote:
Numerous texts, don't have them on hand at the moment.

Vajrasvapna said:
I think the big mistake of some Buddhist scholar is to believe that the teachings of Yogacara are contradictory to the teachings of Madhyamakha; but if this is true, for what reason we have Nagarjuna's collection of praises, an expression of the teachings of the third turned?

krodha wrote:
Not the same Nāgārjuna. But even then I don't see the text you are referencing as relating to Yogācāra.

Vajrasvapna said:
My opinion is that all Buddhist philosophies are incomplete and are not able to express the Buddha-nature, for it is simply beyond expression.

krodha wrote:
Yes every system agrees that the unenumerated ultimate is beyond expression.

Vajrasvapna said:
You supported the vision of Prasangika school. Despite the logic of reducing to absurdity is special, it takes the impression that the Buddha nature is equal to nothing;

krodha wrote:
Prasangika does not state that one's nature is 'nothing'. It simply says the ultimate is the non-arising of the relative.

Vajrasvapna said:
but if it is equal to nothing, for what reason so many positive qualities of enlightened beings arise?

krodha wrote:
Well positive qualities are merely conventional for one, and secondly those qualities can only occur in the first place because that nature lacks inherency.

Vajrasvapna said:
Then you have a contradiction.

krodha wrote:
There is no contradiction.

Vajrasvapna said:
Finally, Dzogchen is not comparative with the logical method of sutras, but the vision is no different.

krodha wrote:
Right, the praxis is different, the view of the ultimate is the same as that found in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Vajrasvapna said:
As Manjusrimitra beautifully says:
"3. The Supreme Path of Direct Recognition
19 The direct, hard to understand, subtle field of knowing, the Great Path, is non-conceptual (akalpana), and entirely beyond the grasp of intellectual thought.
20 Divorced from verbal ideation, it is difficult to point out and as difficult to enquire into.
21 It cannot be communicated through words and [therefore] is not within the scope of the neophyte(adikarmika).
22 Nevertheless the path is to be approached through studying scriptures (sutra) of the World-Teacher
and following the personal instructions (upadesa) of one's Guruji."

krodha wrote:
Which apart from the principle of direct introduction is really no different than how the ultimate view is portrayed in any system of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 10:11 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Simhamukha
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Very beautiful to speak, very difficult to practice. Even Guru Padmasambhava made use of transformation method to protect themselves from attacks, for example. He turned into Simhamukha against a group of hateful Hindu scholars who had been defeated in debate.

As stated by Manjusrimitra.
8. The Validity of Contemplating Oneself as Divine
124 The World-Teacher has taught: "The use of an authentic indicative Symbolism (samketa) is also [a
valid way to] Enlightenment."
125 That [spoken of] here refers to techniques for the generation (utpatti) and meditation
(bhavana) of the Enlightened-mind [through symbolic procedures].
126 Having applied the three seals (mudra) which are signifiers [of Enlightenment], and stabilized the
three Contemplations (tri-samadhi)
127 then through the practice of reciting the Heart Mantra one generates the reality of the Mahamudra of
Mind-in-itself. http://www.dharmafellowship.org/library/texts/cultivation-of-enlightened-mind.htm#fifteen

krodha wrote:
Guru Rinpoche emanated as Senge Dradog against the tīrthikas, not Senge Dogma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Aside from adopting a few tenets from Yogācāra you really will not find very many teachers asserting that the view of Dzogchen and Yogācāra are agreeable. You will however see many masters advocate for the similarities in view between Dzogchen and Prasanga Madhyamaka... even Bönpo lamas go with Prasangika Madhyamaka as a proper equivalent in the context of fundamental view when it comes to Dzogpachenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 4:55 AM
Title: Re: Clouded perception
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Why is your quaint Bed & Breakfast better than Hilbert's Hotel?

dzogchungpa said:
Because no matter how many guests check in, it's always empty.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Clouded perception
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Maybe you two should get a room.

BTW, you never asked me why it's better than Hilbert's Hotel.

krodha wrote:
Why is your quaint Bed & Breakfast better than Hilbert's Hotel?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
plwk said:
What's the Mahayana perspective(s) on this?

Vajrasvapna said:
Here the Mahayana view:
"Thus, bodhisattvas do not reach or attain nirvana but overcome all delusions, including

those that concern the ultimate. goal of nirvana, namely, views that see nirvana as either permanent or not permanent, pleasurable or not pleasurable, self-existent or not selfexistent, pure or not pure. Nirvana is simply the final delusion.[...]
"Another common derivation was to understand nirvana as a combination of the negative prefix nir and the root vri, «to
cover," «to restrain," or "to obstruct." This is most likely the sense understood here, with nir-vana referring to «no walls of the mind," as the word for «walls," avarana, is also derived from vri. Thus, not only do bodhisattvas see through delusions of existence and non-existence, they see through delusions of having stepped past all such delusions.[...]
Ching-mai says, "This explains the liberation door of no desire. Once one realizes dharmas have no nature, and they aren't blocked outside and have no fears inside, they come to know that dharmas are simply delusions, like dreams, and are false and not real. Thus, they see through them and don't give rise to desires." The Heart Sutra - Red Pine

Here the Madhyamaka view:
"The nineteenth verse describes how samsara and nirvana are actually undifferentiable:
Samsara is not the slightest bit different from nirvana.
Nirvana is not the slightest bit different from samsara.
From the perspective of precise knowledge analyzing the nature of genuine reality, once the true existence of nirvana is refuted, then one realizes that there is no samsara that is even the slightest bit different from nirvana, and no nirvana that is even the slightest bit different from samsara. In short, samsara and nirvana are of the nature of equality, because both have a nature beyond all conceptual fabrications about what it might be, and because both in their true nature are originally pure.
As the Fifth Karmapa Deshin Shekpa states:
Whatever is the suchness of samsara, that is nirvana." The Sun of Wisdom: Teachings on the Noble Nagarjuna's Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way - Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso

Here the Dzogchen view, similar to the Yogacara view:
"Ho! Everything - appearance and existence, samsara and nirvana, has a single ground, yet two paths and two fruitions, and magically displays as awareness or unawareness. Through Kuntuzangpo's prayer, may all beings become Buddhas, completely perfected in the abode of the dharmadhatu. The ground of all is uncompounded, and the self-arising great expanse, beyond expression, has neither the name samsara nor nirvana. Realizing just this you are a Buddha; not realizing this you are a being wandering in samsara." The Prayer of Kuntuzangpo

krodha wrote:
Of course there are certian Yogācāra tenets that Dzogchen implements in its system such as eight consciousness model, but when it comes down to the view in principle one can also say that Dzogpachenpo closely resembles the Madhyamaka view (not in praxis, but in principle).

The two quotes you posted above for Madhyamaka and Dzogchen are not all that different since the "ground" (or rather, 'basis') which is mentioned in the Dzogchen

quote is original purity... a principle which is also referenced in the Madhyamaka quote: "...both in their true nature are originally pure."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 23rd, 2014 at 1:43 AM
Title: Re: Clouded perception
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Maybe you two should get a room.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 21st, 2014 at 8:22 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
Fa Dao said:
kind of amazing that so many have achieved rainbow body with Longde in light of what was written above...

krodha wrote:
That's sort of the name of the game though when it comes to the triumphalist narratives associated with Atiyoga. In the context of comparing itself to other systems, the other yānas are marginalized. Even within itself concerning the three series you'll sometimes see klong sde presented as superior to sems sde, and then man ngag sde as superior over klong sde. Then within man ngag sde you see yang ti presented as superior to spyi ti, and spyi ti as superior to ati, etc... but that is all only really so from within the context of defining specific aspects of the path in relation to other methods through comparison and contrast.

Just as you see distinctions and differences highlighted, in certain instances you'll also see every yāna advocated for as valid and that same validity asserted for every series, cycle etc., so context is everything. The superior path or method is different for everyone because the superior method is always going to be the one that works for the individual concerned.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 20th, 2014 at 3:05 AM
Title: Re: Rainbow body question
Content:
Fa Dao said:
sorry if am am a little dense..just want to make sure I understand you correctly..this is serious shit, ya know?
3rd level=Awakened person=you just Know?

krodha wrote:

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=1154&start=480#p33601

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 19th, 2014 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Diet in relation to Rainbow Body
Content:
krodha wrote:
Yogis of that caliber are most likely using the elements for sustenance.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 17th, 2014 at 1:21 PM
Title: Re: Alayavijnana by Schmithausen available
Content:
krodha wrote:
Looks like Schmithausen published a new monograph this year: The Genesis of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda: Responses and Reflections

Schmithausen, Lambert:
The Genesis of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda : Responses and Reflections / Lambert Schmithausen. - Tokyo : The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, 2014. - 740 S. - (Kasuga lectures series ; 1)
ISBN 978-4-906267-71-2
YEN 2400,00
DDC: 294.342042

http://www.indologica.de/drupal/?q=node/3188

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 16th, 2014 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: Complete Togal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book
Content:
alpha said:
Can you provide some evidence that there are people whose paths were destroyed by them ?

krodha wrote:
It can happen in general, which is of course why you see statements from Padmasambhava such as this:

Having an unexamined teacher is like jumping into an abyss;
Having an unexamined student is like drinking poison.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 12:51 PM
Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Longchenpa also discusses this type of mistaken view. Pointing out the irony it implies. He says those who assert that principles such as karma, rebirth, compassion, merits etc., are inferior and will not lead to liberation, while simultaneously advocating for a so-called superior, simplified view (which does not require said principles), are actually the ones with the most inferior view of all.

smcj said:
If you could cite your source for where Longchenpa said this you'd be doing a lot of people a big favor.

krodha wrote:
Some say: "Cause and effect, compassion and merits are the dharma for ordinary people, and it will not lead to enlightenment. O great yogis! You should meditate upon the ultimate meaning, effortless as space."

These kinds of statements are the views of the utmost nihilism, they have entered the path of the most inferior. It is astonishing to expect the result while abandoning the cause.
- Longchenpa | rdzogs pa chen po sems nyid ngal gso

He also says:

Some foolish and arrogant people who do not know the (various) meanings of the Dharma say, "There is no karma and no effects of karma. In suchness there is nothing. It is like space;" and they abandon virtuous deeds and indulge in evil deeds. They say, "Beings are self-appearance like a dream. They do not exist as an external factor. So even killing is not an evil deed, since they are like a piece of wood." Those are nihilists and not followers of the Dharma. The Subāhu-sūtra says,

Some say, "There is no karma and no effect of karma. The (karma theory) is taught (by the Buddha) to lead the simple-minded people," and they live with hosts of non-virtuous deeds. You should know that they are not followers of this Dharma but are boasting. They are based on the path of atheists and are deceived by māras.

Both from Tulku Thondup's "The Practice of Dzogchen"

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 10:45 AM
Title: Re: Are Karma and Rebirth Real?
Content:
Wayfarer said:

And I think that this results in a mistake that is often made - the idea that the higher truths are really simple and there for all to see without need to believe anything such as 'rebirth' or to accept the basic truths of the Buddhist path. It is the mistake of those who think that rejecting the basic teachings is the same as going beyond the basic teachings, because they are insufficiently perceptive to grasp the difference.

krodha wrote:
Longchenpa also discusses this type of mistaken view. Pointing out the irony it implies. He says those who assert that principles such as karma, rebirth, compassion, merits etc., are inferior and will not lead to liberation, while simultaneously advocating for a so-called superior, simplified view (which does not require said principles), are actually the ones with the most inferior view of all.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 14th, 2014 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
Gyurme Kundrol said:
No need to abandon, and no need to create either. If you have recognition and confidence in the non-abiding nature then you just rest in that, and everything accomplishes itself. If you are aspiring for that non-abiding state, then you do not have deep enough recognition or confidence (they really go hand in hand) to really practice "Dzogchen proper" which is totally beyond reliance on any conventional mode of thought or conceptualization regarding the appearances and manifestations that happen in ones field of awareness, and this includes any reliance upon an aspiration or intention to become liberated, since in the ultimate nature such an intention or aspiration, or even such a thought is literally not needed.

The problem with calling something "Dzogchen proper" is that there is at least three classifications of Dzogchen, space, mind and pith instructions. Each has a slightly different view and emphasis on different points of practice, experience, and so forth.

krodha wrote:
"Dzogchen proper", meaning; the unfabricated and direct, experiential view of dharmatā.

In the ultimate nature, intention and aspiration are inapplicable, but most are not able to rest in that nature continuously. Even my teacher Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche says he is not in the state of contemplation at all times, and has said when you are not in the state of contemplation then you are in the relative condition, and relative things apply to you.

So there is two sides to this for practitioners on the path; when you are resting in the view of uncontrived dharmatā then of course you are totally beyond concepts and require nothing, the view guides the conduct (which being inseparable, are perfectly balanced) and that is that. On the other hand, during post-equipoise (which is assuming one has genuine recognition in the first place, otherwise 'post-equipoise' does not apply

for there is no initial equipoise to speak of), conduct must support the view. For one who has just entered the actual path, instances of post-equipoise will take up the majority of their time. As familiarization deepens and instances of equipoise are extended, then the need for contrived conduct will decrease. When it gets to the point that equipoise and post-equipoise are blended, then "everything accomplishes itself"... however on the outset this is not the case.

Regarding the classifications: like you mentioned, aspects of the three classifications will cater to different facets of that single view, but at the same time there are aspects of each class which can be considered to be complete paths in themselves as well. Either way, the view [lta ba] is the view... the system is a means to recognize the view, gain confidence in the view, and continue in the view.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 10:52 PM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
Andrew108 said:
This is from a commentary on the Kunjed Gyalpo. So this is coming from a Dzogchen POV.

krodha wrote:
That quote isn't saying anything to the contrary.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 4:57 PM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Energy is likewise merely conventional.

'Sensory appearances, moreover, arise naturally due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa], and so their nature is described in a purely symbolic way as one of interdependent connection [dependent origination]. Even in the very moment that things seem to arise due to that dynamic energy they do not do so without being subject to extremes or divisions - with no question of whether or not something arises - and even 'dynamic energy' is just a symbolic term, with no finite essence whatsoever. So within the context [dharmatā] that is never subject to transition or change, nothing strays in the slightest from awakened mind.'

Even the statement that things arise as samsara and nirvana due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa] is merely conventional, for in essence nothing has ever existed as anything in the slightest - nothing being distinct in itself as the process of samsara or nirvana arising, or as some 'thing' that arises."
- chos dbyings rin po che'i mdzod ces bya ba'i 'grel pa

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 5:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
krodha wrote:
The body is very important in Dzogchen, maintaining the health and integrity of ones channels and a good circulation of winds are good things to be mindful of.

Apart from the anatomical aspects (of the body) that some Dzogchen principles are related to, health in general is if course important, a healthy body means a longer life, and a longer life means more time for practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 5:33 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
ZOOM said:
So could anyone explain to me why Dzogchen training should need pranayama or any other kind of winds training to lead to the goal of enlightenment & rainbow body? Or is it simply a wrong claim?

According to Lopön Tenzin Namdak Rinpoche, entering the Natural State of mind and staying in it is all that is necessary to attain ultimately rainbow body. If that is true, why wasting time with training in the channels with the winds etc.?

krodha wrote:
Depends on the individual. In the ultimate sense, and ideally one would not need secondary supports to maintain knowledge of their nature. But we're all different, some may need some prānayāma to help support their practice, another person may not and will find a different method which helps them rest in their nature.

When it comes to methods and resting in the view, the method that works is the one that works, no need to limit oneself and reject prānayāma, and no reason to cling to prānayāma and take it to be a sole means. I think you'll find that most Dzogchen teachers recommend some tsa lung as a secondary practice and support for the main view.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is a thread in here somewhere dedicated to women who attained rainbow body. I

can't pull it up at the moment but if you do a search you'll find it.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen & rainbow body
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Dzogchen attitude is quite unique. Very special. The idea of wanting to have rainbow body or wanting to achieve enlightenment doesn't fit.

ZOOM said:
What you are implying seems completely absurd to me.
For what reason in your opinion are all those people practicing Dzogchen who finally succeed in attaining rainbow body?

krodha wrote:
Andrew isn't fully understanding the context in which statements of that nature are found. It isn't that Dzogchen champions an absence of aspiration in relation to liberation, but how that aspiration is addressed in itself is different when it comes to Dzogpachenpo.

The view of Dzogchen proper is unfabricated and free of mind, so assertions which convey that desiring liberation, or working towards liberation in a solely causal setting, are 'delusional' is really just stating that these attitudes relate to the mind. In the sense that mind mistakes itself as a subject which relates to objects and therefore mind objectifies awakening as something it can produce or acquire via causal means.

Dzogchen is criticizing this type of approach, but is not saying one should abandon an aspiration for liberation.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 13th, 2014 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Free Will
Content:
Motova said:
From the Buddhist perspective, what is free will?

krodha wrote:
Some info in this thread:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=7753

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: On Nirvana

Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Maybe you two should get a room.

krodha wrote:
Wow, first the monktastic flyboy and now Andrew108... I'm puttin' in work at Dzogchungpa's Bed and Breakfast!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 11:23 PM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
Andrew108 said:
But does this mean that it has no existence?

krodha wrote:
It sure does.

Andrew108 said:
Baselessness does exist. It is a very natural part of experience.

krodha wrote:
Not at all.

Andrew108 said:
It's apart of how reality is.

krodha wrote:
Luckily there is no 'reality' apart from a nominal title, otherwise nirvana would be an impossibility.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 12:14 PM
Title: Re: Tibetan Dream Yoga
Content:
VinceField said:
...many Buddhist practitioners seem to believe that the essence of the nature and purpose of these nighttime dream yoga/lucid dreaming experiences is contradictory to the Dhamma.

krodha wrote:
Interesting, where did you encounter these practitioners?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 12th, 2014 at 9:38 AM
Title: Re: On Nirvana
Content:
krodha wrote:
Technically nirvana isn't experienced in the first place, so the logic which ensues based on that initial premise is flawed to begin with...

Malcolm said:
Aryadeva clearly states in 400 Verses:

[Since] there are no aggregates in nirvana,
a person cannot possibly be [in nirvana].

Candrakirti comments on this:

If there are aggregates in nirvana, there is also a person. At that time, because they exist [i.e. aggregates and persons], in contradiction with sūtra there will be a support that turns into nirvana, and samsara cannot be transcended.

krodha wrote:
Nāgārjuna's examination of the Tathāgata and Nirvana in his MMK further demonstrate how the initial premise is flawed.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 4:32 AM
Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Do you believe in distance? That for example it takes light about 8 minutes to get from the surface of the sun to the earth?

krodha wrote:
I believe that one's apparent perceptions can be conditioned by conventional constructs to create the appearance of a relative condition which seems to uphold the principles it allegedly consists of.

However are those principles, such as distance and so on valid beyond the pale of one's relative experience? No, since they do not withstand investigation or proper scrutiny, and are revealed to be unreal from the standpoint of wisdom.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 4:27 AM
Title: Re: Questions about meditation-Please explain what's happeni
Content:

daverupa said:
Research the terms 'tinnitus' and 'rigors'/'hot flash' and 'phosphenes' and see if these sorts of phenomenological events describe the bulk of your symptoms.

krodha wrote:
Though these explanations would be placing the experience in the context of how materialist science explains this type of phenomena. The point of meditation in general is to work towards freeing oneself from the rigidity of such constructs (which isn't to say we should throw all caution to the wind and ignore relative physical ailments, for if we are truly afflicted with something we should of course seek medical attention).

When it comes to these subtle meditational experiences, turning to the modern physicalist-materialist paradigm to identify and place them into neat little boxes is (i) grasping at those experiences, and (ii) simply breathing life into the very conditioned world views that the buddhadharma is aiming to reveal as ultimately unreal abstraction.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Rebirth....how does it happen?
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Can you cite where that text is, exactly? Where are you getting the phrase 'objective condition'?

krodha wrote:
The 'objective condition' thing is a notion that Andrew evokes quite often. Buddhism has no issue with an objective condition in a conventional or relative sense, but Andrew means an actual objective condition... sort of a byproduct of the physicalist materialism (or 'naturalism' as he perfers) he is enamored with.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Questions about meditation-Please explain what's happeni
Content:
kirtu said:
nimitta is different than what was described.

Kirt

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, I am admittedly unfamiliar with jhanas and nimittas... though chakawhirl's description sounds a lot like it:

chakawhirl said:
I started meditation again a few days back and this time instead of the lights thing that i

used to feel earlier, sometimes when i really became relaxed and was able to sit for a longer duration,i felt a really calm feeling that came over me and though my eyes were closed, there was a subtle light that i felt or saw. It wasn't too bright but it was there.

krodha wrote:
From Ajahn Brahm:
Nimitta, in the context used here, refers to the beautiful "lights" that appear in the mind. I would point out, though, that the nimittas are not visual objects, in that they are not seen through the sense of sight. At this stage of the meditation, the sense of sight is not operating. The nimittas are pure mental objects, known by the mind sense. However, they are commonly perceived as lights...

SUITABLE NIMITTA AND USELESS NIMITTA

It is very helpful to cultivate nimitta of the sort perceived as a light. These "light nimittas" are the best vehicle for transporting the meditator into the Jhanas. However, it is just possible, but rarely done, to enter a Jhana by using "feeling nimittas" instead. By this I mean that one sees no lights in the mind, instead one experiences a feeling of bliss in the mind. It is important to note that the sense of touch has been transcended and such a "feeling" of bliss is experienced completely by the mind sense. It is a pure mental object again, but perceived as relating closely to a physical feeling of bliss. This is a bona-fide nimitta. But it is much more difficult to work with such as a nimitta to gain access to Jhana, though it is not impossible. For these reasons, it is recommended to cultivate the light nimitta if one aspires for the Jhana.

There are some visual nimittas that are of no use on the path into Jhana. It is helpful to know these "useless" nimitta so that one will waste no time with them.

Visions: Sometimes whole scenes can appear clearly in the mind. There might be landscapes, buildings and people. They may appear familiar or strange. It might be fascinating to watch such visions, but they are of little use. Moreover, they are meaningless and one should certainly not take them as some revelation of truth! Experience shows that visions arising at this stage are notoriously deceptive and completely untrustworthy. If one likes to waste time, one can linger on them a while. But the recommended thing to do is to remove all interest and go back to the beautiful breath. Such complex nimitta are merely a reflection of an overcomplicated mind. The mind should have been calmed into simplicity much more effectively before letting go of the breath. When one sustains the attention on the beautiful breath, uninterrupted for long periods of time, then one is training in simplicity. Then when the breath disappears, a simple unified nimitta arises, one that is suitable for progress.

The Firework Nimitta: A less elaborate nimitta, which is still overcomplicated, can be called the "firework nimitta." As the name suggests, this consists of many bursts of light coming and going, never lasting long and exhibiting much movement. There may be several bursts of light at the same time, even of different colors. Again, this firework nimitta is a sign that the mind is still too complicated and very unstable. If one wants, one can enjoy the sideshow for a short time, but one should not waste too much time

there. One should ignore all the razzele-dazzele of the firework nimitta, return to the breath, and develop more one-pointedness and calm.

The Shy Nimitta: The next type of nimitta can be called the "shy nimitta," a single pure light that flashes up quickly and then disappears. After a few moments, it flashes up again. Each time, it lasts only a second or two. Such a nimitta is much more encouraging. Its simplicity shows that the mind is one-pointed. Its power is a sign that pitisukha is strong. But its inability to remain after breaking through into consciousness shows that the level of calm is not quite enough. In such a situation, one need not return to the beautiful breath yet. Instead, one patiently waits, developing more calm, allowing the mind to become more receptive to the very shy nimitta. As will be explained at greater length later, this nimitta disappears because the mind overreacts to its arrival, usually with excitement or fear. By establishing more solid calm and having the confidence to not react at all, the shy nimitta returns and stays longer each time. Soon, such a nimitta loses its shyness and, feeling accepted within the mind's calmness, remains a long time. One should attempt this approach first; But if the nimitta continues being "shy," with no indication that it is remaining longer, then one should return to the beautiful breath and ignore the shy nimitta. When one has built more tranquility of mind with the beautiful breath, then one can return to the shy nimitta to see if it will establish itself this time.

The Point Nimitta: Another type of nimitta is the "point nimitta," a simple and powerful light, but ever so small, which persists many seconds. This nimitta can be very useful. It shows that one-pointedness is excellent, calm is sufficient, but pitisukha is still a bit lacking. However, all one needs to. do is gently look deeper into the point nimitta, letting mindfulness zero in, then it appears as if one's awareness comes closer to this nimitta and its size starts to increase. As it expands a little, one should keep one's focus on the center, not on the edges, nor beyond the edges. By maintaining the mind's focus sharply on the center of the point nimitta, it increases power, it grows in pitisukha. Soon the nimitta unfolds into the best nimitta of all.

The Best Nimitta: The best nimitta of all, that which is the most suitable for Jhanas, begins as being similar to the full moon at midnight in a sky free of clouds. It rises unhurried when the beautiful breath softly disappears. It takes three or four seconds to establish its presence and settle down, remaining still and very beautiful before the mind's eye. As it remains without effort it grows brighter, more luminous. Soon it appears brighter than the sun at midday, radiating bliss. It becomes, by far, the most beautiful thing one has ever seen. Its beauty and power will often feel more than one can bear. One wonders whether one can take so much bliss of such extreme power. But one can. There's no limit to the bliss one can feel. The nimitta explodes, drowning one in even more bliss, or one dives into the center of the radiating ecstasy. If one remains there, it is Jhana.

http://www.what-buddha-taught.net/Books/Ajahn_Brahm_The_Jhanas.htm#PART

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 10th, 2014 at 2:52 AM
Title: Re: Questions about meditation-Please explain what's happeni
Content:
krodha wrote:
These types of experiences occur with meditation. Your friend was right, the best thing is to just keep with the practice and do not grasp at the experiences, otherwise they can potentially become a distraction. If you feel kinesthetic or tactile energetic movement in the body, subtle pressure in the head or elsewhere, visual phenomena like lights or even hallucinations, even strange auditory phenomena such as the sound you mentioned... these things are normal. All of that phenomena is called 'nyam' in Tibetan, they are just passing meditational experiences.

Some traditions refer to the lights you are seeing with closed eyes (you can also meditate with your eyes open, or slightly open, just FYI) as 'nmitta'. If you research the jhanas (or dhyanas) you will find that nmittas are an integral part of the jhanic strata.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 3:35 PM
Title: Re: Are these the warning signs of a cult?
Content:
WonderingAloud said:
What about other Buddhist 'schools' is there an implied focus SOLELY on the ONE person's teachings and writings?

krodha wrote:
Not usually... most other teachers and communities explore the teachings of various key adepts of the system. Granted the guru is always going to be the medium through which teachings are given, and rightly so, but most teachers will not attempt to monopolize your relationship with the Buddhist teachings by rendering themselves the sole conduit for their delivery and reception in every way.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 1:59 PM
Title: Re: Are these the warning signs of a cult?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Your concern is warranted. Many of the 'negatives' you listed are red flags without a doubt... definitely out of the ordinary when it comes to the general on-goings usually associated with sanghas.

There are a few Buddhist cults out there, and there are sites which list those groups; have you tried to see if your teacher/community is listed?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 1:32 AM
Title: Re: still new...questions on mindstream
Content:
Simon E. said:
I have very good reason to suspect that they can and do.

krodha wrote:
Some definitely can.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 9th, 2014 at 12:06 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
It's funny because it's true.

krodha wrote:
Though if my mouth not shutting is supposed to be a reference to my frequency in posting, the numbers show that your mouth is running far more frequently than mine... but let's not let that contradiction take away from your laugh out loud display of comedic genius.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
Mkoll said:
And no offense intended to you ASTNS or anyone else. Just thought that was funny.

krodha wrote:
None taken my friend.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 5:09 PM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:

monktastic said:
Can you do that? Just for me?

krodha wrote:
Anything for you monktastic, and be sure to let me know if I can walk on egg shells around any of your other pet peeves while I'm at it.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 4:45 PM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
monktastic said:
Well, YMMV. It was more than a few minutes I got to spend with him. As I said, he was very clear when he expressed that one-pointedly supplicating this seemingly endless source of goodness is a sure-fire way to realize the nature of mind.

krodha wrote:
Wonderful.

monktastic said:
If you have different instructions, that is fine.

krodha wrote:
As a matter of fact, I do.

monktastic said:
But I'll be honest, I am tiring of your explanations when none was requested.

krodha wrote:
This is an Internet forum, monktastic, receiving unrequested opinions, explanations, insights, anecdotes and such comes with the territory. If you cannot handle that then perhaps some personal introspection is in order. Or better yet, you could stand on the shore and attempt to fight the waves back as they roll in, the two activities are equal in their futility.

monktastic said:
Like I have asked more than a few times in the past Kyle, please, please, please stop trying to teach me / us.

krodha wrote:
I am no authority and would not be pompous enough to present myself as one. If anything you seem to be the one who is reoccurringly interested in teaching me what I should and should not be saying or doing. But I am polite about it and will continue to be.

monktastic said:
Above all else, do not tell me what "devotion is," especially when I'm sharing the words

of my guru.

krodha wrote:
I wasn't aware sharing the insights of one's guru is a sole privilege that belongs to you.

monktastic said:
You have no idea how dangerous such a statement can be.

krodha wrote:
Well, we cannot all be as well trained as you in wielding that sword, though it would be wonderful if we were.

monktastic said:
And do not tell me "well I wasn't trying to tell you what devotion really is."

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't dream of it.

monktastic said:
Read your words again and again if you have to.

krodha wrote:
I can assure you I don't have to.

monktastic said:
I am sorry if this comes across as harsh.

krodha wrote:
"Harsh" would not be the word that comes to mind.

monktastic said:
I do not mean it to be.

krodha wrote:
Well that is good, you are very kind.

monktastic said:
If you really think I am just completely misunderstanding my guru, please preface your words with "well I was taught...." Can you do that just for my sake?

krodha wrote:
I should not have to preface my opinion with what should be a given. In the future, just know damn well that I am sharing what I have been taught, as it is thoroughly understood that you are doing the same.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 10:23 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
monktastic said:
Perhaps la-la land for you. For me, the meaning is clear: supplicating and surrendering to the "all-good non-thing" that my friend was taught to call "god" is precisely the practice that DPR claims will result in realization of the natural state.

krodha wrote:
Right, except the true meaning of 'supplicating' the guru, the 'all-good' i.e. Samantabhadra (or Vajradhara, Vajrasattva etc.) in the context of the buddhadharma means to recognize and rest in the direct knowledge of that inborn nature. Devotion is one's capacity for maintaining a keen interest in the teachings. Not supplicating to a God-like non-thing.

Opening and closing prayers, guru yoga, aspiration and bodhicitta... beseeching the retinues of Buddhas, bodhisattvas, vidyādharas, dharmapālas, etc., to bless myself and innumerable sentient beings is a part of my own practice as well, however it is never taken as truly supplicating to some 'thing'. It is the aspiration, intention and so on which is the most important.

There is also value in praying. For example I have heard Kunzang Dechen Lingpa urge his students who lacked the capacity to understand certain principles of the teaching to pray to him, visualize him and supplicate to him with the intention of increasing their respective capacities in this sense. And he said that after some time these same students were able to easily understand the principles they previously struggled with.

So there is immense value in that type of activity, however supplicating to an 'all-good non-thing' in the context of your friend's tradition could easily err into a counterproductive view or activity if approached the wrong way.

Really depends on the context and the individual. But I don't think that activity translates at face value. There are even subtle differences in these activities between the lower and higher tantras. Context is everything.

monktastic said:
Your statement was not "out of line," but it did put words in his mouth and I wanted to set the record straight on what he actually said.

krodha wrote:
I cited "what he actually said" in my response when I quoted your statement.

monktastic said:
And honestly, in the moment of recognition, "inside" and "outside" are meaningless.

krodha wrote:

Perhaps, but not because there is only "God".

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 9:18 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
monktastic said:
Actually, he didn't use any of those words. You did. His words were "god is inside." I did not bother to tell him that my friend's tradition teaches that too. The meaning of his instruction was clear, and it wasn't an appropriate time to press him on the issue.

krodha wrote:
Seeing as how Buddhism doesn't actually teach that "God" is inside apart from the abstract statement which was made in the context of the discussion you cited, I can't see how my statement is out of line. We're clearly way out in left field la la land as it is when it comes to comparing "God" in Buddhism and Hindusim. Nothing definitive to cling to there, that is for sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
krodha wrote:
This discussion is reminiscent of a post Malcolm made some time ago:

Malcolm said:
So we can find a lot of parallels in Dzogchen and non-Buddhist teachings. The one main difference between Dzogchen and most non-Buddhist traditions is that in Dzogchen there is a definite rejection of creation by a creator. Even in Advaita, on a relative level, they accept Ishvara as a creator. So this is an important difference.

Don't beleive it when people say that Kun byed rgyal po is a Buddhist creator myth. It is not true. Kun byed gyal po refers to the mind. It does not mean Samantabhadra is a primordial creator deity or a kind of Buddhism theism. People who claim this like Alan Wallace and Eva Dargyay-Neumier are mistaken.

But as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says, "God" can be understood as a symbol of one's primordial state. So we do not necessarily have to reject "God" if we are Dzogchen practitioners, if by "God" we mean our own primordial potentiality and the primordial potentiality of everything. This is why we have that famous passage the text on Rigpa from the Tibetan Book of the Dead, cribbed by Shabkar in this way:

Now then, fortunate beloved children, listen!
Concerning this important term widely known as “mind”,
in terms of existence, the mind does not exist as a single entity.

In terms of sources, the mind is the source of the diverse happiness and suffering of samsara and nirvana.

Assertions about the mind exist in many categories of the vehicles.
The mind is designated by inconceivable different names:
ordinary people call the mind “I”;
some non-Buddhists give it the name “atman”;
the shravakas call it the “selfless person”;
the mind-only school gives it the name “mind”;
some call it “the perfection of wisdom”;
some give it the name” sugatagarbha”;
some give it the name “mahāmudra”;
some give it the name “madhyamaka”;
some give it the name “the single unique sphere”;
some give it the name “dharmadhātu”;
some give it the name “all-basis”;
some give it the name “ordinary mind”.
Although it is given inconceivable names,
since it is just this mind in reality, one must recognize it.

You must let the mind itself go free just where it is.
Having been let go, naked ordinary awareness,
a clarity that cannot be seen by looking for it,
the clear and vivid personal experience of vidyā,
is not established in any way at all, empty and pellucid.
Brilliant non-dual clarity and emptiness
is not permanent— not established at all;
is not annihilated— clear and vivid;
is not single— manifold, knowing and clear;
is not manifold— indivisible, one taste.
Not existing elsewhere, this is one’s own vidyā,
the true face of the original guide dwelling within one’s heart,
seen here right now in one’s personal experience.
Never be separate from this beloved children!

We could add a passage:

"other non-Buddhists give it the name “god”..."

This passage illustrates the point I have made all along. We do not need to imagine that all faiths lead to the same point, we merely have to accept that all humans beings are trying to find the same thing: the peace and happiness that comes from freedom.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Speaking of the G word... Really makes you think.

krodha wrote:
Chögyal Namkhai Norbu said that it was quite easy to see Dzogpachenpo in the Judeo-Christian principles he encountered when he used to frequent a church in Italy some years ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 8th, 2014 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: Prayer
Content:
monktastic said:
(Sorry for digging up an old thread, but I felt this was worth sharing.)

I had the opportunity to ask Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche about this earlier this year. I related the story of a friend who had been a devout Hindu as a child, and how his incredibly intense supplication and surrender to the all-good may have given him glimpses of the nature of mind. So intense that tears streamed and hairs stood on end, etc. DPR smiled broadly and nodded. He commented that this was completely natural -- that the spark of inspiration one gets while thinking of Sakyamuni is exactly the same thing. It is the devotion part of devotion and compassion. I was a bit surprised, and asked how praying to god could have any relationship to Dzogchen. He told me "Hinduism, Buddhism... same thing. The only difference is that Buddha showed that god is inside *."

YMMV, but I'd call that an endorsement.

* Many branches of Hinduism -- including the one my friend practiced in -- also teach this.

krodha wrote:
I like how he says Buddhism and Hinduism are the same thing, except for this one major difference ha (sugatagarbha pervading the heart of sentient beings rather than being an undifferentiated ontological existent which pervades everything).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 2:05 PM
Title: Re: Real or Pretend?
Content:
smcj said:
It was 6 arm Mahakala stomping on a Genesh.

krodha wrote:
Yeah I was just using Yamantaka as an example... cos he be in beast-mode steppin' on hella ppl.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 5th, 2014 at 1:27 PM
Title: Re: Real or Pretend?
Content:
smcj said:
But then why is he depicted as being stomped on by certain wrathful deities? Doesn't make sense that way.

krodha wrote:
Wrathful deities stepping on beings just means they are pacifying that being and/or what that being represents. Certain images of Yamantaka depict him stepping on Buddha Śākyamuni amongst numerous other figures for example. It is like that Zen proverb "If you see the Buddha on the road, kill him." Meaning the path and result are noble aspirations but eventually even the means and the desire for liberation must be overcome. Yamantaka represents primordial wisdom, deathless and free from all extremes and attachment, hence he is trampling various deities, Buddhas and other beings. However that doesn't mean it is anti-Buddha. Same for Ganesh being underfoot.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2014 at 3:11 PM
Title: Re: Dharma wheel, ethics, value & online communities
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Science has not yet impinged on the truths Buddhism holds to be definitive. But of course it has proven that some of the conventional truths Buddhists hold to are indeed false or metaphorical.

krodha wrote:
Buddhism proves all of its conventional truths to be false, that is the entire point of the teaching. So it doesn't really mean anything at all if science has apparently refuted a few conventions which are ultimately unreal.

Andrew108 said:
But above all, those truths that are considered contingent or relative can be interpreted and discussed with reference to ideas outside of the body of teachings. And if the reasoning and logic of scientists gains the upper hand then those Buddhist ideas need to be interpreted metaphorically - they can't be held to be invariant or definitive.

krodha wrote:
How would science, which is concerned with ontological truths, gain an upper hand on a self-deconstructive, soteriological, pedagogical methodology which is strictly

epistemic in nature? You're comparing apples and oranges.

Models found within the buddhadharma are posited for purposes of practicality, and are catered towards that type of application. Buddhism is in the business of soteriology, meaning it is solely concerned with liberation (or varying degrees thereof) which is procured via experiential epistemic insights... ontology never comes into the picture. Any constructs and structures presented by the buddhadharma are strictly a means to liberate you from the conditioned projections of inherency which are falsely attributed to your conventionally conscious condition. Those structures are self-deconstructive and are therefore provisional in every way. Rafts to be abandoned.

Science (materialist, physicalist or otherwise) on the other hand, has zero practical application or soteriological value. Buddhism, unlike science, is meant to transcend limitation, and is solely concerned with doing so. The dharma is applied within our limitations on the outset, but it works with those limitations and is meant to pacify them. The same cannot be said for science. There is no path, no means, no method for awakening to be found in science. Science is helpful and wonderful, but there will never be a day where science 'gains the upper hand' in any sense of the notion.

Also, Buddhism never holds its principles as 'definitive' in the way you are apparently perceiving it to. Certainly not in the sense that science considers its insights to be 'definitive'. Buddhism does not adhere to these scientific underpinnings you project onto it.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2014 at 2:53 AM
Title: Re: Unbinding, and The Unmade
Content:
Jikan said:
Please forgive my ignorance. What do you mean by "unbinding"?

krodha wrote:
Unbinding is term sometimes used to describe nirvāṇa. In the sense that nirvāṇa is an exhaustion, an unbinding, a release, an extinguishing, a liberation, a cessation, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 4:19 AM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Yes absence of identity can be experienced and infact one can make the case that without absence of identity, experience wouldn't be possible.

krodha wrote:
Which is why I noted that these relative occurrences are byproducts of that principle

[lack of identity or arising in phenomena].

Andrew108 said:
But emptiness is a concept.

krodha wrote:
Again, 'emptiness' as an enumerated notion is a concept. The direct realization however is not a concept, just as the direct taste of sugar is not a concept.

Andrew108 said:
Without concepts experience is naturally non-fixated - naturally non-fixated because experience and the content of experience are naturally without own identity.

krodha wrote:
Well, 'concepts' in the context of these teachings does not mean simply 'conceptual thought'; but rather includes all abstractive fabrications that the deluded mind serves to manifest such as ideas, emotions, the five poisons, acceptance, rejection etc.

When the deluded mind is pacified (due to delusion itself being pacified through unenumerated and direct wisdom-insight), then natural non-fixation is known. Until that point however there will always be a subtle fixation present, even if one attempts to drop concepts and simply rest in a semblance of non-fixation like in objectless śamatha. Fixation will still be latently present because there has not been wisdom-insight to pacify the reference point of mind.

The fact that experience and its contents are naturally without identity is not what the teachings are concerned with. Rather, they are concerned wth knowledge or ignorance of that fact. Just because experience naturally lacks identity does not mean one possesses that knowledge. There cannot be knowledge of dharmatā without recognition.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 30th, 2014 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The problem is that students want to find emptiness or at least experience it. But it is impossible to experience emptiness because when you do you are experiencing a 'something' called absence or emptiness. A cup that seems solid is changing from one moment to the next. That change is coming about because of interdependence. That interdependence is suggestive of a lack of own identity. There is no room for emptiness. It's a concept about interdependence and the fact or law that dharmas have no own identity.

krodha wrote:
Emptiness (as in an absence of identity) can absolutely be directly recognized in an

experiential sense. A cup that is allegedly changing from one moment to the next is not that lack of identity, but rather is an abstractive byproduct of that principle. Change is also empty, as time and the dharmins which would allegedly change (while enduring in time) cannot be found when sought.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 28th, 2014 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Do you mean a cup which had liquid in it but now does not? If so then the cup is not empty because air is in the cup instead of liquid. So the idea that the cup is empty is just a concept. What is meant is that instead of there being liquid there is now air. As hard as you try to find emptiness you wont be able to. All you can find is a changed state. In this sense emptiness is just a concept related to absence and absence is a concept related to a changed state. Both 'emptiness' and 'absence' are concepts or only work at a conventional level as vague descriptives.

krodha wrote:
How is this related to emptiness in any way whatsoever? Cups which contain liquid and an absence of liquid? This has nothing to do with emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
@ Sherab. Emptiness in the suttas you referenced simply means no essence can found and therefore craving has no basis. Emptiness is a conclusion about a natural fact. In that sense it is conceptual. Look at the Sunna Sutta for a basic outline of emptiness. It is the fact of anatta. Then comes the concept 'it is empty of what it appears to be'. But in no way is emptiness a property of the thing.

krodha wrote:
How could emptiness be a property of a thing, when no such things can be found apart from conventionality?

Are you suggesting that there are actually things which do not have emptiness as a property?

All in all it's impossible to understand emptiness or dependent origination while maintaining a materialist view. Materialism directly contradicts the insight that emptiness and/or dependent origination are meant to convey.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 4:18 PM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
@ asunthatneversets . Dependent origination is not a view but an invariance experienced in a factual way. In a material way.

krodha wrote:
This assertion is tragic, to say the least.

Andrew108 said:
Emptiness is the view. The concept. The imagined.

krodha wrote:
As mentioned earlier in this thread; there is emptiness in its enumerated form, which is a concept. And then there is emptiness in its unenumerated form, which is not a concept.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 4:05 PM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
Andrew108 said:
There is no 'it is emptiness'. Emptiness is just another way to talk about interdependence. Phenomena don't have emptiness as a property. Again, emptiness is just a concept concerning dependent origination. This 'emptiness as a property' is the one view that I had before that caused me many problems. This view that emptiness is a property and is descriptive of an ultimate is IMO very damaging.

krodha wrote:
Well, not interdependence. Pratityasamutpada does not translate to 'interdependency'.

But you're correct, phenomena do not possess emptiness as a property because said phenomena which would possess 'emptiness' cannot be found. Their lack of essence, substantiality, findability, etc. is what we term their 'emptiness'. This will not make sense to you since you uphold a view of physicalist materialism.

Emptiness is not merely a concept concerning dependent origination. Dependent origination is a view which can be implemented to realize emptiness.

Trust me 'emptiness as a property' is the least of your worries when it comes to damaging views.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 27th, 2014 at 3:04 PM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
krodha wrote:
The ultimate is described as 'permanent' because it is emptiness, ergo it never arose and therefore cannot cease. However it is not an permanent existent in the ontological sense, that type of permanence is of course considered to be impossible.

Everything is transient except for the ultimate simply means that the emptiness of phenomena is never compromised or adulterated by the various apparent activities and actions of relative phenomena. Non-arisen dharmas are non-arisen by nature, meaning; the arising, abiding and cessation (transiency) of dharmins is delusory abstraction and afflictive fabrication. From the standpoint of the ultimate it is explicitly known that there has never been arising, abiding or cessation.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 26th, 2014 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
rachmiel said:
"More" ultimate imo: no oasis, no mirage, no ultimate truth. Just ... _____ (pure experience) .

krodha wrote:
Just 'pure experience' would be like saying there is just 'pure weather'. The weather isn't an entity but rather a designation attributed to any number of appearances or combinations thereof. Weather is an abstraction, you'll never find 'weather' as such, it is just a useful convention. Same goes for experience.

Also, since when investigated all the elements which would constitute 'experience' are non-arisen, experience itself is non-arisen. Because again, experience isn't a homogeneous entity but is instead an aggregated heterogeneous amalgamation of various elements, aspects, characteristics, which do not withstand scrutiny themselves.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 26th, 2014 at 10:53 AM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
krodha wrote:
In an example of an oasis which is actually a mirage:

The oasis is the conventional designation.

The appearance of water, foliage, trees which constitutes the oasis is the relative truth.

However the oasis is actually a mirage, so the 'oasis' is a deluded cognition. That cognition functions in as far as it is efficient, but it will not withstand proper scrutiny. That is relative truth.

The ultimate truth is recognizing that the oasis is actually a mirage. There is nothing truly there which has any inherency or substantiality. Recognition of the unreality of the oasis is a valid cognition.

When we formulate a conceptual description of that ultimate truth, it is actually a conventional description, and so is only relative.

The non-conceptual recognition itself, the experiential lived realization, is the actual ultimate truth. But of course that cannot be captured using words, just as the taste of chocolate cannot be truly communicated using words.

So it isn't as cut and dry as story and non-story. But at the same time it is in a way. There are just a few nuanced aspects of this topic so the context would of course be important.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 26th, 2014 at 9:15 AM
Title: Re: Unreality of Thoughts
Content:
krodha wrote:
The relative is X person, place, thing etc. i.e. objects of deluded cognition.

The ultimate is the non-arising of X person, place, thing etc., which is valid cognition.

When you delineate or describe the ultimate using words it is an enumerated ultimate. Which is a conventional relative truth. Like describing the taste of an orange.

The direct realization of the ultimate, which is non-conceptual is the unenumerated ultimate. Like the actual taste of an orange.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm
Content:
Wayfarer said:
I met UG. THought he was an utter phoney. Said 'Buddha was a fascist'.

krodha wrote:
That was U.G.'s method for the most part; non-affirming negation, except not in the skillful way non-affirming negations occur in Madhyamaka for example, he just straight up said any alleged spiritual authority was phony. The purpose for that being that he

didn't allow anyone to grasp at anything or land anywhere. That's why no one really gets what U.G. was trying to convey in his teaching and you have a lot of people who simply think he was a negative guy who attacked everything and everyone. But once you get what he's doing and see his interactions it becomes clear.

I came into contact with the buddhadharma through my friend's uncle who used to follow U.G. around. He said U.G. was actually a very kind and loving man, despite how his methods came across.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 4:44 AM
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I kind of prefer the other Krishnamurti.

oushi said:
Me too.
Debates between those two were probably fascinating. Like fire and water. I wonder if there are any records of both Krishnamurti meeting.

krodha wrote:
They did. UG Krishnamurti actually attained his initial realization at a teaching that Jiddu Krishnamurti was giving. I believe UG was somewhat of an avid follower of Jiddu prior to that incident as well. UG writes of frustrations he had with trying to understand Jiddu for quite some time prior his own awakening experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
rachmiel said:
I don't see the relationship between the https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Skandhas and the https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five_Dhyani_Buddhas. Am I missing something?

krodha wrote:
When the skandhas are experienced from the standpoint of primordial wisdom, they are recognized to be wisdom itself, or more specifically five aspects of primordial wisdom.

Sogyal Rinpoche states: You can also think of the nature of mind like a mirror, with five different powers or 'wisdoms.' Its openness and vastness is the wisdom of all-encompassing space [or dharmadhātu], the womb of compassion. Its capacity to reflect in precise detail whatever comes before it is the mirror-like wisdom. Its fundamental lack of any bias toward any impression is the equalizing wisdom [or wisdom of equality]. Its ability to distinguish clearly, without confusing in any way the

various different phenomena that arise, is the wisdom of discernment. And its potential of having everything already accomplished, perfected, and spontaneously present is the all-accomplishing wisdom. (The Tibetan Book of Living and Dying, p. 157)
Form skandha [rūpaskandha] becomes mirror-like wisdom [skt. ādarśajñāna, tib. me long lta bu'i ye shes]. Just as the clear surface of a mirror reflects everything before it, the wisdom of dharmadhātu 'reflects' all the phenomena of samsara and nirvana. This clear reflection is the mirror-like wisdom.

Sensation skandha [vedanāskandha] becomes wisdom of equality [skt. samatājñāna, tib. mnyam nyid ye shes]. Just as all the reflections in a mirror are the same in being simply reflections, without any concept of good or bad, the wisdom of equality is to regard samsara and nirvana as equal, as having a single mode and one taste.

Perception skandha [samjñāskandha] becomes discriminating wisdom [skt. pratyavekṣanājñāna, tib. so sor rtog pa'i ye shes]. It is the knowledge that while from the point of view of the ultimate nature all phenomena are the same in being equal, from the point of view of the phenomena themselves all things in samsara and nirvana are distinct and not confounded.

Volition skandha [samskāraskandha] becomes all-accomplishing wisdom [skt. kṛtyānuṣṭhānajñāna, tib. bya ba grub pa'i ye shes]. Like a doctor who diagnoses a disease by taking the patient's pulse and then does all he can to treat and remedy the disease, the buddhas, with their all-accomplishing wisdom, consider beings and the ways by which they might benefit them, and then appear spontaneously and effortlessly, without change or exertion, to benefit those beings.

Consciousness skandha [vijñānaskandha] becomes dharmadhātu wisdom [skt. dharmadhātujñāna, tib. chos kyi dbyings kyi ye shes]. The wisdom of the dharmadhātu is the realization of the ultimate truth, the natural state of all things.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 23rd, 2014 at 1:59 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
Five skandhas are primordial five Buddhas, but adventitious obstacles obscure these natural qualities, like cataracts.

rachmiel said:
Please explicate further.

krodha wrote:
The five skandhas in their natural expression are the five wisdoms i.e. the five dhyani buddhas.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 5:44 PM
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Any time someone says that Dzogchen is like..... Then they get told that Dzogchen is unique and a system unto itself etc. So these threads are somewhat of a dead end. However, the realizations that practitioners of different systems have are pretty much the same if they have explored their traditions in full as Krishnamurti had.

krodha wrote:
Not really... the 'choiceless awareness' that Krishnamurti speaks of is clearly not the same thing. However there is surely no knee jerk reactivity occurring on the account of Dzogchen being 'unique'. Sure the system which surrounds Dzogchen may be unique, but the definitive realization is the same state as all Buddhas, call it prajñāpāramitā, Mahāmudrā, Dzogchen, it's the same.

At any rate, you're the guy who went head over heels for the Ramana Maharshi quote which was featured as the epigraph in 'The Marvelous Primordial State' and couldn't for the life of you understand how or why that was an inappropriate fit. So it's blatantly obvious where your confirmation biases lie. Whether you really don't understand the differences in the systems, or just like to kick up dust for the sheer fun of being contradictory I have no idea. One thing is clear though, these little controversial topics are your favorite because you get to act as if you're taking some sort of highly evolved, open minded, high ground which contrasts those partial to what you call 'orthodoxy.' Surprised it took you this long to add your two cents in this thread to be honest... but never fear, Andrew is here.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 3:09 PM
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Interesting how the great naysayer to all religious hypocrisy has now become an icon to be dismissed.

krodha wrote:
No one is dismissing Krishnamurti, the only thing which is being addressed is the assertion that Krishnamurti's view is the same as the Dzogchen view. I would dismiss that assertion, others may not.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 2:04 PM
Title: Re: Krishnamurti and Dzogchen.....Hmmmm
Content:

Stefos said:
When I compare Krishnamurti's "Choiceless Awareness" to Dzogchen's "Naked Awareness," it's the same thing!

krodha wrote:
Not the same thing. Here's B. Alan Wallace on 'choiceless awareness' in the context of Dzogchen:

"It's vitally important to distinguish between this shamatha practice and 'choiceless awareness,' which has recently been introduced by popularizers of vipassana meditation... As for choiceless awareness, there are no references to this term in any of the teachings of the Buddha recorded in the Pali language or in their authoritative commentaries, so it is misleading to present this as vipassana practice. In reality, choiceless awareness is a term coined and defined by Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895-1986), who characterized it as the observation of whatever is occurring in the present moment, without any reaction, resistance, justification, or condemnation. As helpful as this practice has proven to be, as it's been studied within the context of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction, it is neither shamatha nor a viplasyana practice in any Buddhist tradition.

Such choiceless awareness also bears a strong similarity to 'open presence,' which a number of popularizers of Dzogchen teach these days. This practice consists of simply letting your awareness be open to all kinds of appearances, sensory and mental, while letting them come and go without intervention. 'Open presence' is a very loose translation of the Tibetan term rig pa chog zhag, which literally means 'resting in pristine awareness.' This refers to the 'breakthrough' phase of Dzogchen practice, and to engage in such authentic meditation, you must first gain an experiential realization of rigpa, and then simply rest - without distraction and without grasping - in this ultimate-ground state of consciousness. This practice is imply sustaining the Dzogchen view: viewing all phenomena from the perspective of rigpa. However, without having such realization of rigpa, one is simply resting in one's ordinary dualistic mind, like a marmot sunning on a rock, and does not qualify as shamatha, vipasyana, or Dzogchen. Dudjom Lingpa ridicules such practice by citing the Tibetan aphorism, 'The marmot ostensibly cultivating meditative stabilization is actually hibernating.'"

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 5:57 AM
Title: Re: Pema Khandro?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've also enjoyed Lama Lena's teachings the few times I've seen her. Unfortunate that Lama Wangdor doesn't travel anymore, to the U.S. I mean, he is quite incredible.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 22nd, 2014 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Pema Khandro?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I take it he wouldn't recommend her?

krodha wrote:
Probably not. If you want to make a local connection of that type (Dzogchen etc.), I'd say go with Chaphur Rinpoche in Richmond, CA, or Lama Lena who is back in the area, there's also a lama connected to Chatral Rinpoche in San Mateo I believe (forget his name but can find out), the Nyingma spot in San Jose, Orgyen Dorje Den in Alameda or good old' Dondrub Ling.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 10:53 PM
Title: Re: Pema Khandro?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I asked a friend about her who's been around the Berkeley/bay area dharma scene for a long time and all he had to say was; "Yeah, I know who she is and have met her. To be honest, she's ok, however she doesn't show me sh*t." So... there's that statement, in all of its infinite wisdom ha.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
krodha wrote:
What is interesting to see is that the ātman proponents usually tend to cast aspersions at those who advocate for the view of anātman, stating they are nihilists or annihilationists. Which is patently false being that the view of anātman proper is non-arising and a freedom from extremes, ergo anātman is not a view which errs into extremes. The irony of the entire matter is that the same cannot be said for the ātman proponents themselves, for they are guilty of what they project onto those who uphold the view of non-arising [anātman], which is; they (the ātman proponents) are the ones who uphold an extreme view.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 21st, 2014 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
shel said:
Being that spelling is so important, I feel it must be pointed out that you've misspelled ego-centerdness. Perhaps it was a Freudian slip of some sort. In any case, we're all human, even Easterners.

krodha wrote:
For the record: Ego- centeredness. You misspelled it too.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Guru Rinpoche on this matter ...

dzogchungpa said:
Further on "Guru Rinpoche" has a little more to say: Now, wakefulness that is primordially pure in essence
Is unobservable and indescribable, beyond words and analogies,
Not an object of conceptual mind, but the original empty nature
In which samsara is unfounded and nirvana is a mere designation.

The spontaneously present nature is the unconfined expression of wakefulness;
Like light from the sun in the sky,
It pervades everywhere and abides as the life-force of everyone,
Indivisible from anything and without being partial to samsara or nirvana.

These two are beyond the constructs of 'one' and 'many'.
This natural state of unformed unity,
Unviewable, the king of all views,
Is what the lord of yogis in his personal experience
Should be pointed out and actualized as being the view.

krodha wrote:
No contradiction at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 20th, 2014 at 3:36 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Guru Rinpoche on this matter:
The mind that observes is also devoid of an ego or self-entity.
It is neither seen as something different from the aggregates
Nor as identical with these five aggregates.
If the first were true, there would exist some other substance.

This is not the case, so were the second to be true,
That would contradict a permanent self, since the aggregates are impermanent.

Therefore, based on the five aggregates,
The self is a mere imputation based on the power of the ego-clinging [bdag 'dzin].

As to that which imputes, the past thought has vanished and is nonexistent.
The future thought has not occurred, and the present thought does not withstand scrutiny.
- Padmasambhava

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 18th, 2014 at 10:55 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Wayfarer said:
Indeed. And in K Venkata Ramanan's translation and commentary on the MMK, he observes that at some times the Buddha would teach 'there is a self' when speaking to those with nihilistic tendencies, and say the opposite when speaking to those of the opposite view. As often was the case, what he said depended on the pre-disposition of those he was talking to, as part of 'skillful means'.

ps. Beings are not actually nothings. In some schools of Mahayana there is a saying, 'all beings are already _____'.

Fill in the blank. Hint: begins with 'B'.

krodha wrote:
The proper view is emptiness, free from extremes. It resolves all of these issues.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 10:28 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
yea that wasn't my interpretation of Dolpopa, that was direct quotes from him stating his view on the existance of the True Self/Enlightenment.
he was very clear that The True Self is Enlightenment and he upheld the 4 virtues of Nirvana(and then some)

krodha wrote:
It is your interpretation, which is shared by some and considered inaccurate by others. Personally I don't really care for Dolbulba's teachings at all so I have no vested interest in promulgating a viewpoint.

I'm merely saying your view is not the inherent and infallible treatment, it's an interpretation. If there can be multiple interpretations, then all possibilities are equal in being interpretations. You may consider your interpretation to be correct, but that does

not alter its status as an interpretation.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 10:06 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
no this conversation wasn't about convincing you of the True Self, this conversation was about correcting your misrepresention concerning Dolpopa's actual teachings on the topic of True Self.

if you want to know about the True Self you don't need me to tell you about about it , just read the numerous Buddhist Sutras and Tantras it is taught in

krodha wrote:
Ah, well apparently not everyone shares your sentiments regarding Dolbulba's view. You have your interpretation, some people agree with that type of view, some don't. Some people interpret certain sūtras and tantras as advocating for a True Self, someone else may read the exact same texts and not see a 'True Self' suggested at all.

So no, your interpretation of Dolbulba is not 'the actual' view of the teaching, it is your interpretation. Same goes for my view on it. Likewise your predilection to see a True Self in certain teachings is your own, and far from an inherently official view. Same goes for my view on the matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
We most certainly would,we uphold the 4 virtues of Nirvana:
Permenance,Bliss,Purity,True Self.

asunthatneversets said:
The term 'self' [atman] in that context means 'nature' as was previously clarified when this came up before. It is describing the definitive nature of mind as luminosity free from extremes.

Son of Buddha said:
in what context?
from the context of the Buddhist teachings on True Self, True self means True, real, eternal, sovereign/autonomous/ self governing, ground/foundation is unchanging, uncreated, unconditioned, unborn,pure,bliss,permanent.
Dolpopa taught 75 straight pages in the Mountain Doctrine defending the True Self.
asunthatneversets"

Though not in the sense you mean. Which is addressed in the Mountain Doctrine itself, as pointed out by Malcolm some time ago:

"Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the forders [tīrthikas], and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the forders impute to be permanent."
Mountain Doctrine, ppg. 118-119.
this quote is not Dolpopa saying there is No Self, this quote is Dolpopa showing that the Noumena True Self is not like the self of the forders.
what I highlighted in Pink is Dolpopa's description of the Noumenal True Self.

Also look very carefully at the page number you listed ppg. 118-119, these are apart of the page numbers where he is being objected to for having a True Self view.

if Malcolm would of kept reading the Mountain Doctrine for just 6 more pages he would of gotten to ppg 125 which is where Dolpopa goes into a 75+ page defense of the True Self teachings which starts with this opponents objection:

ppg 125: Objection: The basic element of Selfhood, Great self, Pure Self, and so forth do not at all exist because Self foes not at all exist.

Dolpopa's Answer: In that case, the Self of Thusness, Pure Self, also would not exist. Like wise these would not exist:(here he gives along list of True Self names/titles listed in the Tantras and the Sutras

Glorious Guhyasamaja Tantra, The pure self of the supreme,fortunate Buddha, The noumenon not having the nature of consciousness is the ultimate, immutable Self.....then like I said he goes into 75 pages of Tantra and Sutra quotes concerning the True Self and his explanation of them.

Dolpopa only objected to the "two selves' positions of the forders he did not disagree with the Noumenal Self that is beyond Samsaric understanding.

krodha wrote:
Yes you really enjoy an eternalist or essentialist view, and your confirmation biases reflect that. I am not partial to that type of view. As we've danced this dance numerous times, and you've had this discussion various times with others; I obviously won't be convincing you of anything, nor will you convince me of anything. We each have our opinions and can agree to disagree. To each their own.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 9:17 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:

dzogchungpa said:
Well, I'm not a scholar, so I don't really know, but why don't you do a search for 'great identity' in Gyurme Dorje's translation of the Guhyagarbha Tantra together with Longchenpa's commentary, available here: http://vajrayana.faithweb.com/guhyagarbhatantra.pdf, and see what you think.

krodha wrote:
Longchenpa definitely disagrees with the non-Buddhist interpretation of 'atman':

"The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears no similarity to the self [ātman] of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality."

Malcolm has also shared quite a bit of insight regarding the use of 'bdag nyid/atman' in the context of the buddhadharma:

Malcolm said:
The term bdag nyid, atman, just means, in this case, "nature", i.e. referring to the nature of reality free from extremes as being permanent, blissful, pure and self. The luminosity of the mind is understood to be this.

There are various ways to interpret the Uttaratantra and tathāgatagarbha doctrine, one way is definitive in meaning, the other is provisional, according to Gorampa Sonam Senge, thus the tathāgatagarbha sutras become definitive or provisional depending on how they are understood. He states:

In the context of showing the faults of a literal [interpretation] – it's equivalence with the Non-Buddhist Self is that the assertion of unique eternal all pervading cognizing awareness of the Saṃkhya, the unique eternal pristine clarity of the Pashupattis, the unique all pervading intellect of the Vaiśnavas, the impermanent condition, the measure of one’s body, in the permanent self-nature of the Jains, and the white, brilliant, shining pellet the size of an atom, existing in each individual’s heart of the Vedantins are the same.

The definitive interpretation he renders as follows:

Therefor, the Sugatagarbha is defined as the union of clarity and emptiness but not simply emptiness without clarity, because that [kind of emptiness] is not suitable to be a basis for bondage and liberation. Also it is not simple clarity without emptiness, that is the conditioned part, because the Sugatagarbha is taught as unconditioned.

Khyentse Wangpo, often cited as a gzhan stong pa, basically says that the treatises of Maitreya elucidate the luminosity of the mind, i.e. its purity, whereas Nāgarjuna's treatises illustrate the empty nature of the mind, and that these two together, luminosity and emptiness free from extremes are to be understood as noncontradictory, which we

can understand from the famous Prajñāpāramita citation "There is no mind in the mind, the nature of the mind is luminosity".
This is because the term bdag nyid chen po has a different connotation that those people who merely blindly translate things literally.

The term is carefully explained by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe to mean that all phenomena are included in the state of Samantabhadra. This then is the meaning of mahātman, bdag nyid chen po, in Dzogchen teachings in general.

In general, the way the term is used in sutras and tantras is as a title, i.e., "great persons", mahātmas.
Yes, perfection of identity, described in the Uttaratantra as being beyond self and non-self:

Having purified the proliferation of self and non-self
Since [the proliferation] is completely pacified, it is the highest self.

But, you have to realize that reality has been described already in the Uttaratantra as free from all extremes of proliferation. The dharmakāya is defined as the wisdom of Jinas, which is course is why it cannot be seen even by tenth stage bodhisattvas since they still possess a thin veil of the knowledge obscuration.

Here, that which is being described as the nature of the mind, the mind essence, is what Mipham is describing.
What I am saying is that people are incapable of perceiving the difference in meaning between the two terminologies because they are unfamiliar with the basic premises of which underlie Ramana Maharshi's statements in general. I am sure they are not the same because I have received teachings in Dzogchen and I have received teachings in Yoga sutras, etc. And the premises underlying Ramana Maharshi's practice and realization and the premises underlying Dzogchen practice and realization are not the same.

For example, these extracts are taken from the section of Nub's review of different views held by different Dzogchen masters enunciated. bDag nyid chen po is Vairocana's favored way of expressing Dzogchen view. Vimalamitra's was called gza' gtad dang bral ba, "freedom from reference points", Garab Dorje's view, so he says, was lhun grub., and so on.

So the "great self" approach is one facet; the lhun sgrub view is another facet, etc. But one cannot get stuck on these views because it is very clearly explained in such tantras as sgra thal 'gyur and others that there are seven positions about the basis [gzhi] and only one of them (i.e. the basis is ka dag) is in the final analysis utterly faultless.

Please do not lose sight of the fact that these views are partial attempts to describe the view of Dzogchen. So when we see things like the above citation we mustn't rush off and start proclaiming to everyone that Dzogchen teaching teaches the same things as Ramana Maharshi. We have to understand that Ramana is coming from the

Samkhya/Yoga tradition. He says nothing that cannot be found in the Yoga sutras as interpreted by Shankaracarya.

I am also pointing out that there is a long standing commentarial tradition based on the Dzogchen tantras own statement that will not allow one to interpret such terms as bdag nyid chen po as being in any way similar in intent to the sentiments of RM that you cite above.
It is not the same. Maharshi's comments make sense in the context of Samkhya/Yoga where there is a total cessation of citta vrttis, and yet Purusha remains. People deify Maharshi, but since they do not have a basic grasp of the Samkhya Yoga tradition, they really do not understand the context of his statements such as the above.

Dzogchen teachings are not stating that there is an existing atman which is free from cittavrttis.

Generally, we must not take such terminologies as implying something they are not. Otherwise, the Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas detailed refutations of the views of self found outside Buddhadharma will be rendered senseless.
Yes, I am saying that purusha is the self, according to Ramana and Advaita. The main difference between Advaita and Yoga is Advaita asserts there is only one self or purusha, but SamkhyaYoga asserts there are many -- otherwise, the path taught in Yoga and the path taught in Advaita are the same. When you look at Ramanas remarks about pratyakasha for example, these remarks are completely consistent with the way pratyaksha is treated in the Yoga sutras.

You also have to understand that purusha excludes all phenomena from itself. It is pure consciousness, but prakriti is not part of purusha. Advaita too keeps the prakriti purusha duality in terms of relative truth, but rather than asserting that prakriti is real, it asserts that prakriti is actually unreal (maya). However, cit, is real, is brahman. Here, they understand that purusha actually means brahman.

bdag nyid chen po in Dzogchen pretty clearly refers to the basis, not any kind of personal identity, transcendent or otherwise, which is why ChNN translate it as "the totality of one's state".

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 7:56 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
The point is, ''bdag nyid" is Tibetan for "atman".

krodha wrote:
Obviously, however that really isn't the point for the reasons mentioned above.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 7:30 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Hint: "bdag nyid" is Tibetan.

krodha wrote:
Right, and is not 'atman' in the sense of a personal or universal self (like the use of the term in the context of Vedanta suggests).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Just for the record, the Buddhist tantras do indeed talk about atman.

krodha wrote:
Example?

The tantras speak of bdag nyid and bdag nyid chen po, but this does not mean atman in the sense of a personal or universal self. It is a reference to the nature or identity of things as innately pure, free from arising, abiding, cessation etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
We most certainly would,we uphold the 4 virtues of Nirvana:
Permenance,Bliss,Purity,True Self.

krodha wrote:
The term 'self' [atman] in that context means 'nature' as was previously clarified when this came up before. It is describing the definitive nature of mind as luminosity free from extremes.

Son of Buddha said:
Dolpopa taught 75 straight pages in the Mountain Doctrine defending the True Self.

krodha wrote:
Though not in the sense you mean. Which is addressed in the Mountain Doctrine itself, as pointed out by Malcolm some time ago:

"Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the forders [tīrthikas], and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the forders impute to be permanent."
Mountain Doctrine, ppg. 118-119.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 5:41 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?
Content:
rachmiel said:
I guess what I'm asking is something like:

Who or what is it that acts, experiences, perceives, senses, thinks, dreams, suffers, awakens?

krodha wrote:
An inferential, conventional designation.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 17th, 2014 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: Why Garchen Rinpoche meditates so much
Content:
krodha wrote:
Just shared the statement in the OP with a friend, who replied:

"I had an experience with him [Garchen Rinpoche] once that seems to confirm this. I was attending a teaching he gave at Tibet Center in New York. He was sick with a bad cold or pneumonia and kept clearing his throat while the translator spoke, forgetting that he had a microphone pinned to his robe. His innocence was very endearing. At one point the text being translated said 'Every sound is the Buddha's speech,' and another loud cough filled the room. At one point I felt a strong feeling of love for him and the wish that he be well. His head turned and he looked at me, smiling, and waved as if saying 'hello.' I was one of about two hundred people and sitting near the back of the audience. It was a direct and immediate communication - the heart wish from me and what looked like a 'thank you' and 'hello' from him.

In this case it wasn't my need he was picking up, but I was sure he had felt what I was feeling for him."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 8:18 AM
Title: Re: Is there anyone home?

Content:
Dhammawheel said:
All the questions that he [the Buddha] did not answer when asked were in some way or the other tied to the nature of the self i.e. an attempt to define it and grasp it, to form a view about it.

Wayfarer said:
Quite true. 'What am I? Will I continue to exist? Will I not exist?' All of those questions arise out of self-concern.

krodha wrote:
Buddha refrained from answering more so due to the fact that the 'self' is a conventional title attributed to patterns of grasping which manifest the illusion of a subject indentifying with objects [in this case; views]. Therefore he said identification with the view there is a self is precisely the self, indentification with the view of no-self is precisely the self, etc. All views must be abandoned. In order to prevent further proliferation and grasping in his disciples he did not give an answer.

"Moreover, these sentient beings must have also discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conceptions of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self, because if they had not, their minds would inevitably grasp after such relative ideas. Further, these sentient beings must have already discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conception of the non-existence of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self. If they had not, their minds would still be grasping after such ideas. Therefore, every disciple who is seeking Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi should discard, not only conceptions of one's own selfhood, other selves, living beings and a Universal Selfhood, but should discard, also, all ideas about such conceptions and all ideas about the non-existence of such conceptions."
- Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 6:06 AM
Title: Re: Is Nirvana Worth It?
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
In the teachings of the third turning of the wheel of dharma, it is said that Buddha-nature is like a eternal self (atman)...

krodha wrote:
Not really. As shared by Astus some time ago:

"In the country of Benares at Rsipatana in the Deer Park, the World-honored One first turned the wheel of doctrine, [teaching] the four holy truths for those setting out in the word-hearers' vehicle. This turning of the wheel was marvelous and wonderful, such as nobody, whether gods or men, had been able to turn in the world before. Nevertheless there were superior teachings, for [this first turning] had to be interpreted and

occasioned controversy. Then the World-honored One with an underlying intent turned the wheel for the second time for the sake of those setting out in the great vehicle, [teaching] that all things have no-essence, no arising, and no passing away, are originally quiescent, and are essentially in cessation. This turning of the wheel was marvelous and wonderful indeed. Nevertheless there were teachings superior to this, for it also had to be interpreted and occasioned controversy. The World-honored One then with an explicit meaning for the third time turned the wheel of doctrine for those setting out in all the vehicles, [teaching] that all things have no-essence, no arising, and no passing away, are originally quiescent, and are essentially in cessation. This turning was the most marvelous and wonderful that had ever occurred in the world. It had no superior nor did it contain any implicit meaning nor occasion any controversy."
(Samdhinirmocana Sutra, ch 5, p 49; tr. Keenan, BDK edition)

So, to sum up the teachings of the three turnings:

1. four holy truths for those setting out in the word-hearers' vehicle

2. all things have no-essence, no arising, and no passing away, are originally quiescent, and are essentially in cessation

3. all things have no-essence, no arising, and no passing away, are originally quiescent, and are essentially in cessation

The definitions of the second and third turnings are identical.

The same sutra also answers the question about the nature of the unconditioned.

"Good son, the term 'unconditioned' is also a word provisionally invented by the First Teacher. Now, if the First Teacher provisionally invented this word, then it is a verbal expression apprehended by imagination. And, if it is a verbal expression apprehended by imagination, then, in the final analysis, such an imagined description does not validate a real thing. Therefore, the unconditioned does not exist."
(ch 2, p 12)

"While teachers of the middle way, mind only, transcendent wisdom, mantra, and other schools may have their own assertions, the fulfillment of those intentions is the same. There is not a single thing that is not contained within mind."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:
krodha wrote:
Curious about some opinions on this statement:

"Hello,

My name is Pema Khandro and I first heard of Traktung Rinpoche when a friend of mine wrote to Dungse Thinley Norbu Rinpoche about him. Dungse Rinpoche is the son of Dudjom Rinoche and one of the highest Nyingma Lamas alive - and Traktung Rinpoche's root lama. My friend received a letter back from Dungse Rinpoche's assistant, saying that Traktung Rinpoche (referring to him as Rinpoche) was an excellent teacher of pure Dharma and had Dungse Rinpoche's complete blessing. Later, 3 years ago, I was fortunate enough to be at Pema Osel Ling, teaching seat of Tharchin Rinpoche, when Traktung Rinpoche was there for private teachings with Thinley Norbu Rinpoche and the three year retreat people. Dungse Thinley Norbu Rinpoche had Traktung Rinpoche sit on a small throne - the only other person not sitting on the floor was Dungse Rinpoche himself. The Tibetan Lamas of Pema Osel Ling offered Traktung Rinpoche katas and all referred to him as 'Rinpoche'. In a public tsog feast Traktung Rinpoche was given a public place of honor by Dungse Thinley Norbu Rinpoche, and Dungse Rinpoche spoke of him to the gathered group - again referring to him as 'Rinpoche' and saying he was very courageous in upholding 'pure dharma'. Later in the evening Thinley Norbu Rinpoche said 'I love Traktung Rinpoche very sincerely from my heart.'

Last year I was at Pema Oself Ling when Traktung Rinpoche came to visit Tharchin Rinpoche. Again he was treated with great respect. When he insisted on prostrating to Tharchin Rinpoche, Tharchin Rinpoche also prostrated to him. Tharchin Rinpoche also had all the three year retreat people offer katas to Traktung Rinpoche and he spoke of Dungse Thinley Norbu Rinpoche's respect for Traktung Rinpoche. Tharchin Rinpoche is coming to teach at Traktung Rinpoche's center Tspogyelgar this summer and offering the Dudjom Tersar Three Roots Empowerments. I have also seen the long life prayer wirtten by the Tibetan Nyingma Lama Orgyen Tanzin Rinpoche which explains Traktung Rinpoche as the tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje, a high lama from the Golok region of Tibet. Lama Tanzin Rinpoche is a direct student of Dudjom Rinpoche and Dungse Rinpoche. I have also spoken with Hamta Tulku Lama Yonton a high Geluk and Nyingmapa tulku from Golok who confirmed this recognition for me again.

I have now heard Traktung Rinpoche speak several times in Germany and also listened to his talks on Vajrayana on the internet. His knowledge of Vajrayana is astounding - especially in the area of the yogic traditions of 3rd Karmapa Rangjung Dorje, Longchenpa's commentary on Guyagharba and the works of Dudjom Rinpoche. His knowledge of the subtle aspects of the stages of the path in Kagyu and Nyingmapa traditions is profound. Also his knowledge of world religions, he has a degree in comparative religion, is amazing. I know from some of Traktung Rinpoche's students that he refuses to allow any students of his to ever defend him against attacks. Traktung Rinpoche never charges for Dharma teachings and currently also does not accept students. Traktung Rinpoche himself is very humble and makes light of his 'recognition' often refusing to allow anyone around him to call him 'Rinpoche' He refuses to 'post certificates' - he says that since he does not accept students he prefers people to simply evaluate his words in their own right by comparing them to pure dharma sources - as the Buddha suggested. Still it is good to be careful spreading any negative gossips about sublime beings so I have written this little bit which I know first hand about Traktung Rinpoche to help clarify this matter.

Sncerely, Pema Khandro"

http://www.dharmaling.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=1284&page=2

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 16th, 2014 at 4:52 AM
Title: Re: The Three Skyes
Content:
Nirvan said:
Like you can speak about Thogel, the 4 visions etc. without explaining the practice itself.

krodha wrote:
That's a slippery slope, my friend.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Yeah, Traktung Khepa or Traktung Yeshe Dorje, from Michigan. He's considered to be a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje per Thinley Norbu Rinpoche.

Malcolm said:
No, per himself. His association with DTR was very subsequent to his proclamation of his own tulkuship. I have observed the development of Kirkpatrick's self-mythology for 20 years on the internet. The DTR relationship is rather late.

But this is off-topic, and if people choose to believe Kirkpatrick's claims about himself, that is their business and none of mine.

krodha wrote:
Appreciate the clarification!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 7:59 AM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I take it you don't recommend him then?

krodha wrote:
I too have heard of some controversy, but also have a friend who is a student of Traktung Khepa and is very much enjoying his experience with him so far... so I try to stay neutral.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 10th, 2014 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
one morning at breakfast Rinpoche (Traktung Khepa) said "[/i]

Jikan said:
is the person called Rinpoche in the story named Traktung Khepa?

thanks

krodha wrote:
Yeah, Traktung Khepa or Traktung Yeshe Dorje, from Michigan. He's considered to be a tulku of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje per Thinley Norbu Rinpoche.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 9th, 2014 at 8:29 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Non-affirming negation really just means that Madhyamaka refutes the inherency of everything and doesn't put forth (or affirm) any of it's own views. Like that Buddhapalita quote Malcolm cited some time ago; 'we do not assert non-existence, we merely remove claims for existing existents'.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 4:18 PM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:
alpha said:
So does Rinpoche mean that that particular crayfish was a Tsen Warrior ?

krodha wrote:
Apparently so, taking the form of a crayfish. Either that or it was a messenger of the Tsen, sort of like black animals are supposed to be messengers of Mahakāla. Enjoyable anecdote either way.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 7th, 2014 at 3:55 PM
Title: Re: Dharma protectors and samaya
Content:

krodha wrote:
Speaking of Tsiu Marpo, a friend shared this story the other day:

"Living near Rinpoche and being a close disciple over the last 20 years I have been lucky enough to see some astounding things like the day the lord of the Tsen protectors [Tsiu Marpo] came to a Drupchen. This was in 1999.

We were practicing the Hayagriva sadhana on forest land in Indiana and one morning at breakfast Rinpoche (Traktung Khepa) said 'Today the Lord of the Tsen will be paying us a visit. He is the holder of this land, lord of these forests.' The Tsen are a male warrior spirit that live in the woodlands. They are always red. Those of us at breakfast were most intrigued. The sadhana began and Rinpoche was sitting with us under the large tent outdoors, maybe 30 or so people. He was sitting facing us in the front middle at a puja table.

Suddenly, in the middle of the protector prayers, from a stream about 100 yards away came walking slowly the largest deep red crayfish I have ever seen. It was huge, maybe 4 to 5 inches long with large pincers. The crayfish walked through the grass and directly in front of Rinpoche puja table where it raised up its pincers waving them in the air. The crayfish stayed for the duration of the entire sadhana, about 45 minutes and as the final prayers of dedication ended it simply walked back to the stream.

When the sadhana was over Rinpoche smiled and said 'He was marvelous wasn't he!' All beings share in the interconnecting tendrels of wisdom and compassion. All beings long into and for the beauty, truth and goodness of Guru Rinpoche's wisdom splendor."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2014 at 4:36 PM
Title: Re: Abandoning Buddhism, What Now?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
...than to hit others with doctrine and orthodoxy.

krodha wrote:
Thou shalt only bludgeon others with the orthodox doctrine of scientific materialism.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 4th, 2014 at 10:16 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist beliefs
Content:
rachmiel said:
Newborn babies are often used as an example of the natural state: a fluid mind that observes without interpreting or reifying what it sees. Pure awareness, subject without object. But newborn mind can also be seen as a physiologically immature work in progress, one that reaches fruition and full ability later on in life.

krodha wrote:
That description is an inaccurate portrayal the natural state [gnas lugs]. A mind that observes without interpreting is just a mind observing without interpreting, that activity is a provisional means or meditation which may be used in order to gain non-conceptual insight which reveals dharmatā, but the means in itself is not the natural state. Subject without object would also be an inaccurate description of gnas lugs [tathātva].

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Confusion or contradition?
Content:
krodha wrote:
With rebirth it's usually said that only ignorance transmigrates, to put it coarse way. Just as we feel we're an entity which endures moment to moment subject to different experiences in daily life. The way the web of interdependent conditions coalesce to create the illusion of an inherent being is very compelling and the conditioned habits which arise as a result only serve to solidify that nescience.

There's no entity or self within the various aggregated factors which create the illusion of an enduring self even now. However we as sentient beings do not recognize this, and so we are caught in the throes of afflictive patterning and habitual tendencies which sustain the illusion of being a conditioned entity.

Just as this process endures throughout our lives, through night and day, it will persist after death. And so what continues in rebirth is merely the same aggregated conditions which were present in the last life. This is what the buddhadharma addresses and seeks to correct.

So in that way, there is no actual rebirth in rebirth, nothing substantial which transmigrates, however ignorance is self-perpetuating and manifests the appearance of an enduring entity. Overcome ignorance and the entire charade collapses.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 3rd, 2014 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Challenge23 said:
That's easy. Do I have significantly more good days than bad? Do the teachings make perfect sense after a single reading? Is my health radically improved? Do I have that awesome blissed out thing that some practitioners seem to experience all(or at least most) of the time? Am I able to perfectly balance my own needs with the needs of others without being a jerk about it? Do I have a radically diminished need for "stuff"(this is a higher bar than you might think because I already don't need all that that

much)? Are subsequent practices afterwards like eating german chocolate cake with fresh milk? I can go on with a number of examples but you get the idea. I'd be happy if I just got one of those

krodha wrote:
None of this is proper motivation for doing ngöndro, and expecting or desiring these things may very well prevent them from flowering. Your motivation should be in line with the opening and closing aspirations you do with each session of practice, and in my opinion that proper motivation should result in an immediate satisfaction.

I mean this is just some advice, take it or leave it, but functioning under the premise that you give every ounce of benefit and merit away, while expecting nothing, wanting nothing, desiring nothing, except to have your practice benefit others is the correct motivation. Otherwise you've compromised your practice from the very beginning.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 2nd, 2014 at 5:00 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
Actually, terms such as "eye consciousness" and 'ear consciousness" are misleading. Those parts of the body do not possess consciousness. The activity associated with the sense organs, once light enters the eye, and vibrating air molecules reach the ear, occurs in the brain, which also itself has no consciousness. Nothing but neurological activity... and of course, some awareness of that neurological activity which manifests as sensory experience.

krodha wrote:
We're coming at this from two entirely different angles now. The point of the "eye-consciousness" [cakṣurvijñāna] (and the other seven consciousnesses) is to propose a conventional model (for the purposes of upāya) in order to allow the aspirant a means to pierce the seeming inherency of consciousness in general. Unlike the intromission theory you are referencing, the eight-consciousness model is not a statement (or proposition) of ontological truth. And that exclusively conventional nature is characteristically implied due to the fact that the buddhadharma contends that inherency (in general) is a figment of deluded cognition which is completely unreal. Therefore the label "eye consciousness" is a term which is implemented so that the visual faculty and all of its implied constitutional characteristics can be compartmentalized into a single grouping for the purposes of analysis or expeditious delineation (eye-consciousness accounting for (i) sensory organ [eye], (ii) sensory cognition [seeing] and (iii) sensory objects [sights]).

At any rate, intromission theory is really only towing the standard party line when it comes to a modern materialist scientific interpretation of consciousness. While the processes you are writing about are all well and good in a conventional sense, they have no practical application (in the sense of being a means to liberate you from the

conditioned projections of inherency which is attributed to your conscious condition). In fact, the model you are proposing (and championing) actually serves to fortify the conditioning that the buddhadharma is attempting to dispel.

The eight-consciousnesses [aṣṭavijñāna] as a conventional model is meant to be a tangible and empirical guideline for your direct experience, whereas the intromission theory you are discussing with its various electro-chemical processes is inferential in every way. The former model (the eight-consciousnesses) is one means to reveal the non-arising of consciousness, that cannot be said for the latter (intromission) which possesses zero soteriological value.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 4:23 PM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
I am not reducing everything into awareness.
It is obvious that events occur of which there is no awareness
(often, until it is too late to change things).
But while those events might be refuted,
shown, perhaps, in some existential way that there is no absolute proof that they are really happening,
There is no denying that awareness is happening.

krodha wrote:
Sure but that doesn't mean the inherency of awareness cannot be refuted. Awareness is dependently originated just like any other conditioned phenomena is. To use Nāgārjuna's logic; if you can have awareness without objects, then you can have objects without awareness. Obviously you cannot have objects without awareness, and therefore you cannot have awareness without objects, meaning awareness is dependent and therefore without inherency and entirely refutable.

PadmaVonSamba said:
You can't deny that awareness occurs.
As soon as you try, there is still awareness of that denial,
And that denial is an object of awareness.

krodha wrote:
Rather than positing a solitary awareness which abides while events (such as denial) pass before it, perhaps try (as mentioned above) viewing awareness as dependent upon each alleged appearance. You can even go as far as to say that each object has its own awareness which is associated with it.

Or view the aggregated eight consciousnesses as heterogeneous, meaning that there is no linking core between them. The eye consciousness and its objects is a separate consciousness from the ear consciousness and its objects, and so on. There is no

single core consciousness or awareness but many consciousnesses or awarenesses. Each dependently originated and lacking inherency.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
There is awareness,
and there is everything which is an object of that awareness.

The fact of awareness is, I think, the only thing which cannot be refuted.

krodha wrote:
Awareness can surely be refuted. Otherwise you're advocating for reductionist tīrthika views which subsume everything into awareness.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
LastLegend said:
Well there is something. That's why we are here.

krodha wrote:
Yes, there is ignorance and karmic formation.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 1st, 2014 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
I cannot deny that it seems that I am the very same person sitting in front of my computer that I was a minute ago, that I was a week ago, a year ago, or was as a child. It feels like a constant person.

But it isn't. It is a series of rapidly arising conditionally-created events of the mind.

uan said:
Then there is no rebirth, or more specifically, what we refer to as rebirth as being something that exists after we die. But in reality, it's just that there is a larger gap between me in the now, and what I am picturing in the future. But it is always going to be experienced as a series of rapidly arising conditionally-created event of the mind - from the moment when this current body ceases to function, through the bardo, through

rebirth, etc.

If rebirth is something we experience each moment, then what we conventionally consider (or most Buddhist consider) rebirth is no such thing.

krodha wrote:
There are multiple applications of rebirth. The moment-to-moment interpretation of rebirth doesn't contradict the usual lifetime-to-lifetime view of rebirth.

The seeming continuity of a self is of course an aggregated process, whether that continuity is being addressed in the context of being momentary or an entire lifespan. So the continuity of those processes from one lifetime to the next merely means that the momentary process is continuing. Just like the illusion of going to sleep and waking up in the morning; the same aggregated processes manifest the appearance of an entity which has endured through those events, and so in the same way the same aggregated processes will manifest the appearance of an entity which traverses the bardo and is reborn in the next life.

The idea of momentary rebirth is meant to convey insight into the subtle meaning of transience and impermanence. Subtle impermanence is encountered through non-arising, wherein the illusion of a core or essence of a given appearance is severed, and so without any enduring identity every apparent instance of manifestation is disjoint, unique and unrelated. Inferential concepts like this can be helpful in cutting through the illusion of an entity which is enduring through time. Instead of assuming the self is a homogenous entity which is abiding, it can be intuited that the self is merely an aggregated and heterogeneous amalgamation of causes and conditions, each apparent instance of expression being unique and unrelated to any other instance ('instances' therefore being equally unreal in the ultimate sense).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 30th, 2014 at 1:59 PM
Title: Re: work
Content:
TaTa said:
Hey just curious, do you know what reason does Norbu gives? Of he does give any reason... Thank you.

krodha wrote:
Rinpoche said that if we (as practitioners) eat meat it creates a positive cause for the animal. We should primarily consume the meat while in the state of contemplation, however that state isn't within everyones grasp so we should aim to at least be present. Eating meat during tsog especially creates a positive connection for the animal.

Rinpoche also states that during tsog, whether we are resting in contemplation or not we should aim to be present and refrain from accepting and rejecting, the point is to experience the food fully, taste, texture, consistency, colors and so on. The food is an

offering, so the experience is meant to be free of our personal limitations etc.

There is also the aspect of Dzogchen which dispenses with the sentient and insentient dichotomy, so everything is seen as sentient, or perhaps free from such distinctions altogether. And in that case the fundamental nature of the meat is no different than anything else, and therefore any reason we could find to reject the meat is an expression of ignorance (in the ultimate sense).

Another point Rinpoche makes is that rejecting meat on the grounds that an animal died, while having no problem with eating grains, vegetables and fruit etc., is somewhat hypocritical due to the fact that countless sentient beings perish (such as small bugs) in the maintenance and cultivation of those fruits and vegetables. Especially nowadays with the methods implemented in modern industrial farming and so on. He also says that the animal is already dead by the time it is on your plate, so you might as well eat the meat with pure intentions and create an auspicious connection for the animal, no use in wasting the meat, because if you discard the meat then the animal died for nothing.

I'm vegetarian myself, have been for over 10 years, but I will eat meat at ganapuja and so on.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 11:05 PM
Title: Re: Neither X nor not-X in Buddhist texts
Content:
krodha wrote:
Neither X nor not-X does not define nor suggest a transcendent. It suggests that the X which could allegedly exist or not-exist cannot be found to begin with. X is non-arisen.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 8:54 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Sherab said:
AN 10.58
"All phenomena gain their footing in the deathless."

MN 72
Freed from the classification of consciousness, Vaccha, the Tathagata is deep, boundless, hard to fathom, like the sea.

I think I have problem with the view that each individual has one mindstream that goes from delusion to enlightenment.
I prefer to think that each individual has parallel mindstreams, one that is polluted and can be seen and one that is unpolluted (and from which the polluted mindstream

emerge) and can only be fanthomed by enlightened beings.

krodha wrote:
Conventionally there are individuals endowed with mind streams, and there is either correct or incorrect knowledge of that condition (conventionally referred to as 'mind'). Realized beings simply posses a correct knowledge of their condition, whereas sentient beings do not. In the case of a fully awakened Buddha, that knowledge is complete and totally divested of obscurations.

This goes back to that other recent (lengthy) thread on the basis being one's unfabricated mind. Which discussed how the presence of knowledge [vidyā] or ignorance [avidyā] decides how the single continuum of mind expresses itself. The neutral mind [jñatā] either (i) becomes afflicted in the presence of ignorance [avidyā], whereby it is expressed as consciousness [vijñāna], or (ii) it is unafflicted in the presence of knowledge [vidyā] whereby it is expressed as wisdom [jñāna].

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 12:58 PM
Title: Re: work
Content:
krodha wrote:
Depends from teacher to teacher, many masters have no issue with meat and some do. They all seem to agree that it is okay to eat the meat of animals who's death you had no karmic connection with (meaning the animal didn't die by your hands, nor was it killed for you specifically). Some teachers say to avoid meat from an animal that was deliberately killed in any sense, and only eat the meat of animals who died due to natural causes or by accident (this is the position of Dzogchen master Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen). Other lamas such as Chatral Rinpoche do not even allow meat on the premises of his land. And then other teachers such as Chögyal Namkhai Norbu support eating meat in general. So there is no uniform view, best to follow the advice of your teacher.

That is sort of the rundown when it comes to eating meat, as for handling it I'm not sure, but would imagine you will again hear different things.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 11:48 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Experiencing my own affliction does not mean the entire charade is relegated to the realm of mind or consciousness (as I believe would be implied by the Cittamatran view).

But perhaps this is better: The pronounced expression of my own ignorance is the five elements [aggregates]. 'Material reality' is a conventional abstraction which is reified as

valid through self-perpetuating, habitual tendencies of grasping etc. the entire structure implied by these processes has no reality apart from delusion.

smcj said:
So you'd be a Madhyamika?

krodha wrote:
I consider Dzogchen my heart dharma, but enjoy the Madhyamaka view as well. The above can apply to either I suppose.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 11:22 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
smcj said:
I experience the pronounced traces of my own deeply engrained affliction, which we may conventionally refer to as a 'material reality'.
Apparently you are a Cittamatran.

(I'd say Yogacaran, but unfortunately that term has become ambiguous since different khenpos currently use different definitions for it.)

krodha wrote:
Experiencing my own affliction does not mean the entire charade is relegated to the realm of mind or consciousness (as I believe would be implied by the Cittamatran view).

But perhaps this is better: The pronounced expression of my own ignorance is the five elements [aggregates]. 'Material reality' is a conventional abstraction which is reified as valid through self-perpetuating, habitual tendencies of grasping etc. the entire structure implied by these processes has no reality apart from delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 10:39 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
You seem to be functioning under the presupposition that there is in fact a material reality apart from your own deeply engrained conditioning.

PadmaVonSamba said:
You seem to deny that you experience a material reality.

krodha wrote:

I experience the pronounced traces of my own deeply engrained affliction, which we may conventionally refer to as a 'material reality'. That however does not mean that I am truly experiencing a material reality. Ultimately, 'material reality' is an abstraction which is reified by habitual patterns of delusion and a thick accumulation of traces. It certainly appears quite real, there is no doubt about that, yet the degree of its reality is directly congruent to the level of ignorance present in your condition. Which means when you are divested of ignorance, the conventional appearance we know as the world appears like an illusion, without the slightest degree of materiality (or reality) to be found therein. For it is a charade with no reality apart from ignorance.

O Protector, You have said that the entire conditionally born [world exists only] by convention... Like a dream, an illusion, [or] seeing two moons: Thus have You seen the world, as a creation not created as real. Like a son who is born, established, and dies in a dream, the world, You have said, is not really born, does not endure, and is not destroyed.
- Acintyastavaḥ

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 28th, 2014 at 8:43 AM
Title: Re: Evidence for karma
Content:
JamesNewell said:
The fact of reincarnation means that when one body dies, the consciousness must migrate to another brain at a distance.

Wayfarer said:
I don't think that is the Buddhist view.

krodha wrote:
Definitely not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 12:29 PM
Title: Re: My first of many questions
Content:
krodha wrote:
A teacher is an indispensable requirement for Vajrayāna, but doesn't sound as if that is the type of path which resonates with you so I'd imagine you're good to go it alone (practicing Pure Land).

But then again I'm not well versed with Pure Land so you can take my word on the Vajrayāna part but other's advice may be better with Pure Land.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 10:58 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
...and my point is that is that all the Vajrayana traditions are preserved via the exact same material reality "that is so deeply ingrained in our culture", that malcom is so eager to condemn.

How totally hypocritical to say that a scientific view, because it is established on some method of measuring and evaluating what is immediately observable, is crap, and is leaving piles of traces in our mindstreams...

...but that the same material reality that make up the collections of printed teachings, the precise measurement of stupas, the minerals ground for the pigments used in painting thangkas, the relics left after cremation, all of the ceremonial headgear, musical instruments, butter lamps and even the examples of pots and so forth used in philosophical arguments, not to mention the carbon based forms that teachers occupy...is not indicative of an intrinsically materialist view.

If a Buddhist lights a candle, that's valid.
But if a scientist measures the amount of heat and light given by the candle,
that's bullshit?
. . .

krodha wrote:
You seem to be functioning under the presupposition that there is in fact a material reality apart from your own deeply engrained conditioning.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 8:33 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
Malcolm's teachers never appeared materially.

krodha wrote:
All of our teachers, assuming we have a teacher (or multiple teachers), represent an unbroken lineage which goes back to Buddha Śākyamuni (this is also assuming we are discussing this notion in the context of Vajrayāna). Our teacher(s) in this life certainly appear materially, and those practitioners with high capacity actually have access to 'non-material' teachers (via pure vision) as well. Therefore the living teacher you interact with is a direct expression and representation of that lineage of Buddhas, bodhisattvas and vidyādharas. Not to mention a living expression of dharmakāya, which is the mind of all Buddhas.

What is surviving (or being passed on) through the lineage is (i) the tradition and path, and (ii) wisdom-knowledge, so if you are involved with the tradition and have recognized your nature, you intimately know the heart-essence of the lineage, alive in you.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 7:48 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
So, you are saying they are figments of your imagination?

krodha wrote:
Is this an attempt to evoke an ultimate point of view? Because it is rather extreme and unnecessary. We can all sit around and conjure up ultimate points of view, declaring that everything is ultimately imaginary and unreal, however all that accomplishes is nihilism.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 1:46 AM
Title: Re: Understanding of karma
Content:
krodha wrote:
Someone shared this from Tulku Pema Rigtsal some time ago, good insight for this thread:

"Until our pure presence is a constant, until we attain fearless confidence, we must attend to karmic causality, vows and samayas, accumulation of merit, abstention from vice, and so forth. As Padmasambhava famously said, quoted in The Chronicles of Padmasambhava, which were revealed by Orgyen Lingpa, My view is higher than the sky; My karma is finer than barley flour. Pay attention to karmically effected events with the same care we reserve for protection of the eyes. But at the same time, such events should not be seen as real and true. Quoted in The Samye Chronicles, Padmasambhava again says, 'Maharaj! In my tantra it is the view that leads; but don't let your conduct bend toward the view. If you do let it stray, you take the black demonic sophistic view that may justify any wicked action by emptiness. But on the other hand, don't let the view tend toward conduct because if you do, trapped by notions of concrete materialism and specific attributes, the occasion for liberation will never arise.' Due to his misconception of karmic cause and effect, Tarpa Nakpo was born in hell and then reborn as Rudra. For further details of this story, browse through the tantra The Discourse of the General Assembly. Tarpa Nakpo's fate was determined by his contempt for karmic repercussion in his confusion about the causal process. As Jowoje Atisha said in The Lamp of the Path, until concepts are exhausted, there is karma; believe in the repercussions of karma."

And this from Longchenpa:

"Some say: 'Cause and effect [karma], compassion and merits are the dharma for ordinary people, and it will not lead to enlightenment. O great yogis! You should meditate upon the ultimate meaning, effortless as space.'

These kinds of statements are the views of the utmost nihilism, they have entered the path of the most inferior. It is astonishing to expect the result while abandoning the cause."
- rdzogs pa chen po sems nyid ngal gso

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 27th, 2014 at 1:13 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
For some people it is important. For me it's not meaningful. If you want to follow Buddha's teachings then it is best to slowly divest yourself of concepts regarding Buddhist teachings.

krodha wrote:
This makes no sense. Seems to be a misinterpretation of what it means for wisdom to be free of concepts.

Andrew108 said:
Sooner or later you are left with life and a direct view.

krodha wrote:
This whole "life" thing is something you fabricated, the teachings state nothing of the sort, and while the definitive view is a certain species of insight regarding the nature of "life", it surely isn't just "life".

Andrew108 said:
Equality is the key understanding and if someone draws a line and declares one way is the only way then they haven't really understood from their heart what it means to be a Buddhist.

krodha wrote:
I don't see that anyone at any point in this thread has drawn a line and declared one way. You seem to be quite conflicted about your beliefs. This treatment of 'equality' is also another misinterpretation.

Andrew108 said:
I'm saying that it is possible to be a Secular Buddhist. Also I am saying that whilst I respect my teachers I don't follow everything they say.

krodha wrote:

I wouldn't expect anything different from you, Andrew.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 26th, 2014 at 3:20 PM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Beliefs tend to reinforce identities.

krodha wrote:
As does disbelief, which is simply believing that something isn't true. So is agnosticism. Identities form via identification, if you take a side on an issue you are identifying with something. Which isn't an issue for those who know how to work with such things.

Andrew108 said:
Building an identity so that you may at some point in the future be liberated from such identity-making seems pointless.

krodha wrote:
Finding value in the idea of rebirth does not equate to "building an identity". However to play devil's advocate; even if placing weight in rebirth did construct an identity, identities aren't the issue. Ignorance and wisdom are the point. One's identity is simply known to be a conventionality from the standpoint of wisdom, and therefore isn't an issue. Identities are only problematic from the standpoint of delusion.

Andrew108 said:
There is also the issue of petty sectarianism where other views can't be tolerated and are seen as being a threat. Such sectarianism pushes people away and that by itself will cause Buddhism to diminish. It is sectarianism and intolerance of other views that will be the reason Buddhism destroys itself from the inside.

krodha wrote:
Petty sectarianism is nothing more than the result of small minds clinging to views. But either way, as soon as views come into the picture, sectarianism is automatically a possibility, and therefore is automatically part of the spectrum of conduct surrounding views. This is unavoidable. And just as you'll have petty sectarianism you'll also have open minded and compassionate people who celebrate different views.

Bottom line; sectarianism is part of the fabric of any tradition or system, and doesn't speak for the whole of the system or tradition. So there will be no destruction of Buddhism from the inside because of sectarian polemics... sectarianism is commonplace, just as non-sectarianism is commonplace. Welcome to humans identifying with views, it's been going strong for centuries and isn't going anywhere.

In any case, choosing to believe that rebirth is invalid doesn't really constitute a sect anyway, nor does disagreeing with rebirth naysayers constitue a sect. So sectarianism

doesn't come into the picture in this case, all that is occurring is people disagreeing about something. Pretty normal and straightforward stuff.

Andrew108 said:
Since the logic is not there, it should be perfectly acceptable for a Buddhist to not accept rebirth. They should not have to feel excluded or de-valued because of their agnosticism or reasoned disbelief.

krodha wrote:
The "logic not being there" is your own opinion, backed by your own confirmation biases. Your position on the "logic" does not mean the logic actually fails, it just means you choose to believe it is invalid.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 25th, 2014 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: DEALING WITH ANTS
Content:
TaTa said:
What can i do for the ones that i did kill?

krodha wrote:
Vajrasattva.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 4:16 PM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Self-liberation has to be effortless. The famous effortless effort means leaving 'it' as it is. This is another description of what reality is and why I find being a realist so important.

krodha wrote:
Definitely not a description of what 'reality' is. Effortless self-liberation [rang grol] is only valid from the standpoint of the definitive view, which means one has recognized the definitive nature of mind [sems nyid] and is resting in that knowledge [rig pa]. Self-liberation isn't possible from the standpoint of mind. We can of course create an inferential semblance of what self-liberation is like, mimic it in a provisional way, but that is not truly self-liberation. Only in the state of contemplation is self-liberation valid.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 3:16 PM
Title: Re: Chogyal N. Norbu, May 23rd-31th, Longsall Atii Gongpa Go
Content:
krodha wrote:

This teaching is in Longsal Vol. 2 'The Opening of the Gate to the State of Ati'.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: chNNr New York Retreat
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Indeed. Is that the intended word? I might guess that "yedal" = "ye bral" but I would like to know for sure.

krodha wrote:
Seems to be. And then 'ye' is a contraction of yé né [primordial, from the beginning]. 'Bral' is a negation.

This is pure speculation for me though.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 24th, 2014 at 1:18 AM
Title: Re: chNNr New York Retreat
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
So what is “Khorva Yedal” in Wylie?

krodha wrote:
'khor ba means samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 5:56 AM
Title: Re: Nothing Exists
Content:
Jesse said:
Poor Elephant.

krodha wrote:
Ha I think it's a horse, it's supposed to be at least.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
pensum said:
Thanks asunthatneversets, that's a good quotation from an excellent source.

So from the perspective that the sense consciousnesses are merely modes of consciousness (in that they are not distinct from or separate from consciousness), it would seem that, contrary to Malcolm's claim, according to Dudjom Lingpa the body can affect consciousness, if only to cause the locus of its attention to shift from the senses to the alaya.

And with that the bell rings for the next round of this heavyweight contest between the reigning champion Malcolm and the gritty contender Andrew108. Let's keep it clean boys...

krodha wrote:
The sensory consciousnesses are different modalities (six to eight depending on the system) of what is referred to as 'consciousness', but we cannot really say they are different modes of 'consciousness' in the sense that consciousness is a singular thing which possesses subsidiary offshoots of itself. That is more of the Vedanta approach which treats consciousness as a single capacity which then can either interact with the sense faculties, or recede back into itself (much like covering all the windows while inside a house). Buddhism doesn't really go that route. In terms of the buddhadharma, these consciousnesses are always aggregated and heterogenous, rather than secondary expressions of a primary homogenous overarching consciousness.

The ālaya, in the way that Dudjom Lingpa is using the term is actually a division of the eighth consciousness [ālayavijñāna] into the all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi] and all-basis consciousness [skt. ālayavijñāna, tib. kun gzhi rnam shes]. Generally the eighth consciousness is only the ālayavijñāna. So this division is something like the division that the Third Karmapa Rangjung Dorje made with the seventh consciousness [klṣṭa-manas], and therefore isn't something which is necessarily accepted everywhere. Though personally I think it is a valuable distinction, because the ālaya acts as the conditioned background substratum which seems to form due to the solidification of delusion (the ālaya is really delusion itself). The arūpadhātus explored in deep samādhi states are actually the experience of being directly absorbed into the ālaya, which is why in Dzogchen it is said that attachment to the ālaya is cause for rebirth in formless devalokas (and then attachment to ālayavijñāna is cause for rebirth in the form realm, and attachment to thought is cause for rebirth in the desire realm).

Within the body, consciousness rides the rlung and depends upon other factors for sustenance, and that aspect of this topic is really quite multifaceted... others are far more qualified to comment on it than I am. But I would say it is most likely a two way street; the body can affect the consciousnesses, and the consciousnesses can affect the body. Again however, there are various facets to this issue, because yogis who have purified themselves of delusion are obviously not affected the same way everyday sentient beings are. For they have fully realized that body, speech and mind are inseparable and thus the bindings of the seal of the body are undone.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Nothing Exists
Content:
Jesse said:
DharmaWheel Should invest in buying sticks for our moderators. I can see them being used alot.

krodha wrote:
Definitely. They need to play catch up with the rest of the forum members who use their sticks incessantly...

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 4:58 AM
Title: Re: Are animals mindful?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Animal" is sort of a vague, blanketed and overarching term which is commonly used for pretty much any 'earthly' sentient being which isn't a human being.

Excerpt from the synopsis of Jacques Derrida's The Animal That Therefore I Am:
"The book is at once an affectionate look back over the multiple roles played by animals in Derrida's work and a profound philosophical investigation and critique of the relegation of animal life that takes place as a result of the distinction - dating from Descartes - between man as thinking animal and every other living species. That starts with the very fact of the line of separation drawn between the human and the millions of other species that are reduced to a single; the animal."

So 'animal' is misleading relegation which stems from our own anthropocentrism as human beings. In order to explore this topic in a valuable way you would surely have to address different species or classes of beings in a more precise manner. For instance, according to the general 'animal' classification (in its conditioned, subconscious and anthropocentric expression), a mouse and a dolphin are equivalent. However we know that they (a mouse and a dolphin) are both vastly different in capacity and nature. Dolphins and whales have exhibited advanced forms of communication between members of their pods, along with clearly calculated and strategic behavior depending on the circumstances. Not to mention the expression of emotions much like our own. If these examples are not evidence of something equivalent to what we refer to as 'thought-processes' in our own species, I'm not sure what would be.

Either way though, it is an interesting topic no doubt, and should make for a good discussion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 23rd, 2014 at 4:07 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:

pensum said:
So what then actually occurs when one is struck a heavy blow to the head and knocked "unconscious"?

krodha wrote:
The consciousnesses recede into the all-basis [ālaya] i.e. substratum, according to Dudjom Lingpa (granted this interpretation is one of many):

"The actual ālaya is something immaterial, thinking nothing, a space-like vacuity and blankness in which appearances are impeded. Know that you come to that state in deep, dreamless sleep, when you faint, and when you are dying."

"...the genuine ālaya [tib. kun gzhi], which is immaterial like space, a blank, unthinking void. Arrival in that state corresponds to being comatose, being in meditative absorption, arriving in a trance induced by meditative stabilization, being engulfed by deep sleep in the ālaya in which appearances have dissolved into the ultimate nature [tib. dbyings, skt. dhātu], and arriving at the point of death, in which appearances have shifted. That is called the genuine, ālaya."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 11:53 AM
Title: Re: why is Vajrayana considered the fasted way to buddhahood
Content:
rory said:
So then it's like the Hindu system of tantra which is a yoga and experiential? How is it different then from Hindu tantra?

krodha wrote:
Vajrayāna Buddhism vis-à-vis Hindu Tantra by Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche: http://www.byomakusuma.org/Teachings/VajrayanaBuddhismVisAVisHinduTantricism.aspx

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 8:15 AM
Title: Imitating Freedom: View of Actualism vis-a-vis Dzogpa Chenpo
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here is a short essay by a member of a fellow dharma forum titled: "Imitating Freedom: A Buddhist Refutation of Actualism". The paper explores the differences between "Actual Freedom" a.k.a. "Actualism", which is the teaching of a guy named Richard Parker who resides in Australia, and Ati Dzogpa Chenpo.

I am not posting the essay here for the purpose of comparing Dzogchen to a different view in order to say it is superior (or the other inferior etc.), but because the way the writer goes about making his points is well thought out and serves to address some of

the subtle intricacies of the Dzogchen view. Primarily some of the notable differences between the nature of (i) the all-basis (or basis-of-all as it is coined in this paper) [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi], (ii) the all-basis consciousness [skt. ālayavijñāna, tib. kun gzhi rnam shes] and (iii) the definitive view of primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes]. Focusing on how each of these aspects unfold (or in the case of primordial wisdom; may potentially unfold) in one's experience moment to moment.

The writer's argument is that the view of "Actualism" does not go beyond the all-basis, but according to the buddhadharma no other views or paths do (otherwise they would be vehicles of liberation), so this statement is nothing new. However the points surrounding this argument may be beneficial, as right view (whether inferential or direct) is an important aspect of Dzogchen and the buddhadharma in general.

There is no abstract (summary) for the essay, but here are the opening and concluding remarks:

"'Actual Freedom' or 'Actualism' is a fringe quasi-tradition which asserts an attainment of the same name. It utilizes methods intended on pointing out or bringing about a condition it calls 'pure conscious experience' or 'PCE', while it asserts all other conditions to be altered states of consciousness. PCE is an apparently non-dual and non-conceptual condition initially occurring for a brief instance prior to perception where there is an uninterpreted moment of pure sense datum, where the experiential continuum isn't taken as an object nor are sense-objects being segmented and subsequently experienced as concepts, and where involuntary and recollective self-conscious memory imprints are not functioning, renewed, or newly created. During the course of repeatedly pointing out or bringing about such a condition (PCE qua path), the once brief instance is extended and then appears to stick (PCE qua fruit), and this apparently persisting condition is called 'actual freedom'. As implicitly implied by its name and by the terminology used, the quasi-tradition and its progenitor assert superiority and novelty over rigorously developed contemplative traditions such as Buddhism, referring to the Awakening found in Buddhism as mere 'spiritual enlightenment' an 'altered state of consciousness' while branding itself as a 'third alternative'."

"...'actualism' and its asserted freedom found in the the state of 'actual freedom' is not the true freedom of Rigpa, and it is devoid of meaningful novelty. It is evidently the base-of-all, providing no notable contribution to the science of contemplative theory or practice. Actualism tries to present itself as different, a third alternative, even an optimization, yet none of these claims have been demonstrated in the slightest. Actualism is a case of a distinction without a meaningful difference, and at that, a deluded path misinterpreting the base-of-all qua total relaxation, a path not capable of directly bringing about total freedom and even hindering the search and attainment of the freedom found in the supersanity of Rigpa qua fruit, the absolute total relaxation, the total completeness, the supreme happiness, ultimate satisfaction, and end to existential lack and thus a total plenitude. In the face of Rigpa therefore, it is a mere imitation of freedom."

The paper can be downloaded directly from this thread, or here is another link to download the essay via scribd:
http://www.scribd.com/doc/218157375/Imitating-Freedom-a-Buddhist-refutation-of-Actualism

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:46 AM
Title: Re: gDangs And mDangs: Differences In Meaning?
Content:

Malcolm said:
1) gdangs
2) mdangs, it is a translation of ojas.
3) dwangs ma is the nutriment, it means refined essence.
4) gdangs.

krodha wrote:
Thanks!

Is there anything to the internal-external dichotomy (in relation to these terms) as suggested by the Longchenpa references above? Or does gdangs account for the radiance in general, and mdangs (as the ojas) is therefore unrelated in that context?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:29 AM
Title: Re: gDangs And mDangs: Differences In Meaning?
Content:
krodha wrote:
A few other questions:

Which is the proper Wylie transliteration for 'dang', in the context of the three energies: dang, rol pa and rtsal [gdangs or mdangs]? Because I have seen both used in that context.

Which [gdangs or mdangs] is the vital essence (dang) spoken of in Tibetan medicine?

How about this third term 'dwangs'? Is dwangs simply an orthographic variant of one of the above terms?

When Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche makes a statement such as "The dang of emptiness is rigpa", which variant [gdangs or mdangs] is he using?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 3:25 AM
Title: gDangs And mDangs: Differences In Meaning?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I came across a discussion regarding gdangs and mdangs some time ago and it doesn't seem as if there was any solid consensus as to the meaning of these terms. I had always assumed these variants were orthographic in nature as suggested below, however that does not seem to be the case.

On one hand both terms appear to be denoting a glow, dynamism or radiance, yet on the other hand there seem to be subtle distinctions in the meaning and treatment of that radiance. The suggestion that gdangs means "tone, pitch, tune or melody" appears to fall in line with the idea of 'sound', in sound, light and rays. Per Longchenpa, gdangs is said to be an outwardly (or externalized) radiance (or display) [phyi gsal], as opposed to mdangs which is said to be an internalized glow [nang gsal]. How does this internal-external dichotomy coincide with rol pa and rtsal?

Here are the different views expressed in the blog:
(https://philologia-tibetica.blogspot.com/2012/08/blog-post_7033.html)

"གདངས། མདངས།
Sometimes it is not easy to keep the meanings of gdangs and mdangs apart. But perhaps we can live with this distinction: dgangs is vocal or audial impulse or dynamism and hence it could mean 'tune, melody, lyrics, etc.' whereas mdangs is optical or visual impulse and hence is connected with 'colour, shimmer, glow, etc.' But then what do we do with terms such as rig gdangs or rig pa'i gdangs? Perhaps gdangs in this context is to be understood in the sense of 'impulse, pulse, dynamism, impetus.'"

And the responses:
(i) "I don't know, but I always thought that it was just a spelling preference, except of course when you're reading Longchenpa. For him the mdangs is inward radiance and the gdangs is outward radiation, right? Do you think other writers outside Longchenpa's tradition make this distinction? Is there a pre-Longchenpa background? Do you think dwangs/dwangs-ma is somehow meaningfully implicated in these other two forms? Sorry, today I'm more question than suggestion."

(ii) "I have assumed that for most Tibetan writers, gdangs and mdangs would not be simply orthographic variants but that gdangs is always related with voice/sound whereas mdangs with brilliance (inner or outer) and thus connected with colour or glow. I did not know of the existence of an inner–outer distinction. So we find sgra/skad/ngag/dbyangs/gzhas/bred gdangs (cf. mgur len pa'i gdangs), all of which are recorded in the Tshig mdzod chen mo. That mdangs has to do with glow can be seen in the phrase: dkar la dmar ba'i mdangs chags pa 'a tinge of red formed on [the base of] white [colour].' See also dkar/dmar/'od/bkrag/gzi mdangs, etc."

(iii) "Not to answer my own question, but I look in the Negi dictionary and see that mdangs was used to translate Sanskrit ojas and rajas — the fiery fury of the human spirit — and gdangs is not used for those words, but rather Sanskrit words that have to do with tune or melody. But what does this have to do with Longchenpa's meanings?"

(iv) "So this supports our understanding that mdangs has to do with 'radiance,' 'brilliance,' 'flare,' or 'charisma' whereas gdangs with melody. In the rDzogs-chen context, I tend to think that gdangs is quasi-synonymous with rtsal inasmuch as rig pa'i rtsal and rig pa'i gdangs too seem to be quasi-synonymous although some rDzogs-chen exegetes would insist on making a distinction between the two. So I think it would be justified to be understand gdangs in the rDzogs-chen context as 'dynamism' or 'impetus.'"

(v) "You can find some Longchenpa examples in an article by Daniel Scheidegger in RET —

http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/journals/ret/pdf/ret_16_02.pdf" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

He could have derived his interpretations from Guenther's Longchenpa, I suppose, but here gdangs much more than mdangs, has to do with light radiation outward. Gdangs is used with visual, not audial, contexts or metaphors. Let me look in Germano's dissertation... He discusses it on p. 866, in his entry headed 'dynamism.' He says, 'It should be kept in mind that Longchenpa strictly differentiates between "glow" (mDangs) and "radiation" (gDangs), with the former signifying a non-manifest internal glowing associated with "internal radiance" (Nang gSal), and the latter signifying externally manifest radiation into actualized forms associated with "external radiance" (Phyir gSal).'

Does that take us anywhere interesting? I was kind of thinking that gdangs can have a technical musicological meaning when you are talking about music, but a different meaning in other contexts, like Dzogchen especially..."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 1:20 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
If it did that then it would be conditioned. The problem here is thinking that tha mal gyi shes pa should function in a particular way. I think this is a fault of over intellectualizing and of viewing the mind as primary.

krodha wrote:
Ye shes [tha mal gyi shes pa] surely 'functions' in a certain way. It is wisdom which cognizes the unconditioned and primordial non-arisen nature of phenomena.

The mind is primary in the sense that you cognize phenomena because you have a mind. Not in the sense of your fabricated idea that making the mind primary entails everything being subjective, that has already been demonstrated to be an ill-conceived byproduct of your own personal view.

Of body, speech and mind, mind is held to be foremost.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 1:06 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
dharmagoat said:
It actually doesn't matter what you call it or how you conceive of it. When you find it you recognise it. Better to pay attention to how it is to be found. Or am I wrong?

krodha wrote:
I can loosely agree that it doesn't matter what you call it, though it makes better sense to use conventional parlance. As for how it is conceived, I would argue it is incredibly important. Right view is a necessary foundation and requirement for that finding to occur.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:54 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Tha mal gyi shes pa is absolutely 100 percent natural.

krodha wrote:
There's a difference between 'natural' and readily or easily accessible.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:52 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Malcolm said:
Yes, in the sense that thoughts (citta) are contaminated consciousness, and "ordinary mind" is an untainted consciousness, i.e. ye shes. So the difference is more like gold in gold ore and refined gold, rather than a substantial difference. The shes pa is the same in both.

krodha wrote:
Yes better way to put it. Yet I still believe Andrew mistakes ye shes for merely resting in an indeterminate cognizance which lacks insight into its nature. He certainly appears to contend that ye shes does not cognize the non-arising nature of phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:15 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I was talking about tha mal gyi shes pa. Which is very close.

krodha wrote:
Sems and tha mal gyi shes pa are only 'close' in the same sense that gold and pyrite are 'close', in appearance. However they are not 'close' at all in fundamental characteristic or constitution.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 22nd, 2014 at 12:11 AM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
In terms of appearances it doesn't eradicate anything. If it did then it wouldn't be tha mal gyi shes pa. On the plus side it does eradicate (naturally) any grasping to those appearances and then it doesn't establish that appearances are either real or unreal. That's about it.

krodha wrote:
I never said that it eradicates appearances. Since it is a valid cognition (of appearance), it surely reveals the non-arising nature [dharmatā] of phenomena, hence, their unreality.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Non-duality is a fact. Right now non-fixation is a fact. Perfect Pure Presence is a fact. These are entirely natural and entirely factual. They are Buddhist invariance.

krodha wrote:
They are natural and factual if you have recognized them in a direct and concrete way. Otherwise they are ideas no different than the rebirth that you reject, or the quantum theory that you accept.

Andrew108 said:
But the problem is when we use concepts to tell reality how it should be.

krodha wrote:
Because we all know it should really be a reality which possesses natural laws and is made of gross material elements.

Andrew108 said:
We have to uncover these natural wonders for ourselves and really that to me is the beauty of Buddhism. Meditation is sooooo easy when you know how to rest in ordinary mind. And this ordinary mind is 100 percent natural.

krodha wrote:
You must mean 'ordinary mind' [sems]... because the other 'ordinary mind' [tha mal gyi shes pa] isn't the walk in the park you seem to be suggesting it is. Plus the fact that truly resting in tha mal gyi shes pa completely eradicates any notions of a so-called reality which could accord with a physicalist or materialist paradigm.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 10:48 PM
Title: Re: Is Rebirth Unscientific?
Content:
dharmagoat said:
There is a fundamental contradiction in Buddhism:

The Buddha is known as an independent thinker and innovator. We are encouraged to emulate him, yet are obliged to follow his teaching without question and without making any compensation for the enormous social and cultural changes that have occurred over the 2000+ years since it was written down.

krodha wrote:
You'll have to be more specific about which "enormous social and cultural changes" you are alluding to...

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 21st, 2014 at 4:45 AM
Title: Re: karma bully
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Actually, I just express myself in a way that was not clear what I meant, but this debate was positive, because I learned how to express myself better. I do not believe that karma is just a Buddhist or a Hindu theory, all religions and materialistic philosophies speak of causality somehow. Buddhist philosophy explains karma in order to help people to achieve enlightenment, then it seems to me to be something dangerous to

use karma in other context.

krodha wrote:
Though it is important to be mindful of the fact that the difference between materialist causality, and the nature of karmic causality, is incredibly vast. Honestly the true meaning of karma in the context of the buddhadharma does not even really apply to the materialist interpretation of causality. Sure, 'karma' means 'action' and so you can say that there are gross karmic forces playing out in the context of materialist causality, but the meaning is entirely different when compared to karmic causation associated with pratītyasamutpāda and so on.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
And yet you do accept that rebirth is a convention:

krodha wrote:
Everything is a convention. You still don't seem to understand Madhyamaka very well, probably due to your continual deprecation of studying and refining your understanding.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 19th, 2014 at 2:34 PM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
7. Middle way teachings are subtle and easily misunderstood.

krodha wrote:
I like that you state this prior to confidently citing various [Middle Way] quotes you clearly misunderstand.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 12:46 PM
Title: Re: Celibacy
Content:
krodha wrote:
Well for everyone in the northern hemisphere it's about that time for the late-spring and summer sex life as suggested by Tibetan medicine... which is once every fortnight. So prepare thyself for the spurts of fourteen day abstinence and/or retention.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 9:15 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Matt J said:
Following this to its conclusion, if we are ill, then we might as well follow the advice of a schizophrenic as a medical doctor since both are "mirages." The hand and the foot are both empty, but try to brush your teeth with your foot and try to walk around with your hands.

krodha wrote:
Ah, well you're missing the point I was making and taking this in a direction it isn't meant to go. My comment applies solely to the notion that science (and natural laws) are somehow more valid than other views (in an inherent sense). Andrew's original comment was that science (and natural laws) are the best definition of what counts as convention, and so I was specifically addressing the prospect of actually believing that one relative truth is inherently superior to others, 'inherently' being the key word (because that is what Andrew is proposing). I used the ultimate point of view to illustrate how his proposition does not withstand scrutiny, and not in the radical, illogical, nihilistic manner you seem to be insinuating I was.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Matt J said:
While true, some models work better than others. For example, I would prefer the modern Western medical model over the Medieval Western 4 humors theory as the Western model appears to allow people to live longer.

krodha wrote:
Right, and these are examples of semblances of relative truth. If one prefers modern western medicine over other options then that is your preference. And we can even explore, compare and contrast the efficacy of certain treatments between different medicinal approaches, thereby establishing what we could refer to as relative truths.

However since we are approaching this issue through the lens of the buddhadharma we must admit that relative truths are merely examples of reliable efficacy on the relative platform. In the ultimate sense everything relative is non-arisen and lacking inherency in every way, ergo relative truths are acceptable in their context but are ultimately unfounded since they are fallacies.

My point being that we can surely declare that one relative account is more accurate than another but this declaration does not transcend the relative level and is revealed to be an abstraction from the ultimate standpoint. Which means an assertion that science and so called natural laws are somehow more accurate than anything else is like saying

one mirage is better than another mirage. When it comes down to it neither hold water. So I respect Andrew's preference for science, but an argument that his preference is somehow more inherently valid or accurate then anything else is ultimately choosing one delusion over another.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 1:47 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Science is founded on natural laws. Natural laws are these best definition of what counts as convention.

krodha wrote:
Since all conventions are equal in their emptiness (i.e. lack of inherency), what you're choosing between are actually relative truths (rather than conventions). Yet since all relative truths are objects of deluded cognitions per Candrakīrti, you're ultimately and merely exhibiting a bias between figments of ignorance which amount to little more than abstractions. Saying one is more suitable as a "best definition" is therefore little more than a belief, equivalent to the so called beliefs you are attempting to marginalize (at the expense of your own beliefs).

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 18th, 2014 at 1:26 AM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I prefer scientific convention since it's convention is based on reasoning and proof.

krodha wrote:
The lovely cast of It's Always Sunny In Philadelphia making my point, more or less...

"Science is a liar... sometimes"
https://vimeo.com/69970735

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 11:49 PM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I haven't been denying the conventional. I've been saying that if you accept buddhist convention why not also accept scientific convention? I prefer scientific convention since it's convention is based on reasoning and proof.

krodha wrote:
The majority of your allegedly proven scientific convention is inferential information you take on faith (because someone you invest with authority has said it is so). Which does not sound reasonable by your own purported and self-proclaimed standards (of reasoning and proof).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 10:10 PM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Causes have no inherent nature. It is only a convention that says past causes give rise to present results. If you are going to use conventions then you might as well use worldly conventions too (and you do).

Consciousness cannot exist without an object. That is, it can only ever said to exist conventionally. It is also a convention to say that there is a stream of consciousness. As we know, conventions are somewhat important but they are not definitive.

Rebirth is not important for me - it isn't meaningful, What is important is direct experience of the definitive aspects of Buddha's teaching.

krodha wrote:
Everything is conventional and everything can only ever be said to exist conventionally, there is nothing which isn't a mere convention, for the very reason that nothing possesses inherent existence. Of course it is a convention to say there is a stream of consciousness, and of course it is a convention to say that past causes give rise to present results... obviously, this is a redundant point and goes without saying. Should have been assumed from the get go. However the fact that everything is a convention does not make everything arbitrary.

The teachings are of course conventional, and the teachings are then subdivided into the categories of definitive and provisional, therefore conventions can be definitive in the context of the teaching. You cannot marginalize everything because it is a convention because you would then be marginalizing everything, and thus would be erring into nihilism. And in your case; simultaneously erring into eternalism (materialist physicalism) and now nihilism.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 1:56 PM
Title: Re: Contra Buddhist Modernism
Content:
pensum said:
Okay, then what is the proof for the existence of such formless realms?

krodha wrote:
Formless realms are like the nirvikalpa samādhi (and other attributeless absorption states of that ilk) propagated in certain Hindu traditions and so on. These states necessarily involve the senses being fully retracted into the substratum i.e. consciousness is fully absorbed into itself. States like these are considered to be distractions from the Buddhist perspective, hence why Buddha stated that grasping at these states is cause for rebirth in a formless realm as a Deva etc.

As for proof, well, since it is a completely subjective experience, asking for proof would be akin to asking someone who claims they dreamt of a pink elephant last night to provide proof of that dream. Meaning the proof is in the pudding, access such a state yourself and there is your proof.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 17th, 2014 at 4:15 AM
Title: Re: What practices can you do publicly?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Probably best to avoid any type of activity which shows outward signs of being a practitioner in a public place or populated area. There are numerous practices you can do incognito, I go to a park everyday with my son so he can play, and I practice. Guru yoga, refuge and bodhicitta, purification of elements can all be done mentally, really any mantras can, or very quiet under the breath. Then śamatha, vipaśyanā, sems dzins like Malcolm mentioned, there's really a whole host of possibilities. Better to refrain from anything which involves postures, implements, mudras, mantras spoken aloud etc., anything which may draw attention to yourself. I won't even sit in seven point posture but will sit in any relaxed manner where I can keep my back as straight as possible.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 16th, 2014 at 8:06 AM
Title: Re: Nightmares, Sleep Paralysis, False Awakenings
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also could be a succubus (or succubi) as someone mentioned above. Apparently the succubus is a female entity that sexually assaults men in their dreams.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 7:15 AM
Title: Re: Nightmares, Sleep Paralysis, False Awakenings
Content:
Jesse said:
I know it's a stupid question, but could this have been an actual demon? It did seem intelligent, but since it was a dream -- obviously I should be wary of thinking such things.

krodha wrote:
This phenomena is common with sleep paralysis and is referred to as "old hag syndrome" by some (though it is hardly a syndrome). I don't think there is such thing as 'demons' per se, but there are indeed entities of various types. The interesting thing with this female entity (that is associated with sleep paralysis) is that encounters with her have been reported for centuries across almost every culture.

In modern times it has been theorized that her appearance is simply the mind accounting for the sensation of tightness in the chest which comes with sleep paralysis. According to this theory, the mind in its hypnagogic state is able to project appearances quite easily, and so this entity is allegedly the result of the mind compensating for a lack of visual stimuli to accompany the tactile sensation in the chest. However the issue that skeptics raise with this theory is the fact that everyone sees the same female entity with the same grotesque features, and if she is merely a fabrication then why would she appear the same to everyone?

Either way though your account is spot on when it comes to the usual themes which are reported. The sheer terror is very common, many say that it begins with an uneasy feeling and escalates from there. It's often said that there is another larger, dark presence which accompanies the old woman which remains uninvolved and merely observes. There are old paintings which depict the hag sitting on someone's chest while a black horse watches in the background.

The only preventative measures I have read about (if you are prone to sleep paralysis episodes) are to avoid sleeping on your back. For some reason sleeping on your back can trigger this phenomena. The other preventative measure is for during the actual event. Since you are paralyzed apart from breathing and the ability to move your eyes, the other alleged method to break the paralysis is to consciously change your breathing pattern. Apparently your body has a go-to pattern of breathing while asleep which it defaults to automatically, this rhythm of breathing while asleep is supposedly constant and the body does not deviate from it. The theory behind this method states that sleep paralysis entails a subtle mind-body duality where the body is in the mode of being asleep, while the mind is awake. Usually the body knows to break its sleep paralysis when the mind wakes up, but in the case of the event you are experiencing there is a miscommunication and the body remains in sleep-mode. Since the mind is awake in sleep paralysis and you retain conscious control of breathing, if you change your pattern of breathing this will signal the body that the mind is awake and will break the paralysis. So perhaps give that a shot.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: karma bully
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Holding a deterministic view of Kamma isn't helpful in my view. In fact, as I mentioned before, I see it as akin to a crime against humanity. If you follow this deterministic

interpretation then you can't help but be in a position of indifference and then worse, a moral certitude that blames the victim.

krodha wrote:
I don't see that anyone has suggested determinism in this thread. Determinism would require inherent causes giving rise to inherent effects, however if you understand karma it is understood that this isn't the case. Ironically, you are the one who is advocating for inherent natural laws, which is just about as close to determinism as you're going to get.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 15th, 2014 at 12:49 AM
Title: Re: karma bully
Content:
saraswati said:
Indeed, I know my view of karma is not very clear, as I am learning in this thread. But at least the notion of no-self can counteract the karma bullies of the title?

krodha wrote:
An absence of an inherent self does not contradict karma. Karma is actually the reason why there is no inherent entity, the so-called 'self' is simply afflictive patterns of grasping i.e. karmic proliferation, which creates the illusion of an individual.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 14th, 2014 at 8:19 AM
Title: Re: karma bully
Content:
Vajrasvapna said:
Actually, I did not mean it, the text that you shared expresses what I wanted to say at the end:

The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

So good and evil appear to be real, but are illusions.

krodha wrote:
This is a redundant point, and is a given from the standpoint of these teachings. Everything appears to be real, but is ultimately illusory. That doesn't mean you are in recognition of that fact, and you cannot adopt such a view because then you err into nihilism. Even if you are in recognition of that fact, unless you are a fully awakened buddha you are still bound by your karma, and are therefore still bound by relative appearances.

Ignorance and karmic formation are the mother and father of samsara. Recognizing the definitive view free of mind dispels ignorance, however that is just the beginning of the

path. The path is a gradual exhaustion of your collective karmic propensities, and you are on the path as long as you have karma to exhaust. Therefore ignoring karmic implications or sweeping relative appearances (such as good and evil) under the rug in the name of their emptiness is a detrimental misstep.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 11th, 2014 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: White Ah and Thigle
Content:
alpha said:
And what happens if one, having already received transmission of guru yoga, only visualises the white A inside the thigle and resting afterwards ,as it is explained , but without seeing this symbol as the union of all the teachers and teachings ?Will this symbol still produce its function or not ?
I wondered about this a while back , whether one has to assign meaning or project meaning into the symbol in order for the guru yoga to lead to discovery of instant presence.

krodha wrote:
Seems there are provisional and definitive aspects to guru yoga. The provisional or inferential aspect is the visualization of the thigle at the heart and sending-receiving tröndus etc. And then the definitive or direct aspect is the actual state of contemplation [ting nge dzin] i.e. the state of tregchö. The guru is fundamentally your nature, which is why it represents the state of all buddhas, bodhisattvas, vidyādharas and so on.

I would say the projected meaning attributed to the visualized symbol on the outset is helpful to intuit the essential meaning, along with having the practice empowered through the tröndus.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 8th, 2014 at 3:04 AM
Title: Re: Complete Togal Instruction in Unrestricted New Book
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Heart Drops of Dharmakāya" pays homage to the guru, the lineage, stresses the vital importance of direct introduction from a qualified teacher and cites quite a few preliminaries which are to be practiced prior to even reading about the man ngag sde practices, let alone practicing them (which Loppön is clear in saying transmission is required).

The Old's are not doing any of that, and in fact it sounds as if they have turned their backs on their teacher (who informed them they did not complete the path they claim to have completed) and lineage completely. It's bad news.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: Alan Wallace on Dzogchen
Content:
heart said:
Yeah, they should have reprinted a long time ago, it is a shame all the traffic it brought to that strange site.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Ah interesting, so the book was originally published some time ago and this release next year will be a second edition? I saw on Wallace's site that his translation of the tantra was released in 2004(?) by Wisdom Publications, and the book was titled "The Vajra Heart" or "Vajra Essence". Though I figured the listing was a typo or an old entry which was never updated because I have never seen or heard of anyone having a hard copy book, and Wisdom Publications does not mention it. But the first edition was a limited release then perhaps?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 6th, 2014 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Alan Wallace on Dzogchen
Content:
heart said:
I find it very interesting that he says all his Dzogchen translations (four?) from the Dudjom Tersar will be published next year.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Wallace's translation of Dudjom Lingpa's "gnas lugs rang byung" [dag snang ye shes drva pa las gnas lugs rang byung gi rgyud rdo rje'i snying po] will be one of the publications, finally. An unfinalized version of the translation has been circulating online for some years now, looking forward to this finalized version being available (the text requires a transmission no doubt, but nevertheless nice to see this coming out).

Wallace based his book "Stilling the Mind" on the śamatha and vipaśyanā sections of this tantra. The tantra in its entirety includes the aforementioned preliminary practices along with rushan, tregchö, thögal and bardo instruction... essentially Dudjom Lingpa's A to Z on Dzogpa Chenpo.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 30th, 2014 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: Sleep yoga the central practice?
Content:

krodha wrote:
Incredible that teachers like Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche are able to do months worth of practice in a single night due to lack of time limitations in the dream state.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 9:42 AM
Title: Re: Gorampa & Tsongkhapa
Content:
ConradTree said:
Well most sutra followers would prefer the view of PP sutras, Nagarjuna and Candrakirti (nonarising) to Tsongkhapa (lack of inherent existence).

krodha wrote:
Nāgārjuna, Candrakīrti and the prajñāpāramitā sūtras all point to a lack of inherent existence as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 29th, 2014 at 7:50 AM
Title: Re: Sleep yoga the central practice?
Content:
ConradTree said:
Does everything ultimately relate to sleep yoga?

1. During sleep yoga, tertons 'travel' to pure lands and receive terma, instructions etc.
2. The progress of all daytime practice, whether mantras or even lhun grub practices, is explicitly assessed by dreams.
3. The practice of the night is a standard feature in Dzogchen practice manuals.
4. Sleep yoga is explicitly emphasized by Dilgo Khyentse, Jigme Lingpa etc.

So is sleep yoga the highest and most direct practice?

krodha wrote:
Luminosity in sleep is just a natural result of maturation in view. According to Dudjom Lingpa the afflictive consciousness of sentient beings recedes into the ālaya (or substrate) during sleep, but for seasoned practitioners that process starts to dissolve and ignorance in sleep begins to diminish.

There was another dream yoga thread not too long ago where I posted some info from the Dröltig Gongpa Rangdröl which divides the path of no more learning into three stages. In the lesser stage equipoise and post-equipoise are completely mixed, but there is still subtle delusion in sleep. In the medium stage luminosity is stabilized and present both day and night. Regarding the last stage (per Jigme Lingpa): the great yoga of no more learning is also called 'crossing over, without any difference in day or night, to the state of the inseparable three kāyas'. In Dzogpa Chenpo sem sde this stage is referred to as 'the experience of spontaneous presence transcending the boundaries of

ordinary contemplation'. These three sub-divisions of the path of no more learning span stages [skt. bhūmi, tib. byang chub sems dpa'i sa] 8 to 16. Ergo at the time of the result, wisdom pervades both waking and sleep evenly.

As stated in the concluding remarks (found in song twenty) of Lama Shabkar's Flight of the Garuda: "When dreaming and being awake are without any difference, that is the time of having actualized the meditation."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 9:57 PM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:
I give up.

thigle said:
Don't forget, most of the critics of you, follow the same subtle focus like you, even if they calling himself Dzogchenpas and tell you: "You're wrong, I'm right." So no worry.

krodha wrote:
Yes, it's a shame the entire forum doesn't reflect your nihilist leanings, thigle.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 9:32 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa's nose
Content:
krodha wrote:
At any rate thigle, you seem to continually confuse the basis, path and result, cutting the path out altogether. Recognition of one's nature does not mean that unfabricated effortlessness suddenly ensues and there is no reason to practice for the sake of stability and so on. You reference the ZZNG as a support for your claims, yet their system is dead set on cultivating stability after recognition, setting up various retreats of different lengths, implementing various practices just to achieve stability in the natural state.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 9:20 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa's nose
Content:
krodha wrote:
The pot calling the kettle black.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 5:09 AM
Title: Re: Who is Khyentse Yeshi Silvano Namkhai?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Heard through the grapevine that Yeshi has announced there is only one master in the Dzogchen community and has chosen to focus on his personal life for now.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 4:00 AM
Title: Re: Unity's theory on the nature of mind
Content:
Unity said:
Please ask a qualified teacher about it, someone who you trust.
There's no more that I can say about it.

krodha wrote:
"Designating appearances as the dharmakāya obscures me,
designating whatever appears as mind obscures me,
designating wisdom as mind obscures me"
- The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra Tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 3:49 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:
This is not about systems, it's about recognizing the nature of reality. That is what Dzogchen is about.
Perhaps you could ask someone who has realized the nature of reality and the nature of the mind, someone who you trust.
I give up.

krodha wrote:
The view of Vedanta [sanatānadharma] is not synonymous with the view of Dzogchen [buddhadharma]. I am saying your treatment of Dzogchen comes across as a sanatānadharma view, and does not coincide or correspond with the view of Atiyoga in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:

We are all inside the one and same reality, inside the one and same mind, and we call it 'rigpa', in order to differentiate it from the illusionary personal mind which we call 'sems' in Tibetan, and it is a continuum, there are no holes, no separation. (sorry for being so emphatic, I don't mean to be rude or offensive)

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen does not say this. Advaita Vedanta does perhaps, but again you are conflating systems.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 2:09 AM
Title: Re: Unity's theory on the nature of mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Guru Rinpoche also apparently had a twin brother named Yungdrung Donsal who later took the name Tsewang Rigdzin. I've heard there's a Bon practice which incorporates the whole family. But anyway, back to whatever it is we're discussing at this point ha.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: Unity's theory on the nature of mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The theory that Drenpa Namkha and Nyimai Nyingpo Obarma were Padmasambhava's father and mother is interesting.

Sherab Dorje said:
Which Padmasambhava?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 28th, 2014 at 2:01 AM
Title: Re: Unity's theory on the nature of mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
The theory that Drenpa Namkha and Nyimai Nyingpo Obarma were Padmasambhava's father and mother is interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 11:30 PM
Title: Re: Now I "get it"
Content:
thigle said:
I did not ask you.

krodha wrote:
I'm well aware of that.

thigle said:
..because of grasping. But primordial natural losseness is completely unfabricated. So stability can't be practiced. This is clear, even if knowledge seems to be hidden again. Therefore one have to make a strong decision and the fruit is relative stability. This can take years and decades. If knowledge is relative stable, potentiality begins to unfold. That's the beginning of thögal. True stability without thögal is not possible, because solid vision isn't the exact expression of knowledge. The thin ignorance-layer of solid vision always creates confusion.

STG said:
Everything that is practiced in those paths is made up by thoughts, and their practitioners never achieve the stage of acting without action. [..] Decisions without action has three subdivisions. The first is in general to remove all faults; the second is to explain what the decision without action means; and third is to decide to practice without practising. [..]

krodha wrote:
Stability must be practiced. The fact that primordial wisdom is unfabricated is irrelevant, the path consists of you working with your knowledge of primordial wisdom. Wisdom must be recognized and then familiarized with.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 8:48 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
ConradTree said:
My Dzogchen teacher didn't teach sitting on a cushion.

If you want to go through sutrayana style contrived meditative states, again, go right ahead.

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=4704&start=0

krodha wrote:
For most, even in the context of Dzogchen, contrived meditation is a necessary provisional method. In fact the path is termed the "path" because it consists of vacillation between equipoise [mnyam bzhag] and post-equipoise [rjes thob]. "Post equipoise" denoting anytime the practitioner is not resting in direct uncontrived contemplation, which for beginners isn't a matter of choice but is simply the result of instability in the definitive view. Therefore contrived meditations of various kinds may be necessary, and are in most cases.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 8:38 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
haha said:
theanarchist wrote:
You might find this interesting:
https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2013/03/rainbow-body-and-thusnesss-advise.html?m=1
no it is not interesting. even thought one may attain the samadhi in fire element and enter its samadhi at the time of one's death, such thing cannot be happen (i.e. when the body of the Blessed One had been burned, no ashes or particles were to be seen of what had been skin, tissue, flesh, sinews, and fluid; only bones remained.....) nor one should assume that he was cremated by the ordinary fire (i.e. the fire from outside).

Milerepa's iconography indicates, he was definitely a dzogchen practitioner.

krodha wrote:
"Interesting" in the sense that the dissolution of the physical form does not necessarily indicate the body of light. I wasn't making any statements regarding the rest of it. But you're welcome to think it is uninteresting!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 4:23 AM
Title: Re: Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti on the Chatuskoti
Content:
krodha wrote:
A few from the Mulamadhyamakakarika:

MMK 5.6: If the existing thing (1) (bhava) does not exist, how then would the non-existing thing (2) (abhava) come into existence? And who holds: the existing-and-non-existing (3) thing which does not have the properties of an existing-and-non-existing thing (4)?

MMK 7.20: It is not possible that what has originated either exists or does not exist, Nor that what has not originated either exists or does not exist; this has been demonstrated earlier.

MMK 9.12: For him who does not exist previous to, at the same time, or after seeing, etc. The conception "He exists," "He does not exist," is dissipated.

MMK 15.5: If there is no proof of an existent thing, then a non-existent thing cannot be proved. Since people call the other-existence of an existent thing a "non-existent thing."

MMK 15.6: Those who perceive self-existence and other-existence, and an existent thing and a non-existent thing, Do not perceive the true nature of the Buddha's teaching.

MMK 15.10: "It is" is a notion of eternity. "It is not" is a nihilistic view. Therefore, one who is wise does not have recourse to "being" or "non-being."

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 3:00 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
theanarchist said:
He supposedly was cremated and left bone relics behind, something that doesn't happen in a case of rainbow body.

krodha wrote:
You might find this interesting:
https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2013/03/rainbow-body-and-thusnesss-advise.html?m=1

This statement from Malcolm sums up the topic of the link:
"No, but I have heard (from ChNN among others) that the disappearance of the body is not necessarily a sign of the body of light..."

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 1:55 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Andrew is discussing his materialist objective condition theory, not anything which resembles the gzhan stong view.

Andrew108 said:
Well that's a mouthful. And not really my position at all. For example I still hold to dependent origination.

The Dalai Lama says: "Philosophically, and for that matter conceptually, it seems more coherent to maintain a position that accepts the reality not only of the subjective world of the mind, but also of the external objects of the physical world."

krodha wrote:
Dependent origination would mean that the so-called subjective and objective dimensions are merely conventional in nature. For to be dependently originated is to be a conditioned arising, and that which is a conditional arising cannot be said to posses inherency.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Now I "get it"
Content:
thigle said:
Because primordial natural losseness is completely unfabricated. So stability can't be practiced.

krodha wrote:
In the beginning stability must be practiced, and practiced diligently. It is said that initially the practitioner chases the meditation and later once stability has occurred, the meditation chases the practitioner. Without achieving that stability though, there is no hope of becoming stable. Your nature is always stable, you however are not. So it is a matter of familiarization and continually returning to that knowledge. Effortlessness comes in time.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 27th, 2014 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Now I "get it"
Content:
thigle said:
So you've "found" some-thing inside of this experience?

krodha wrote:
That is how it works, your nature is not discovered elsewhere.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
smcj said:
I stand by the notion that there is an objective condition that exist independently of the perceiver. This objective condition would also have characteristics that are entirely natural to it. Lack of established identity is one such characteristic. Non-fixation is another.
I agree. I habitually quote Khenpo Tsultrim in regards to Shentong:

This non-conceptual Wisdom Mind* is not the object of the conceptualizing process and so is not negated by Madhyamaka reasoning. Therefore, it can be said to be the only thing that has absolute and true existence.

It is one school's orthodox position. But I must admit there is a bit of troll in me that enjoys it.

*He is very specifically NOT talking about the Mind Only school here btw, but something deeper.

krodha wrote:
Andrew is discussing his materialist objective condition theory, not anything which resembles the gzhan stong view.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 11:34 PM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:
This great pure mind which pervades everything was called Parabrahman, Rigpa, God, Allah, and many other things.

krodha wrote:
"If you don't understand this clearly but think that one mind pervades everything, then that is what is kept and learnt in Vedanta; that is their very strong view. If you believe this then your Damtsig is broken and you go against the meaning of Dzogchen.

Is that clear? You must make sure (of this point). If you think that (Nature) is one without individual partitions, that this 'one' pervades everything, then that is breaking your Dzogchen Damtsig and goes against the Dzogchen View. Hopefully you have understood clearly."
- Lopon Tenzin Namdak

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 26th, 2014 at 10:32 AM
Title: ChNN and Changchub Dorje's Teachers
Content:
krodha wrote:
Seems that Changchub Dorje's teachers Adzom Drukpa and Nyala Pema Düddul are referenced often in Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche's teachings. However Changchub Dorje's third teacher Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen is not mentioned as often, if at all. All three were undoubtably very profound teachers and tertöns... curious why Norbu Rinpoche chooses to focus primarily on the cycles of Adzom Drukpa and Nyala Pema Düddul when he gives teachings associated with Changchub Dorje's teachers?

Is it that Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen wasn't as influential for Changchub Dorje? Or does Shardza Rinpoche being a Bön lama have anything to do with it? Can't see that being the case when Norbu Rinpoche is so good about focusing on the essence of the teachings and straying from sectarian politics.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 7:02 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:
I'm claiming to have recognized the nature of mind.

krodha wrote:
Recognition of the nature of mind is simply a recognition event, it is an important cornerstone of the teaching and the beginning of the definitive path, but it does not constitute the result [buddhahood] by any means.

This is assuming you actually have recognized mind-essence, which may or may not be the case, either way, there are many here who have and many more who will. Most importantly, you should take this up with your teacher and heed his or her advice regarding the type of conduct you should exhibit in the wake of (or while aiming to actualize) such insight.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 25th, 2014 at 6:41 AM
Title: Re: Breaking samaya if one talks about rigpa?
Content:
Unity said:
I'm just trying to use the terminology that the people seem to understand who I'm trying to communicate with.
I use the term "rigpa" here only for you, because I thought you understand it.
Would you understand other words better, e.g. Parabrahman? That means the same as Rigpa, but it's a Sanskrit word, not Tibetan.

krodha wrote:
Parabrahman and rigpa [vidyā] are not synonymous. You are (i) conflating systems and (ii) are taking a perennialist approach to these teachings.

Unity said:
By the way, "dzogchen" means "great wisdom", it's not exactly a trademark, it has a very long and ancient tradition, unfortunately people seem to forget that.
It's really not about "usurping terminology", I'm just trying to communicate with you, to express my thoughts to you in a way that I hope you can understand.
People in this forum seem to be a bit jumpy about "their" terminology, they seem to claim it to be their own, not to be used by "outsiders".
Looks like a sect to me.

krodha wrote:
No one ever said that Dzogchen was a trademark, and I don't think it has slipped

anyone's mind that it is a longstanding ancient tradition. That being said, the system surrounding Dzogchen is precisely that, a system, and therefore has its own methods, practices, terms and so on. There's no need to insert or import concepts from other systems for various reasons. The system works, the lineages are unbroken, and what isn't broke doesn't need fixing.

If you're a fan of perennialistic soups that is all well and good, but in this forum assertions of that nature will undoubtably face critique. Not out of stubbornly adhering to fixed views like religious fundamentalists, but because the majority of people here find value in the teaching as it is, and the integrity of the teaching should be maintained.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 24th, 2014 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: Using Astral Projection for Dharma Practice
Content:
krodha wrote:
There are many who are naturally inclined to have lucid dreams and/or so-called astral experiences, doesn't mean it is pure vision though. Some teachers actually urge practitioners to err on the side of caution while dreaming because lesser beings can present themselves as realized beings. Definitely something to discuss with your teacher.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 1:29 PM
Title: Re: Guru Pema Tho-threng-tsal
Content:
kirtu said:
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Padmasambhava: With Mandarava, he then returned to Oddiyana, but was recognized, and burned on a sandalwood pyre. After some time, they were found seated on a lotus in a lake of sesame oil

krodha wrote:
Lake Rewalsar i.e. Tso Pema is said to be the lake which formed as a result of this event. Lama Wangdor built a giant Guru Rinpoche statue there which overlooks the lake, curious if the statue depicts this Thöthreng tsal form of Padmasambhava.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 22nd, 2014 at 3:31 AM
Title: Re: Nonduality and the two truths?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Some entries from "The Princeton Dictionary Of Buddhism": In Madhyamaka, conventional truths are all phenomena other than emptiness (SUNYATA), which is the ultimate truth.

seeker242 said:
I can't help but to think of the heart sutra when reading this, specifically the part where it says "phenomena is emptiness, emptiness is phenomena." Which appears to say there is no such thing as "phenomena other than emptiness" to begin with. But if conventional truth = phenomena other than emptiness and there really is no phenomena other than emptiness, then it would follow that there is no conventional truth either? Does Madhyamaka disagree with what it says in the heart sutra? Hmm.

krodha wrote:
Yeah, that Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism statement is quite misleading, the conventional is precisely what is empty. The ultimate truth is simply the non-arising of the conventional.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 11:25 AM
Title: Re: Nonduality and the two truths?
Content:
krodha wrote:
If Madhyamaka declared that the two truths were inherently valid, then Nāgārjuna wouldn't have made statements like this:

"Since the jīnas have stated nirvana is the sole truth, at that time, what wise person would think 'the rest is not the opposite'".
-- Yuktiṣaṣṭika

In the ultimate sense Madhyamaka does not even uphold a single truth, since an ultimate cannot be truly established. The entirety of the principles found in the teaching are conventional and/or relative. Which means they are unreal.

The main issue is that this principle will never make sense unless the difference between "advaya" and "advaita" is properly understood. Attempting to reconcile a non-dual"ity" in general, in the context of the buddhadharma, is coming from a flawed approach to begin with. In Buddhism the conditioned and the unconditioned are "non-dual" [advaya], an epistemic insight, but this is not suggesting an ontological "non-duality" [advaita]. It simply means a proper knowledge of the so-called "conditioned" will reveal that it is primordially "unconditioned". The dharmatā of a given dharmin is not found apart from said dharmin.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 21st, 2014 at 8:38 AM
Title: Re: Nonduality and the two truths?
Content:
seeker242 said:

So some Buddhist traditions are said to be "nondual" traditions. But at the same time people make distinctions of ultimate truth vs conventional truth, AKA the two truths. But the very notion of "two truths" is itself a dualistic view is it not? If there are two different truths, how can there be nonduality when nonduality means the two are really not different??

krodha wrote:
Non-dual [advaya] in the buddhadharma means a freedom from existence and non-existence. But the "two truths" are merely a conventional or pedagogical methodology, not a statement of inherent truth. If the claim was that there is ultimately two truths, then I would understand your objection, but ultimately, both ultimate and conventional truths are conventional designations, so there is no contradiction.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 11:14 AM
Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience
Content:
ConradTree said:
I meant what the quote means.

krodha wrote:
Ah haha

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 10:39 AM
Title: Re: Jigme Lingpa's mystical pranayama experience
Content:
ConradTree said:
What does Jigme Lingpa mean?

krodha wrote:
jigs med is "fearless" I believe. gling pa is an honorary title given to tertöns, but "gling" [skt. dvīpa] translates to something like "island", or continent; island; location [as of a monastery] according to Jeffery Hopkins Sanskrit-Tibetan-English dictionary.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 20th, 2014 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: HUM or HUNG?
Content:
Fa Dao said:
I have noticed that some Dzogchen teachers use HUM while others use HUNG..is there really a difference energetically?

krodha wrote:
I'd say it's best to go with whichever was used in the transmission you received, but ultimately it doesn't make much difference. Chögyal Namkhai Norbu just recently told the story of Sakya Pandita and the yogi who mispronounced "vajrakilaya" as "chili chilaya", read that story sometime if you get a chance, puts things in perspective with discrepancies like this.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 9:19 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Those who adopt Buddhist views of the pre-eminence of mind (and I have done this), are not able to let go of subtle concepts regarding mind. Since they cannot let go of these subtle concepts regarding mind, they are not able to progress. That is the long and short of it. If you understand consciousness is located in the brain then go with that. The sooner you are able to have a direct experience of reality not mediated through concepts then the better you'll be.

krodha wrote:
Those who adopt materialist views of the pre-eminence of the brain (and you have done this), are not able to let go of subtle concepts regarding mind. Since they cannot let go of these subtle concepts regarding mind, they are not able to progress. That is the long and short of it. If you understand consciousness is merely conventional, and its location is likewise conventional, then go with that. The sooner you are able to have a direct experience of reality (which is also a mere convention) not mediated through concepts (like the mind being located in the brain) then the better you'll be.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 19th, 2014 at 2:27 PM
Title: Re: A Physicalist Theory of Mind
Content:
Jayarava said:
If one kind of substance is wrong, how can two kinds be right?

shel said:
Perhaps two wrongs make a right in this case. Jeeprs?

krodha wrote:
And three rights make a left... per Lil' Wayne.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 18th, 2014 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind

Content:
Andrew108 said:
Freedom from extremes means not mediating reality through concepts. It is a direct experience where concepts are not applied. If you have the idea that you need to realize 'freedom from extremes' then our intellectual tendencies will tend to imagine that this is something they either have realized or should realize, or is a position they should promote and defend.

The term mind is redundant. Useless. Because the practice is the practice of not mediating reality through concepts. The concept - 'it can't be found' is as useless as any other concept - as useless as the contradictory idea that 'it doesn't exist but it exists'.

I guess this thread has gone way off topic. The reason I have posted so much is because I think a realist/materialist view is more conducive to this practice of 'direct experience not mediated through concepts'. The tendency for westerners is that they think they should take on wholesale a belief system that is actually alien to them. They needn't bother with that. Buddhism will fail in the West if it stays as it is. It is failing. The Dalai Lama's dialogue with western science has been really useful.

In the end you have this cognition - just that - and that cognition is not separate from reality. It belongs in reality. If you see this reality as belonging to mind, as being in the mind, then reality is resting on a concept that stands between you and direct experience.

krodha wrote:
Freedom from extremes means that so-called conditioned phenomena are recognized to be fabrications of ignorance. Like Nāgārjuna's example where he discusses the unreality of the world, paraphrased; like a child who is born and dies in a dream, this world is also unborn, having never truly arisen in the first place. So the world is nothing which has ever occurred in the way we think it has, it is nothing that has originated, nothing that abides, nothing which will cease, and so it is free from origination and therefore free from extremes.

Your views on the rest of the points you mentioned are equally inaccurate in my opinion, the materialist view is so limiting.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 17th, 2014 at 8:50 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
You have claimed that. I will tell you how. You have said that if we see a mountain then there are two aspects. The internal perception of the mountain and the external manifestation.

krodha wrote:
Please cite where I've said anything remotely close to that.

Andrew108 said:
In your view, both the internal perception and the external manifestation are linked to karmic traces. In the first instance the perception of the mountain is linked to the karmic traces inherent in the mind stream of the individual and in second instance the manifestation of the mountain externally, is linked to the karmic traces inherent in the mindstreams of many individual streams of consciousness. So in both cases the mountain is a subjective creation. The only difference being the difference between one subjectivity and many subjectivities.

krodha wrote:
The fact that these things are linked with karmic traces should be quite telling regarding the nature of their manifestation. You are again leaping to compare and contrast these explanations to your materialist view, which is tantamount to trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. At any rate though, your continual conclusion that these matters somehow resolve into subjective experiences in any inherent sense (which is the only sense you are capable of working with) is an asinine notion.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The point that I have made again and again is that you can't tell reality how it should be. Whilst reality has characteristics it would be wrong to say that these characteristics are only subjective.

krodha wrote:
No one has claimed that there is a reality which is only subjective. The idea that anyone has suggested that any sort of reality is solely subjective is your own notion. A strawman through and through.

Andrew108 said:
There are characteristics that are also objective - that exist independent of the subject who observes them.

krodha wrote:
Conventionally, sure.

Andrew108 said:
This is not just a conceptual idea.

krodha wrote:
Fortunately, it is just a concept, though it undoubtably appears as much more than a mere concept to those entrenched in confusion.

Andrew108 said:
It is a scientific fact.

krodha wrote:
You're reaching with that one.

Andrew108 said:
It is a truth that is as 'normal' as you can get.

krodha wrote:
According to you.

Andrew108 said:
Accepting that fact is the start of genuine integration.

krodha wrote:
Far from it. Though perhaps it is the start of further integration, or more accurately; "entrenchment" in delusion.

Andrew108 said:
In terms of how to integrate I would say that whilst reality has characteristics it does not have a theory about itself. So why have a theory about it? Why not just be what it is? This is effortless integration.

krodha wrote:
Yes, well, in the throes of ignorance theory becomes mistaken for "how it is". Your alleged "how it is" is pure theory, pure concept.

Andrew108 said:
What you are saying is that you should develop a view based on centuries old reasoning and then apply that to your experience in order to liberate yourself from the 'normal'. I think that is going about things the wrong way. I think that is deluded.

krodha wrote:
If you do not have the wherewithal to see how these principles apply to your direct experience precisely in this immediacy, then that is your own limitation to work through. There is nothing archaic about it, the only "centuries old" decrepit reasoning being displayed here is the material physicalism you champion.

Andrew108 said:
I am a Buddhist.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 16th, 2014 at 9:34 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:

Andrew108 said:
I am in agreement with a lot of what you say. I'll write some more latter this evening. There is a thread on psychotherapy and Dharma. In that thread Jeeprs posted that he saw realization and realized individuals as 'supernormal'. I would agree with this. That these individuals are highly integrated. One wonders how some one who constantly reified a subjective experience could be integrated at all?

krodha wrote:
Because again these conclusions of yours are product of your view. You are taking certain notions and attempting to place them into your own conceptual model, in hopes of creating (what you consider to be) a logical explanation. And the only way they are going to fit with your model is if you peg them as "subjective experiences" in an inherent sense (such a notion has no basis in the teachings, only the mind of Andrew). However in the actual context of the system there is no conflict. In the true view of the system there is no need to relegate these occurrences to inherently existent subjective experiences, no need to scratch one's head wondering how these individuals can be integrated, these are the residual conflicts of your own ideas, not the system. Why is that? Because the system can allow for conventional and ultimate standpoints and so on. Aspects of the teaching that your materialist view utterly lacks, and so you face contradictions and conflicts within your view, yet you act as if you're encountering conflicts apart from your own projections.

To repeat what I wrote in my last post; your contention that these systems are reifying subjective experiences in the way you are suggesting is pure delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 6:08 PM
Title: Re: Ken Wilber - Towards a fourth turning of the wheel of Dh
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ken's view of Buddhism is mostly his own fabrications and misinterpretations in general, so whatever turning or reinventing of any wheel he is involved in is undoubtably complete b.s.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 15th, 2014 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I know you posted a lot but this small sentence caught my attention. For ages I thought the same as you. I thought that if I had enough realization I would be able to lift heavy weights knowing full well that they are concepts. But the truth doesn't work like that and this is typical of the trap of subjectivity that Buddhists sometimes find themselves in.

krodha wrote:

You do realize that Buddhists never champion a view of subjectivity at the expense of objectivity, right? This alleged "trap of subjectivity" (you are referring to) is simply a conclusion that you have come to by way of deductive reasoning within your own conceptual model. No one has ever advocated for a solely subjective experience though, nor have they advocated for solely objective, both, neither, etc. Just because objectivity lacks inherent existence doesn't mean that everything is subjective. If objectivity is scrutinized, subjectivity receives the same scrutiny.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 14th, 2014 at 12:52 AM
Title: Re: Madhyamaka vs Dzogchen - Is this right?
Content:
ConradTree said:
There is no dependent origination in Dzogchen.

Dzogchen has kadag, lhun grub and thugs rje.

krodha wrote:
In the system of Dzogchen, dependent origination begins with non-recognition. The conditioned phenomena of avidyā arise dependently. It may be true that from the standpoint of vidyā, dependent origination is seen for what it is, but as long as there is no recognition then appearance is reified in an afflictive way and dependent origination applies.

This is the specific model of dependent origination [twelve nidānas] which is pertinent in this case; one fails to recognize the appearances of the basis to be self-originated wisdom display, delusion [avidyā] ensues, and the remaining eleven links follow accordingly.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Madhyamaka vs Dzogchen - Is this right?
Content:
ConradTree said:
Madhyamaka..... Dzogchen
freedom from extremes..... freedom from extremes
dependent origination.....kadag, lhun grub and thugs rje
two truths.....discards two truths
no tantric features.....direct introduction, dream yoga, dark retreat, description of death process, description of empty clarity etc.

krodha wrote:
Madhyamaka ultimately discards the two truths as well, they are just a pedagogical methodology. Dzogchen also has dependent origination, which proliferates beginning with avidyā just like Madhyamaka. Madhyamaka uses analysis as its main praxis and

doesn't work with energy, so it doesn't work with lhun grub.

A proper Madhyamaka view is quite helpful with setting up correct inferential views in Dzogchen though, take this from Rigdzin Chökyi Drakpa for example:

"On the path of tregchö, all the rigidity of mind's clinging to an 'I' where there is no 'I', and a self where there is no self, is cut through with Madhyamaka Prasangika reasoning and the resulting conviction that an 'I' or a 'self' does not exist. Then, by examining where mind arises, dwells and ceases, you become certain of the absence of any true reality."

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 13th, 2014 at 12:20 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Why do you think it is a good posting? Do you trust Malcolm's intelligence more than your own? He is saying space arises from consciousness. So space is a product of consciousness. You don't see any logical difficulties with that?

krodha wrote:
The logic will never make sense to you due to the fact that your reasoning is predicated on the various presuppositions of materialism and physicality that you deem to be (solely) valid. You are approaching these notions from a completely different frame of reference, and you refuse to come halfway because you insist your frame of reference is the only logical way to view (or approach) these matters. So if you refuse to come halfway in an earnest sense, and these principles are certainly unable to go halfway to you (though they try, by citing aspects of your own view), then the impasse you are constantly faced with (which you interpret as unreasonable views failing to live up to your convictions of accuracy and truth) is perpetually inevitable.

The logical difficulty you perceive is simply the result of fixating on a particular paradigm of thought, the paradigm is treated as an objective absolute truth. So when people challenge your paradigm you believe they are challenging your reality, and it appears ridiculous to you, which leads to your logical difficulties i.e. things which don't match your allegedly concrete and accurate view of reality.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
It's not an empirical investigation. It's an investigation using logical inference and reasoning. So it is reflective.

There is definite benefit in doing this type of investigation. It leads to an appreciation of

the attitude of non-fixation. So it is leading somewhere rather than giving the practitioner an accurate description of the world. It's heuristic.

krodha wrote:
Empirical means the investigation depends upon experiment or observation, it is derived from (and driven by) direct experience. If I asked a friend to go find a hammer in the garage but could not remember where it was exactly, logical inference and reasoning alone (on their part) would not cut it, they would have to evaluate and observe their experience. Sure there may be a degree of logical inference, deduction, reasoning, for example the hammer will not be located in the gas tank of the lawn mower, the mind will not be in there either. But unless there is an empirical investigation there will be no insightful value derived in the process. A logical conclusion is insufficient in the context of these types of analytical meditation. It goes without saying that investigations are meant to lead somewhere.

As for the "attitude of non-fixation" we have always disagreed on that. Attitudes are adopted by mind, and as a provisional method such an attitude may be acceptable, but ultimately non-fixation is not an attitude. Non-fixation is ultimately the result of recognizing mind essence, because the illusory reference point collapses.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 11:06 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
No one has suggested that matter arises out of consciousness.

Malcolm said:
In fact, space arises from consciousness, and the four elements arise from space. This is a universal explanation of the arising of matter in Dharm texts.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps I should have tacked "inherently" onto the end of my statement. I wasn't discounting the fact that there is a posited succession of arisings in a conventional sense. Only addressing Andrew's proclivity to place these statements in the context of absolute truth or explanations of real processes in his inherently existent 'physical universe'.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
To clarify; (i) having a basis in consciousness, and (ii) arising from consciousness.

The latter is a reductionist position which is treating consciousness as a fundamental source. The former is simply giving credence to the interrelated implications that consciousness suggests, and how those inferred implications become seemingly valid and referential faculties, characteristics, aspects, states, entities and so on when viewed through the aperture of potent confusion which invests them with legitimacy.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
So the teachings are heuristic? If so then fair enough. But there should be some transparency, because there are many practitioners who are invested in the belief that matter arises out of consciousness.

asunthatneversets said:
No one has suggested that matter arises out of consciousness.

Andrew108 said:
Yes, you are right. I should have said there are many practitioners who are invested in the belief that matter has a basis in consciousness.

krodha wrote:
Having a basis in consciousness, and arising from consciousness, are two entirely different things.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 10:07 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Location of mind in this practice is referring to mental consciousness or at least it is referring to cognition. It is quite obvious that if you say to your teacher that you consider mental consciousness / cognition to be located in the brain that you will be deemed to have made an error. Recognition of mind essence or nature of mind is a different topic.

krodha wrote:
It certainly is not a different topic. Why do you think students are urged to find the location of mind, or find the mind in general? This an empirical investigation that must conclude with a definitive recognition. Sentient beings are under the impression that they are endowed with a mind which has a fixed location, or a core essence which makes it an enduring entity called 'mind'. These teachings are acknowledging that notion, and are saying if you do indeed have this mind which corresponds to your notions of it, then you should have no problem locating it. Find that mind, find that location. Do so empirically, divorced of your preconceived notions, work with your

direct experience, and find this thing you call your mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 9:43 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
So the teachings are heuristic? If so then fair enough. But there should be some transparency, because there are many practitioners who are invested in the belief that matter arises out of consciousness.

krodha wrote:
No one has suggested that matter arises out of consciousness.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 9:33 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
This is similar to the Emperors' New Clothes. It takes a lot of belief to uncover the deep and profound. That is part of the problem. For example take the title of this topic - the injunction is that you can't progress in Mahamudra until you accept that mind (in this case mental consciousness) has no location. So you need to adopt the belief of non-locality of mental consciousness in order to progress. But this is just a belief. And further more it is a belief that goes against what has been proven otherwise.

krodha wrote:
The practice of attempting to find the location of mind is not one which concludes with a belief. If one merely adopts a belief that the mind has no location then this is failing to recognize the nature of mind. Recognition of mind essence is not a belief, it is a lived discovery, a concrete and experiential epiphany. This is the point of departure which substantiates the rift in understanding which is carrying this discussion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 9:09 PM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
krodha wrote:
Thigle, you are comparing apples and oranges. On the one hand you're pontificating about meditation executed through the veil of mind versus the non-meditation of resting in uncontrived dharmatā. For the most part you are preaching to the choir, but are acting as of you're expounding some profound species of inside knowledge we are all unfamiliar with. You are being quite presumptuous and are underestimating the caliber of practitioner who frequents these forums. As much as you'd like to believe it, the type

of misunderstandings you are referencing are not found here often. And if you perceive that they are (occurring often), then you are reading through the foggy lense of your own misunderstanding.

The aspect which isn't making sense is your contention that respecting intimate instructions is indicative of confusing mind for dharmatā, as if those who actually know dharmatā would be willing to throw everything out the window and nihilistically disavow tradition etc., like you are. This is a misguided assertion, which does not escape mind (or 'grasping' as you put it) any more than embracing tradition does (both are equally relative, but one actually serves a purpose and function). Which means you have really only succeeded in attaching to an opposite extreme in view, and are parading it as somehow more accurate than the views you are attempting to defame, these are games of mind. An accurate knowledge of dharmatā does not require the rejection of tradition, culture, principle, praxis, or anything of that nature. The ultimate nature does not contradict conventional applications. For the ultimate is simply an accurate wisdom which directly knows the nature of that which the conventional and relative appear to suggest.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 7:47 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
jeeprs said:
Thanks! Very kind of you to say so. I will say more later, better let someone else have a go.

krodha wrote:
Doubt too many want to have a go. Addressing Andrew's vapid materialist scientific rhetoric is on par with talking to a wall.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 12th, 2014 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Why the bump?

krodha wrote:
Simon, your bump has not received the Mustang Cave seal of approval.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 9:22 PM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
Andrew108 said:
But I know those who hold a scholarly view will call you a heretic or some such thing. Then they will try to say that you know nothing and have no experience. Or that you are Neo-Advaita or New Age.

thigle said:
Just projections. Look around in this forum. Lot of Advaita/Neo-Advaita/New-Age views. Everything is "nondual" on dharmawheel. Look at this topic. They not even know why they want to ban something. This secret society'nes in the context of buddhist teachings, is a tantric tibetan illness.

krodha wrote:
I took a quick glance and there hasn't been any (Neo) Advaita or new-age "non-dual" views expressed on this thread thus far. Nor has anyone advocated for secret societies.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 9:02 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Simon E. said:
The average human brain has over 80 billion neurons. That is a huge number. All of these neurons can function.
On a point of order.. you have quoted Simon E...but I did not make that statement..

PadmaVonSamba said:
Sorry...my mistake.
Your brain made that statement, about eight posts ago...

krodha wrote:
Andrew made that statement. Simon's response made it appear as of he (Simon) made the statement due to a slight html error. Simon is clarifying that the statement is not his, because it isn't.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 7:05 PM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
thigle said:
It's good to see such reactions like from my academic/tantric friend. Because this is

always the reaction, if someone shows authentic teachings and not just tantric or academical appetizer, sold as "Dzogchen", because the sect want's you and you and you. Why they holding authentic primordial nonpractice teachings secret, has very mundane reasons. I have nothing to do with their artificial drama; no more in this life. It's for everybody. It must be for everybody, if you are a Buddhist or not. Even for beings in hell.

krodha wrote:
This is always the reaction from those who champion the conduct you are exhibiting as well.

You also haven't shown any authentic teachings per se. Giving a brief summary of practices and then relaying your own misinterpretations of their praxis isn't showing "authentic teachings", which is precisely why these practices should be given to a student from a qualified teacher. It's one thing to discuss the teachings themselves, the various points and views which apply to the system in the context being explored, but an entirely different thing to give examples of practice and then proceed to provide your own conclusions regarding their result. That is reckless. Not even the teacher does that, for the very reason that it defeats the theme and purpose of empirical investigation. The skillful means is to allow the discovery or realization to flower in the mind stream of the practitioner through proper application of the intimate instructions... not to plant concepts of the result prior to the individual engaging in the sadhāna, that is the opposite of skillful.

At any rate, my teacher just yesterday addressed this erroneous concept that the teachings are kept secret for the mundane reasons you are alluding to. The idea that the teachings are divisively withheld so that the teacher can recruit more students is patently false.

When it comes down to it, it's ultimately neither here nor there, if certain individuals have the karma to encounter your interpretations and buy into it then that is their own limitation to work through. Your cavalier attitude regarding this whole matter is concerning to say the least though. It is true the teachings are for any and everyone, but within the right setting.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 4:47 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
thigle said:
asunthatneversets, you may read and study a lot about Dzogchen and you may know a lot of tibetan terms, but your academical, religious and sectarian point of view "on" Dzogchen, isn't Dzogchen. Better you stop distracting the invisible reader by seeding doubt and mixing up everything.

krodha wrote:

This is projection of the shadow, meaning; you are addressing your own conduct.

thigle said:
I'm a buddhist, and buddhism is for everybody, even for non-buddhists. This teachings are true, not faked. They are self-secret, therefore it needs nobody to protect. You understand, or not. Better one cannot understand the teachings, before one misunderstand the teachings, because of "mixing up" everything or academical speculations. Where's Kalden Y. when one needs him...

krodha wrote:
Well, you're a big boy or girl (whichever you may be) Thigle, and can make your own choices, which you are, so have at it. I will say however that your statements in this thread are inaccurate in my opinion, for whatever that is worth, which isn't much according to those in your corner. And that is okay, someone has to carry the degenerate age forward, you appear quite enthusiastic to do so.

Vajrayāna is "self-secret" because it carries various meanings - outer, inner, secret, innermost secret - the principles are cloaked in esoteric symbology, which means it appears one way to an outsider, but means something specific to the practitioner. That is self-secrecy. Self-secrecy can also mean the definitive meaning is only truly understood by those who actualize it, but that fact does not mean you are free to broadcast and parade the practices openly to anyone. Why do you think the material which contains some of the points you addressed concludes with "samaya, gya, gya, gya"? If you have transmission for the teaching you are referencing it is profoundly secret, and you maintain that secrecy in body, speech and mind. At any rate, you aren't listening to me (or anyone for that matter) anyway, because you already know better than we, so carry on Thigle.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 1:27 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
krodha wrote:
Thigle, aside from my opinion that your ideas do not correspond with the proper views of sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde, you should not be posting these semblances of practice instruction in this forum or elsewhere on the web. Especially not with your own commentary and interpretations of their meaning and respective results. It is very bad form. There are ways to discuss these teachings without citing the practices, and you would do well to refine your methods of interaction so you are not broadcasting intimate instructions to any one with an internet connection.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 11th, 2014 at 12:00 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:

thigle said:
Maybe for CNN and his followers. But I have nothing to do with this teachings. Semde and longde are just preliminaries in the context of the direct-introduction. There's a subtle artificial focus by most of the semde/longde introductions. That isn't yermed. Stop mixing up "states of mind" with the natural state.

krodha wrote:
Dbyer med occurs at the third level of the fourfold sems sde methodologies known as the four rnal byors and/or the four ting nge dzins. The third aspect of those is nyis med and/or mnyam nyid, respectively, and both are aspects of one another. Both also denote the non-dual insight, or the 'inseprability', that the term dbyer med suggests in the context of contemplation [tib. ting nge dzin, skt. samādhi]. So they are not states of mind, but are the species of insight which results from recognizing mind essence [sems nyid], meaning; the knowledge of the natural state ensues from that insight.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 9th, 2014 at 3:01 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I didn't say consciousness emerges from matter. You are projecting. I said consciousness emerges from reality.

krodha wrote:
'Reality', 'life'... the vague cornucopia of terms which could mean any and everything.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 9th, 2014 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Well this is the argument that Thrangu Rinpoche uses in 'Vivid Awareness' a commentary on Khenpo Gangshar's teaching. :

"When you touch the soles of your feet, the mind jumps there. If you wiggle your finger, then at that point the mind seems to be in the finger, but if you do something else, the mind goes elsewhere. The mind seems to be throughout the body, but exactly where is uncertain - it does not dwell in any fixed location. The mind seems to go wherever you experience a sensation, so you cannot say with certainty that it is in either the head or the heart."

The argument is saying that there is no exact location for mind within the body.

krodha wrote:
Well, his assertion is quite different than how you are painting it. He is pointing to the

fact that you cannot pin down a definitive location for mind. Not that mind goes to specific locations within the body when it's supposed to reside in the brain. Your critique is alluding to, and presupposing a few notions which reflect your view; primarily the treatment of mind as an entity of sorts which is traveling to various locations in a body which contains it. Which is "the ghost in the shell" idea; the body as a material vessel for a non-material mind, etc. Common notions which result from the type of view you champion.

I'm not saying that the mind cannot reside within a body in a conventional sense, that is certainly a rational view to uphold in that context. But you are not suggesting a model that is merely conventional, you are advocating for an accurate explanation for what you perceive to be an actual state of affairs. And you're welcome to that opinion of course.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 9th, 2014 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The argument given as to why cognition is not located in the brain is that cognition jumps to where there is a sensation. So when we hurt our toe the argument says that it seems that cognition is in the toe and not in the brain. This is a very very weak argument given what modern science knows about cognition.

krodha wrote:
If I thought that was a valid example of an argument given in opposition of brain based cognition I would dismiss it as well. Luckily that argument dismisses itself because it is awful, and is an embarrassment to anything which would remotely resemble a valid argument against cognition being located in the brain.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 8th, 2014 at 7:07 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
It is the same as trying to pin down whether the chicken or the egg came first. If consciousness is allegedly located in the brain or skull, yet brains and skulls (including your own skull which supposedly contains your own brain) appear to consciousness, then there's no way to make any definitive statements as to what comes first.

And when it comes down to it neither can be found apart from conventionality, so attempting to make a definitive statement regarding either is choosing to be bias about one of two equally unfounded illusions as it is.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 8th, 2014 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra meditation problem: locating the mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Andrew is a die hard proponent of physicalist materialism, so the notion of consciousness being anywhere but the brain is no doubt blasphemous in that context.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 28th, 2014 at 2:19 AM
Title: Re: "Avoiding extremes"
Content:
Gwenn Dana said:
It comes with the danger of normativity of the mediocre, condemning what is different.

krodha wrote:
This isn't what a freedom from extremes is getting at. Avoiding mediocrity or condemning what is different has nothing to do with it, you're projecting your own interpretation onto this notion. As stated above, a freedom from extremes means there is nothing findable that (i) exits, (ii) does not exist, (iii) both exists or doesn't exists, (iv) neither exists nor doesn't exist. That is the four extremes, and the 'middle way' is simply a way to denote that species of insight, however the middle cannot truly be found either.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: "Avoiding extremes"
Content:
krodha wrote:
'Extremes' means existence and non-existence (also both and neither).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
That seems like a possibly arbitrary distinction to me, the whole point (for instance) of Madhyamaka logic to my understanding is that freedom from extremes is what leads to a "non dual' state - the exhaustion of dualistic concepts.

Sherab Dorje said:
Not really arbitrary because if you define non-duality as overcoming the subject-object dichotomy then where do the four extremes come into play?

krodha wrote:

The four extremes come into play because 'non-dual' in the context of the buddhadharma is denoting the inseparability of dharmin and dharmatā. The non-arising (unconditioned) nature of conditioned phenomena is never found apart from the conditioned phenomena in question. When that non-arising is recognized then it is intimately known that phenomena never arose in the first place and are thus free from extremes. Only so called conditioned entities can accord with the extremes of existence, non-existence, both or neither.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 2:45 AM
Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The pertinent difference being 'non-dual' [tib. gnyis med, skt. advaya], versus 'non-duality' [tib. gnyis med nyid, skt. advaita]. The former is the proper view of non-dual for the buddhadharma (freedom from extremes), the latter is what you find in the sanātanadharma and the neo-nondual spin-offs.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 27th, 2014 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Who are the best teachers of non-duality?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Again, like I said earlier on: WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM NON-DUALITY?

Non-duality of what for crying out loud???

Malcolm said:
It depends on what you mean by nondual. There are three kinds of non dualism. One is cognitive non dualism, i.e., everything is consciousness, for, like example Yogacara. The second is ontological nondualism, i.e. everything is brahman, god, etc. The third is epistemic nondualism, i.e., being, non-being and so on cannot be found on analysis and therefore do not ultimately exist.

The indivisibility of the conditioned and the unconditioned is based on the third. We have only experience of conditioned phenomena. Unconditioned phenomena like space are known purely through inference since they have no characteristics of their own to speak of. When we analyze phenomena, what do we discover? We discover suchness, an unconditioned state, the state free from extremes. That unconditioned state cannot be discovered apart from conditioned phenomena, therefore, we can say with confidence that the conditioned and the unconditioned are nondual. The trick is which version of nonduality you are invoking. This nonduality of the conditioned and unconditioned cannot apply to the first two nondualities for various reasons.

krodha wrote:

https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=14040&p=186276&hilit=+epistemic#p186276

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Śamatha always implies the presence of an artificial point of reference, because clarity is being reified into a substantiated substratum.

monktastic said:
Much like "vipashyana", the word "shamatha" is used in more than one context. TUR again:
In rigpa, the intrinsic steadiness is shamatha and the awake quality is vipashyana.
The way the words are being used here, it is not that shamatha collapses and yields to vipashyana to give the true meditation, but that the two are conjoined.

As masters repeatedly point out, the words "shamatha" and "vipashyana" are used in many, many different ways throughout the various vehicles. It's important not to get too hung up on any one usage.

krodha wrote:
Yes in the way śamatha is being used in the quote you cited, the collapse of fabricated mind has already occurred. The use of śamatha as a descriptive term for conveying the steadiness of vidyā does not mean that śamatha in the traditional sense (meaning meditation performed from the standpoint of fabricated mind), needn't collapse, because it surely must if the definitive view is to flower.

As long as we're quoting Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:
"The recognition of emptiness is accomplished the moment you look. 'Seeing no thing is the supreme sight.'... When śamatha is destroyed or disintegrates, then there is true emptiness, an uncultivated emptiness, a natural emptiness. This primordial emptiness is dharmakāya indivisible from saṃbhogakāya and nirmāṇakāya."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 9:09 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
krodha wrote:
In Dzogchen, vipaśyāna is resting in the uncontrived nature of mind. Śamatha always implies the presence of an artificial point of reference, because clarity is being reified into a substantiated substratum. When śamatha eventually collapses then the true vipaśyāna of the natural state shines forth, which is the definitive meditation.

But I agree this dichotomy is a different use of vipaśyāna compared to the lhag mthong referenced in the four naljors.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 25th, 2014 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: Lhathong
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also Chögyal Namkhai Norbu's book "Introduction to the Practice of Contemplation" goes over the four contemplations [ting nge 'dzins] of sems sde in great detail. He has another called "The Four Contemplations of Semde" which is just a different teaching on the same insight discussed in the 'Introduction to the Practice of Contemplation' book [the four ting nge 'dzins].

Lhag mthong is the second rnal 'byor which is covered in discussing the ting nge 'dzins.

The four naljors [rnal 'byor] of Dzogchen sems sde are:
(i) shi-nè [skt. śamatha, wyl. zhi gnas]
(ii) lhatong [lhag mthong]
(iii) nyi-mèd [nyis med]
(iv) lhundrüp [lhun grub]

The four ting nge 'dzins of Dzogchen sem sde are:
(i) gnas pa [calm state]
(ii) mi gyo ba [non-movment]
(iii) nyam nyid [non-dual]
(iv) lhun grub [natural perfection]

The ting nge 'dzins are something like the essence of the naljors, or what is cultivated/recognized. For instance, the essence of śamatha [zhi gnas] is the calm state [gnas pa] or 'nepa', or you could say nepa is what śamatha results in.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 1:20 PM
Title: Re: Policy of Tolerance
Content:
krodha wrote:
Untxi, be careful not to let a few bad apples spoil the bunch. Those few bad apples aren't reflecting the buddhadharma itself, or as a whole. Just because there are a few intolerant Buddhists doesn't mean that Buddhism is intolerant. It just means there is an intolerant person involved with the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 11:34 AM

Title: Re: Policy of Tolerance
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There's a difference between compassion and dumb compassion. Being tolerant of racists, homophobes, misogynists, etc. has it's place relatively, but there's a difference between a bit of tolerance and enabling ignorance. There are ignorant people in the world, whether naturally or conditioned, so in that way bigoted rhetoric has its place, and should be expected. The world can't be cleansed of fools. Overall though there's a fine line between tolerating bigots and allowing ignorant people to be bigots.

Vidyaraja said:
Racist, homophobe, and misogynists are buzzwords which have become nearly meaningless--at the present they can mean the belief that race exists or has meaning, that homosexuality is wrong and shouldn't be encouraged, or that men and women are different, respectively. In other words, these terms have become so broad as to encompass anything which disagrees with the leftist, politically correct dogmas on how people should think on these issues, thus functioning as mere ways to enforce the status quo and silence any opposing views under the fanatical notion that any deviation from those politically correct views will lead to genocide or some other boogeyman in the minds of progressives.

Better to be called a "bigot" and see things how they really are than to be deluded by a fluffy ideology which nearly all civilizations prior to the 20th and 21st centuries did without.

krodha wrote:
Well, you already seem to have a bias to promulgate, evident by your use of terms such as 'leftist' and 'progressive'. At any rate though, your contention that the meaning of said terms has become so broad as to obfuscate the possibility of having a meaning to be broad in the first place is really reaching. The majority of people know full well what a racist, homophobic or misogynistic view entails.

The opposition of such rhetoric has nothing to do with towing party lines or ideologies like you suggest, which again seems to be where your head is at. The opposition simply has to do with creating a welcoming environment where those who belong to certain communities, races, sexual preferences, etc., are not persecuted. And if the argument is raised that the persecutors are then being persecuted, well, being a racist is a choice, being a certain race is not. Being a homophobe is a choice, being gay or lesbian is not. Being a misogynist is a choice, being a woman is not. That is where the issue lies.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 10:40 AM
Title: Re: Policy of Tolerance
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's a difference between compassion and dumb compassion. Being tolerant of

racists, homophobes, misogynists, etc. has it's place relatively, but a bit of tolerance is quite different than enabling ignorance. There are ignorant people in the world, whether naturally or conditioned, so in that way bigoted rhetoric has its place, and should be expected. The world can't be cleansed of fools. Overall though there's a fine line between tolerating bigots and allowing ignorant people to be bigots.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 8:36 AM
Title: Re: Policy of Tolerance
Content:
untxi said:
There's a big difference between racist, misogynistic, and/or queer phobic language as conduct... I.e. as an act todirectly harm specific individuals... and the same speech bantered about in generalities. IMHO this board guards against the former, not the later.

Personally if I wanted to hear about the ethcial failures of others, and the lack of value and worth of women and LGBT people... I'd have stuck with my birth religion.

There is no place in dharma to make anyone feel lesser because of their gender or sexuality.

This suggestion is in response to homophobic and misogynistic themes in some recent threads.

krodha wrote:
I would say the expression of those themes was only from a select few, and they undoubtably met critique and resistance because of it. There's always going to be that small few who hold views of that nature, all that can really be done is to address their points with counterpoints when they come up.

The unfortunate flip side of tolerance is that we sometimes need to be tolerant of views we aren't fond of as well. Good way to practice compassion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist perspective on Book of Revelation
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
... it ends with the establishment of the 'kingdom of heaven on earth'...

bob said:
The Book of Revelation manuscript is an example of a well-known Jewish apocalyptic literary genre of the late first or early second century. The genre surfaced in the Judeo-Christian tradition whenever the Jews were persecuted for their religion/politics. At the

time the Book of Revelation was written, the Roman emperor Nero is reputed to have slaughtered Jewish and gentile Christians for refusing to worship Nero as a god. Therefore, according to the opinions of most current Biblical scholars, it was intended more as a political oratory than an account of actual future predictions.

krodha wrote:
Yes, well I didn't mean the establishment of the 'kingdom of heaven on earth', as in the literal notion of this story that fundamentalist Christians champion. I was referencing the idea of 'heaven on earth' more in the sense of the definitive realization that samsara is in truth nirvana, or that the two are non-dual from the ultimate standpoint, etc. The five elements are in truth the five wisdom lights, and so on.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 22nd, 2014 at 3:35 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist perspective on Book of Revelation
Content:
krodha wrote:
The term 'apocalypse' means to uncover, reveal, remove the veil, etc., hence 'revelation'. In my opinion it definitely sounds like a story of realization which went awry due to being spun in wild ways, filtered, mistranslated and/or purposefully obfuscated. Especially when it ends with the establishment of the 'kingdom of heaven on earth', and Jesus also states that the kingdom of heaven is within you.

Plus; the father, the son, the holy spirit. Very similar to (i) Buddha, dharma, sangha, (ii) guru, deva, dakini, (iii) dharmakāya, sambhogakāya, nirmanakāya.

Jesus being sealed in the cave (though allegedly postmortem, after 'crucifixion', which could carry various subtle meanings) is very similar to dark retreat. He emerges and is resurrected in a new pure body, very similar to the body of light which is the result of such practices.

Really seems like we're just dealing with the story of a yogi blown way out of proportion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 1:10 PM
Title: Re: Self-Arising as yidam vs. being inseparable with the gur
Content:
krodha wrote:
The 'guru' in guru yoga is the nature of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 4:36 AM
Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?

Content:
garudha said:
May I ask you if you agree with the modern teaching that the Tathagata may manifest as a personified buddha which has a body of light a-la the great perfection ?

edit: I think the correct term for the "body of light" is Nirmāṇakāya.

krodha wrote:
Nirmāṇakāya is the 'form' or 'created' body. 'Body' in the usual context the kāya is presented in means 'dimension'. However it is true that Buddhas who emanate in a physical form to spread the dharma, such as Buddha Śākyamuni or Garab Dorje, are 'Nirmāṇakāyas'. Both Śākyamuni and Garab Dorje are emanations of Vajrasattva, who is in turn an emanation of Samantabhadra.

The 'body of light', a type of phenomena which can take on various forms and expressions, is something different. The general Tibetan term the body of light is associated with is 'ja lus'. There is ja lus chen po, pho ba chen po, ja lus chung ngu, pho ba chung ngu, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 21st, 2014 at 2:42 AM
Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
now when the Buddha talked about Self did he say that if the 5 aggreagtes WERE self they would lead to suffering? no he didn't why didn't he?
thats because the Buddha actually said that IF the 5 aggregates WERE Self they would not lead to suffering.
what did he say about Not Self?
he established that the 5 aggregates were Not Self and it was because they WERE not self that they lead to suffering
SN 22.59
“Form, O monks, is not-self;
O monks, since form is not-self, therefore form leads to suffering
you see the message is actually clear here Not Self is suffering and leads to suffering where as if the 5 aggregates were Self they would not leads to suffering
now did any of those quotes say Self is suffering and self leads to suffering?
no as a mater of fact what ever is devoid of a self belongs to mara
(SN 23.24)
4 (2)-34 (12) Subject to Mara,

krodha wrote:
This claim of yours has already been clarified and refuted various times on here.

For example:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=14268&p=189675&hilit=+nonsel

f#p189675

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 4:02 PM
Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?
Content:
Atanavat said:
"Not self to mean there is no self at all " = Above concepts not relevant.

krodha wrote:
Right, there is a conventional self, but that doesn't truly constitute a self. The self is an expression of karma, where there is karma there is conditioning, and the perception of a self appears as a result of those processes. There is no actual self though, in any sense of the term.

If those karmic propensities are allowed to proliferate, then the conditions persist. The continuity of those afflictive propensities is reincarnation. What reincarnates is habitual patterns, however again, there is no actual self within that patterning. That is why when one's karma is exhausted then liberation occurs.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 3:08 PM
Title: Re: Is all knowing state same as Higher Self?
Content:
Atanavat said:
Certainly seems so, quite puzzling in facts as it completely negates karma and reincarnation, as having any relevance.

krodha wrote:
Actually, quite the opposite. The lack of an inherent self is precisely why those things are relevant.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 12:18 PM
Title: Re: Three Turnings.
Content:
jeeprs said:
The 'three marks' - impermanence (anicca); suffering or unsatisfactoriness (dukkha); non-self (Anatta) - are accepted by all Buddhist schools, are they not?

krodha wrote:
Yes. However that does not suggest a truly existent world or anything in that vein. The true meaning of impermanence is encountered in the emptiness or non-arising of phenomena. The idea of impermanent objects which are established in time and decay

is a provisional coarse impermanence.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 8:36 AM
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Getting back to the topic, although I have never seen asunthatneversets,
I'm beginning to think he is the greatest master posting on this thread.

krodha wrote:
For all I know we've been at the same tsog at Dondrub Ling, numerous times perhaps, but alas we shall never know since you're a top secret human being. Undercover Berkeley vajra brother.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 6:50 AM
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Mahāvidyādhara Jigme Lingpa states:

"In the first place, the primary condition necessary for initiation is none other than the vajra master himself; therefore it is very important to examine the teacher to whom you are connected. As Orgyenpa has said:

'Having an unexamined teacher is like jumping into an abyss;
Having an unexamined student is like drinking poison.'

Because you must not make a mistake in this basic situation. I will examine the nature of it. The rig pa rang shar tantra teaches the following on the characteristics of a master:

'A master endowed with the truth of the vajra should:
Have a good disposition and be skilled in teaching,
Have obtained initiation and have applied himself to the secret mantra [vajrayāna],
Know all of the outer and inner activities,
Be inseparable from his yidam deity,
Be undistracted in contemplation,
Be learned in the secret tantras of the secret mantra,
Which hold the truth of rdzogs chen man ngag sde
Have achieved all outer an inner accomplishments,
Never move from the meaning of the view,
Perform the outer, inner, and secret activities,
With qualities like precious jewels,

And an inexhaustible treasury of activity.'

This tantra [rig pa rang shar] also speaks of six characteristics: having put all samsaric phenomena behind him, [ii] having few desires and being content, [iii] being skilled in practice and having had experiences, [iv] being learned in the meanings of the tantras and having striven to accomplish them, [v] being learned in the meaning of the view and being completely capable with it, and [vi] having great compassion and being happy in renunciation.

One with the complete set of these qualities is said to be necessary. If, on the other hand, he is merely an effigy of whom it is said 'This one is a wonderful source of miracles,' 'This one holds an unsurpassable rank,' and 'This one is a sacred object of worship and harmony with worldly people,' then he is not [a genuine teacher]. From the same tantra [rig pa rang shar]:

'Very proud and ignorant,
Followed because of his foolish words,
Without any realization of the meaning of secret mantra,
His arrogant words disparaging others,
Engaging in a false path,
Not seeing the face of the initiation mandala,
Becoming lax in his vows,
Not coming up with the answers to pure questions,
Very proud of the little he has learned,
The unexamined master is a demon of a master.'

As it says, do not get involved with such a demonic master."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 6:41 AM
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?
Content:
tyler2 said:
you dont understand that noone would believe buddha about enlightenment unless he was "shining" or had presence, anyone can talk and say "i am enlightened".
the ascetics he originally practiced with who had rejected him originally , were going to reject him again but as he drew closer they were attracted by his aura.

krodha wrote:
Which is an example of upāya on Buddha Śākyamuni's part in order to begin turning the wheel of dharma in this current time. It is by no means criteria that you yourself need to rely upon at this point.

If a master emits dbang thang then s/he does, if they do not then they do not. You will not encounter instructions anywhere which state 'if you meet a master and they do not emit an overwhelming dbang thang then they are inauthentic', or 'if you meet a master

and they emit dbang thang chung po, then by definition they are less realized than those who exhibit dbang thang chen po'. That would be ridiculous.

There is indeed criteria by which you can gauge whether or not a teacher is a suitable guru for you, and likewise criteria that a teacher can gauge a proper student by. In either case, the potency of teacher's aura will not be found on that list. This is simply your own standard you have conjured up yourself.

At any rate, no need to attempt to dissuade you from grasping at signs any further, in the end you will undoubtably do as you please.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 6:02 AM
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?
Content:
tyler2 said:
im not looking for someone with strong aura or, some subtle siddhis,
im looking for someone with a extraordinary strong aura, very dramatic and overwhelming aka dilgo khyentse rinpoche, shining with bliss and peace the signs of ultimate realization.

krodha wrote:
An extraordinarily strong aura is no different than a strong aura. An individual could be lit up and glowing like a Christmas tree, and that would not indicate anything.

There are many cautionary tales in Buddhism which address precisely this issue. Some of which describe profoundly realized masters who exhibit no observable signs in any way. Others which tell of fully awakened Buddhas who appear to people (who are seeking a teacher) as deformed or haggard vagrants asking for help, only to be turned away. When they eventually reveal themselves as the guru, the seeker is astounded and ashamed at how shallow they had been relying on signs of dramatic and overwhelming realization.

The guru is the living dharmakāya, free of any limitations your mind could project onto them, free of any limitations such as sensible indicators of profundity. You are limiting yourself.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 20th, 2014 at 5:23 AM
Title: Re: who is the Greatest master you have ever seen?
Content:
tyler2 said:
yeah i agree i think depends on the size of your aura and the power of the emanating masters aura

krodha wrote:
You do understand this is inadequate criteria by which to judge the authenticity (or realization) of a master, yes? The measure of a guru's wisdom cannot be gauged by the amount of kinesthetic vibration or tactile sensation you feel while you are located in their general proximity.

Some residual effects of prolonged meditative states are expressed in the form of measurable anomalies (obviously anomalous in comparison to what we usually perceive as the baseline standard), and these effects, abilities and so on are called siddhis. Siddhis are not a measure of realization, they are simply an indication of practice and meditation. Not all realized individuals have siddhis, and not all siddhas have realization. So be careful.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 10:35 PM
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK
Content:
Indrajala said:
You should reread what I wrote.

There is a legal precedent established by virtue of agreeing that a human rights infringement needs to be rectified in the case of gay couples being denied the right to marry.

krodha wrote:
I did read what you wrote, two or three times.

Your contention that this legal precedent somehow translates to opening the door for equal rights in the case of rapists and people who abuse children is asinine.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 17th, 2014 at 10:21 PM
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK
Content:
krodha wrote:
Pedophilia is abuse. In the vein of rape. The prospect of pedophiles seeking equal rights is nothing like people in the LGBT community seeking equal rights. Members of the homosexual community are not harming anyone, and are not psychologically damaging children, ergo to suggest that opening the door for gay rights will be a call for pedophiles, rapists, murderers and whoever else to seek equal rights is really reaching, and absurd.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:52 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:
Andrew108 said:
I share Elio's false contention. There are others who do too.

krodha wrote:
Then you are fixating on descriptions of the basis and failing to understand how the basis relates to the path and result.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:36 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I'm satisfied with this, but when I read passages like the following one, from Elio Guarisco's introduction to "Systems of Buddhist Tantra", I wonder what is going on: As for the view of atiyoga, Kongtrul presents first the general view of atiyoga, followed by its distinctions. Other systems explain that when mind is bound by illusion, there is cyclic life, while when mind is free of illusion and gains understanding, there is enlightenment. This view is not shared by the atiyoga system, which asserts that everything that exists—all phenomena included in cyclic life and perfect peace—has always been the total sphere of naturally present pristine awareness. Since the stains of the afflictions have never existed, there are no obstacles to clear away and no qualities to develop. All phenomena are perfect from the beginning in the state of essential identity, with no need for acceptance or rejection, prohibitions or remedies: this view of primordial enlightenment is known as the great perfection.

krodha wrote:
His contention that Atiyoga doesn't share that view is patently false. It is true that Dzogchen states that everything is naturally perfected and originally pure, but the system is predicated on knowledge [vidyā] or ignorance [avidyā] if that nature. Therefore Ati agrees that one's condition bound by delusion is cyclic existence and one's condition totally free of delusion is liberation.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 1:18 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Email Jim Valby and ask him if he translates Sems Nyid as 'Presence Itself'. The passage I posted of The Dochu was his translation. You are only going on what Malcolm says the original term was. And I am sure Jim is very careful about his translations.

krodha wrote:
Malcolm just cited the section which precedes the quote you posted above (I would imagine translated directly from Tibetan), so it is sems nyid [skt. cittatā], which Malcolm

translated as "mind-essence". "Nature of mind" is another common translation.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 16th, 2014 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Wow, "presence itself" is a horrible translation of sems nyid. I've seen dharmatā translated as 'reality itself', but 'presence itself' for cittatā is pretty vague.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 9:50 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I guess this is a belief based on study.

krodha wrote:
Projecting again?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 3:46 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
What happened when you realized 'the primordial non-arising of mind'? Was there Buddhahood?

krodha wrote:
Yes in realization, as opposed to recognition, the mind is instead buddha mind i.e. dharmakāya. If wisdom remains unobscured then there is buddhahood.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 3:01 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
if he says that mind cannot be found, then I wonder how can Buddhahood be realized?

krodha wrote:
Because realizing the primordial non-arising of mind is release.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:12 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
no I mean mind is like the son of a barren woman

krodha wrote:
And conventional designations are used to convey that insight.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 10:11 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
"mental events" yes, but "mind" no. it stinks of reification.

krodha wrote:
Also, 'mind' and 'mental events' are both equally unreal.

As elucidated by Longchenpa:
"As there is no mind and mental events, it does not exist as self-mind. As it does not exist as clarity or non-clarity, it is not established as self-clarity. As it transcends awareness and non-awareness, there are not even the imputations of awareness. This is called the Dzogpa Chenpo, free from extremes."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 9:56 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
personally I don't think there is such a thing as "mind" even conventionally. "mental events" yes, but "mind" no. it stinks of reification.

krodha wrote:
Well you just gave credence to the conventional validity of mind by using it in two of your three sentences.

All conventions are equal in two ways; (i) they are equal in being conventions, (ii) they are equal in that they all ultimately lack inherent existence. So feel free to use conventional designations in any way you please. They only become an issue when you believe they refer, and they cease to be an issue when you realize they merely infer.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 15th, 2014 at 9:40 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
Huike said to Bodhidharma, “My mind is anxious. Please pacify it.”
Bodhidharma replied, “Bring me your mind, and I will pacify it.”
Huike said, “Although I’ve sought it, I cannot find it.”
“There,” Bodhidharma replied, “I have pacified your mind.”

krodha wrote:
Same principle. Mind is a mere convention and lacks inherency. If it existed it could be located when sought. But the mind is empty and therefore cannot be found when sought. Mind is empty clarity and the definitive recognition of that reveals wisdom.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Being smart with philosophical terms, being scholarly about Dzogchen, is like looking at Dzogchen through glasses. One hopes to discover something in the small print. But as ChNN points out, you need to look at the mirror (life itself) rather than historical objects such as philosophical treatises and so on.

krodha wrote:
While it is true that conceptual knowledge is no substitute for non-conceptual wisdom, the teachings do not necessarily reject 'being smart with philosophical terms' and so on. For most practitioners it goes without saying that an intellectual understanding is ultimately extraneous to non-conceptual wisdom, because after-all our nature is prajñāpāramitā, and so the two accumulations are naturally perfected through direct recognition. However for those who have yet to recognize their nature there is no issue with embracing upāya, which includes right view acquired from the qualified guru and familiarization with associated philosophical systems.

Dudjom Lingpa actually explores this point in his gnas lugs rang byung. Specifically the claim that studying or learning the correct view (in a provisional sense) is a hindrance. He attests that it is not, and uses the analogy of an ear which has water trapped in it (a nuisance we can all relate to), citing that one of the most effective ways of removing that trapped water is actually pouring more water into the ear, which will successfully wash out the water which is initially trapped leaving the ear free of water. He says that in the same way, the use of concepts and learning (within the context of the buddhadharma and Dzogpa Chenpo), serves the same purpose.

In Bönpo Dzogchen, the studying of the teachings and the wisdom gained from doing so is held to be one of the many modalities of rig pa [skt. vidyā], called bsam rig. It is said

the more refined one's bsam rig is, the clearer one's view becomes.

My Kagyu lama also contends that a refined intellectual knowledge of the teachings is very important (though practice is more important), and states that one's intellectual knowledge of the teachings is directly related to prajñā. The former being a direct expression of the latter, and so while intellectual knowledge should not be treated as a substitute for non-conceptual wisdom, it also should not be rejected either. Just because a refined conceptual understanding is not a substitute for the view non-conceptual dharmatā does not mean it cannot act as a supplement, and in that sense a refined conceptual understanding can be a helpful and effective practice when applied skillfully. The fact that we all have varying capacities means we are all different, for some individuals studying and learning the tenets of the system may be advantageous, so there is no reason to limit oneself. As long as that intellectual knowledge isn't confused for he experiential wisdom of uncontrived dharmatā there really is no issues. Some even say the clearer your knowledge is conceptually, the easier it will be to recognize non-conceptual wisdom (as these varying modalities of vidyā and prajñā are all different facets and expressions of the same wisdom).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 11th, 2014 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
pensum said:
As Tulku Urgyen was fond of saying "not seeing is the supreme sight"

dzogchungpa said:
Yes, later in the chapter ChNNR says: The original texts of Dzogchen affirm in this regard that “finding nothing is the most you can find.” Our real condition is emptiness, so what is there to find? Even if we believe there is something to find, there is in fact nothing there. When you discover for yourself that there really is nothing, you have made the greatest discovery.
However, he goes on to say: Our real nature is not only emptiness. As Dzogchen practitioners, we must understand this.

krodha wrote:
Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche expands on 'not seeing is the supreme sight' in 'As It Is Vol. 2' and mirrors Norbu Rinpoche's sentiments quite nicely:

"The recognition of emptiness is accomplished the moment you look. 'Seeing no thing is the supreme sight.'... When śamatha is destroyed or disintegrates, then there is true emptiness, an uncultivated emptiness, a natural emptiness. This primordial emptiness is dharmakāya indivisible from saṃbhogakāya and nirmāṇakāya."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: How to be non-attached if you have children?
Content:
krodha wrote:
As long as an individual functions from the standpoint of mind, attachment is implied and will always be present. Mind as dualistic experience is predicated on grasping because the duality of subject and object arises directly from acts of grasping. It is possible to aspire to not grasp, and attempt to practice non-attachment, but grasping and attachment will still be present. It is just that we may form attachment to the prospect of being unattached, or grasp at non-grasping. So all in all when it comes to our relative condition we're damned if we do and damned if we don't, and therefore embrace caring for your children and love them fully.

If you want to overcome attachment and grasping then make a commitment to practice the buddhadharma as much as possible and with skillful intent. As your practice flowers you will recognize the innate non-grasping and unattachment of mind-essence, because your nature is innately free of mind, and is therefore free of the confusion which manifests the artificial constructs of you as a subject relating to objects. That non-conceptual wisdom will clarify attachment and grasping for you, and familiarization with that wisdom will purify the afflictive bonds which are the foundation for afflictive habits of grasping. The true face of love is known in wisdom because the true expression of wisdom is uncaused compassion. So you don't have to worry about your love for your children, just commit to practicing as much as possible and if you practice skillfully everything else will come in time.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 10th, 2014 at 5:05 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
Actually my impression is that what distinguishes them are the blessings of an unbroken lineage. However 50 years from now there may effectively be no difference at all.

krodha wrote:
Apart from the blessing of an unbroken lineage you see nothing which differentiates Hindu and Buddhist tantra?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 5:51 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
alpha said:
The translators of the treasuries of Longchenpa are using "the ground of being " very generously throughout their translations.

krodha wrote:
Yeah, just a trend in translation gone awry, same with the trend of translating rigpa as 'awareness'.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 4:07 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
Yes, the quote I gave does cater to my confirmation bias.

krodha wrote:
And that's all well and good, to each their own.

These cater to mine...

"Since my self-originated wisdom originally is pure of delusion, it is beyond the extremes of being and non-being."
- The Unwritten Tantra [Per Malcolm]

"The mandala is completed in the nonconceptual path,
freeing the bonds of proliferation of thoughts and so on,
free from the empty phenomena of intentions and so on,
beyond being and non-being, negative and positive objects, and so on,
liberated from phenomena that fall into an extreme."
-- Rigpa Rangshar Tantra [Per Malcolm]

"Here I will explain the all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi] to start off:
It is the ground of all phenomena [being] and non-phenomena [non-being]."
- sgra thal gyur

"The all-basis is the real ignorance [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa]."
- rigpa rangshar

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 3:33 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
True. So we should rely on more authoritative voices, such as the head of the Nyingma lineage in the 2nd half of the 20th century:

Ultimate reality is the mandala of the perfectly pure expanse of voidness. It is like a "magic" mirror. What unimpededly appears on it are all the things (dharmas) of relative reality, your mind included. These things appear naturally in this "magic" mirror, through

and to your mind. There is no third reality of a truly existing mind or objects juxtaposed to the ultimate reality of the mirror and the relative reality of the images on it.

So I think that it should be acceptable to say that there is an ultimate reality, and that it is a ground of being as per the mirror analogy.

krodha wrote:
The basis [gzhi] is definitely not a 'ground of being' at all, in any sense. If there is a ground of being in Dzogchen it is the all-basis i.e. 'basis of all' [tib. kun gzhi, skt. ālaya], since all four extremes arise from it (including 'being'). But you and I could surely cherry pick quotes all day which seem to cater to our confirmation biases.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 3:10 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
jeeprs said:
Interestingly, there is a Wikipedia article called https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground_of_Being_%28Dzogchen%29 (albeit with https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ground_of_Being_%28Dzogchen%29#Nomenclature_of_article:_meta-annotation.)

krodha wrote:
Granted wikipedia is an online encyclopedia that anyone with a computer and an internet connection can contribute to. Sort of a low bar when it comes to the qualifications required for being involved in the creation of something which is supposed to resemble a dependable source of information. Which is to say trained primates could update wikipedia, and probably do often. Exhibit-A being the link above.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 10:51 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
A lack of inherency would not imply that there is only dependency, because to be dependently originated means to lack inherency.

Sherab said:
Here you are saying that "lack of inherency" implies dependency + something else. I can concede to this for the time being.

krodha wrote:
I implied nothing of the sort. I'm not sure how you are deriving 'a lack of inherency implies dependency' out of my statement that 'a lack of inherency does not imply dependency". Dependent origination is simply correct relative view, it is nothing more

than a means to understand and intuit the non-arising of the relative. Which if contemplated skillfully has the potentiality to lead to the correct ultimate view of emptiness i.e. the realization of emptiness.

asunthatneversets said:
... since there is nothing which exists independent of cause and condition, there is nothing which is inherent.

Sherab said:
Here you are saying that "lacking inherency" implies dependency on cause and condition, or in short, "lacking inherency" implies that there is only dependency. This contradicts what you said earlier.

krodha wrote:
Again I neither said, nor implied, anything of the sort. It seems the issue is that you're filtering my statements through your own interpretation of these notions, which unfortunately doesn't appear to lend to an accurate view on your part.

asunthatneversets said:
On top of that, since that which arises in accordance with cause and condition is only valid as long as those conditions persist (and cannot be found in the absence of those conditions), conditioned arisings do not arise.

Sherab said:
When conditions arise, conditioned arisings arise. When conditions persist, conditioned arisings persist. When conditions ceased, conditioned arisings ceased. So your conclusion that conditioned arisings do not arise is false. Conditioned arisings do not arise only when you shift your perspective, but your argument as presented did not indicate any move to shift perspectives as far as I can see.

krodha wrote:
The shifting of perspective does not render arisen arisings as non-arisen. Those arisings are non-arisen from the very beginning. It is only our delusions which mistakenly perceive arising, abiding and cessation in what has never arisen to begin with.

One interpretation (or treatment) of 'conditions' (in the idea of 'cause and condition') is actually delusion itself. Delusion is the conditions. Where delusion occurs, the false appearance of arising manifests, where delusion persists the false appearance of persisting manifests. Where delusion ceases, non-arising is recognized, because the afflictive projections of deluded mind are simply figments of ignorance, and non-arising had been present since beginningless time.

asunthatneversets said:
Ergo there is nothing which arises independently of cause and condition, and also nothing which arises in dependence upon causes and conditions. Independent origination is impossible, and dependent origination is not origination.

Which means 'only dependency' is impossible, the dependent never arose. Likewise 'only the relative' is impossible, because the relative is merely inferential and conventional dissimulation.

Sherab said:
The rest of the argument are incoherent because your earlier argument was incoherent.

krodha wrote:
What is incoherent, is your conclusion that the impossibility of independent or dependent origination means there is only dependency.

For the record, I appreciate and enjoy the discussion, but the fact that you don't grasp this concept doesn't mean what I am saying is incoherent.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 9th, 2014 at 8:44 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I don't think anyone, at any point on this thread said the relative is all there is. If the ultimate lacks inherency the relative does as well.

Sherab said:
"Lacks inherency" means lacking there is nothing innate and implies that there is only dependency. In other words, everything is relative. Therefore "lacking inherency" is another way of saying that the relative is all there is.

krodha wrote:
A lack of inherency would not imply that there is only dependency, because to be dependently originated means to lack inherency.

If something is inherent then it exists independently of causes and conditions, since there is nothing which exists independent of cause and condition, there is nothing which is inherent. On top of that, since that which arises in accordance with cause and condition is only valid as long as those conditions persist (and cannot be found in the absence of those conditions), conditioned arisings do not arise.

Ergo there is nothing which arises independently of cause and condition, and also nothing which arises in dependence upon causes and conditions. Independent origination is impossible, and dependent origination is not origination.

Which means 'only dependency' is impossible, the dependent never arose. Likewise 'only the relative' is impossible, because the relative is merely inferential and conventional dissimulation.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 3:57 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
From The Mejung Tantra

The True Nature of Reality

"To this end [the Bhagavan said]:

Mahasattva!

Those who desire enlightenment have no enlightenment and are far from the levels of realization,
far from the supreme enlightenment that is complete liberation.

Whoever understands the true nature of reality that is like [the universal] cause
has the certainty that the primordial state is one's self.

Since one's self is the essence of enlightenment,
there is nothing to attain and nothing to abandon.

The enlightenment of the buddhas is a verbal designation
and does not really exist.

The characteristics of phenomena are totally pure,
and always arise from the nature of reality that has no identity.

Phenomena that are not born have no essence,
and thus there is nothing about them on which to meditate.

Since they are self-originated like space,
all phenomena are proclaimed to be always perfect.

since phenomena are natural luminosity,
they are primordially pure, like space.

There is no enlightenment
and there are no sentient beings.

[Everything] arises from the reality that has no identity.

Enlightenment, which is the perfect realization of the primordial state,
is beyond concepts and cannot be thought of as an object."

krodha wrote:

This is speaking from the standpoint of primordial wisdom. For wisdom there is no enlightenment, no sentient beings, everything is known to be self perfected, originally pure, there is nothing to meditate upon, all that rhetoric. The issue, which is a common misconception when it comes to Dzogchen, is that excerpts such as the one above are misinterpreted as referencing our relative condition, when it is doing nothing of the sort. The above quotation isn't negating liberation for the individual in the conventional sense, which is the only sense it is applicable, all it is saying is that wisdom is self perfected from the very beginning, and if wisdom isn't recognized in an authentic way, then there is no authentic connection to the type of insight described above.

Andrew108 said:
You don't really want to get rid of ignorance. It's a natural letting go that is important here. In the end this 'not grasping' is an attitude of being positionless. In Dzogchen, integration isn't about taking up a position with respect to ignorance - integration is being delighted by 'ordinary life'.
Seeing the self as an isolated container is not the way to go. The self is an aspect of life rather than a container of 'mind-life'. That's why there is no individual accomplishment - no heroic transcendence. The idea of reality having no fixed identity is the key point. There is reality in a wider sense of the term. The true nature of that reality is that it has no fixed identity. It's a display of all possibilities of which you are just one possibility in amongst an infinite number of possibilities. Recognition isn't overcoming - rather it's whether or not you see yourself as an equal part of the display (which is a display that contains all possibilities without any bias towards any typical or particular type of display).

krodha wrote:
The 'not-grasping' which results from recognizing dharmatā is not an attitude. An attitude is something the mind adopts in relation to an object, the non-grasping of dharmatā is nothing like that.

Integration is not simply being delighted by 'ordinary life', many people are delighted by ordinary life, that does not mean they are integrating with their nature.

There is individual accomplishment in the conventional sense, the liberation of one individual is not your liberation, and so in that respect there is individual accomplishment. Ultimately is there individual accomplishment? No, since that accomplishment lacks inherency. Either way it has nothing to do with heroic transcendence.

If reality has no fixed identity then there is no reality in the wider sense of the term. That is what emptiness means, no fixed identity, because the entity that said identity could possibly belong to cannot be located when sought.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 1:27 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:
krodha wrote:
Sure the universe, sentient beings and the various other expressions of ignorance may be the play of rtsal, but that doesn't mean they are wisdom display.

alpha shared this quote on here some time ago:
"The essence is like the sun, shining clearly in the expanse of the basic space of phenomena. Everything arises without bias due to its dynamic energy, which is like the sun's rays. They suffuse the earth and bodies of water with warmth, so that a display of clouds arises, formed from water vapor. This obscures the essence itself and even its dynamic energy. Similarly due to the impure display of natural dynamic energy deriving from the essence itself, one's perception of suchness, the heart essence is obscured. The universe of appearances and possibilities consists of an inconceivable range of perceptions based on confusion."
- Longchenpa

The sun simply displays its radiance and heat, and when that heat interacts with water vapor, clouds are formed which then obscure the sun. The sun is still shining all along, however by force of its own innate qualities certain causes and conditions arise which veil it. The clouds aren't a part of the sun, but arise adventitiously as an expression of its dynamism. Likewise dualistic mind and the expressions of avidyā aren't primordial wisdom, but arise adventitiously as a result of primordial wisdom's dynamism.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 12:57 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
I'd like to quote Dudjom Rinpoche again, ibid:

There is no third reality of a truly existing mind or objects juxtaposed to the ultimate reality of the mirror and the relative reality of the images on it.
(formatting mine)

You can mistake a rope for a snake, but the rope--or anything and everything else in the entire universe--is never anything other than "an image on the mirror" of the Basis. That is the entirety of reality, whether recognized or not. (At least that's my understanding of Dzogchen view, YMMV.)

krodha wrote:
Ultimately recognition and non-recognition are the only factors Dzogchen is concerned with. There is no value in the idea that the universe is an abstraction which is truly the wisdom display of the basis unless you actually recognize it as such. Just like any other vehicle in the buddhadharma, Dzogchen is above all a soteriological system, and so the

cessation of ignorance and the end of suffering is the point of the system. That can only be achieved if the basis is recognized, and the path is followed through to the result.

If sentient beings were in recognition of the basis then there would be no reason for the teachings, but the teachings are necessary, and the need for the teachings clearly shows that sentient beings are not apperceiving the appearances of the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 11:27 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
Since this is the Dzogchen forum, it is not improper to mention that those teachings say that everything is a manifestation of the Basis. The analogy that is often used is of the Basis being a mirror and all phenomena being the images in the mirror.

krodha wrote:
The basis only manifests sound, light and rays, which are the appearances of the basis [gzhi snang] as non-arisen display. Everything else arises due to non-recognition of those appearances. In that sense the basis acts as the cause for the various manifestations, such as the universe and so on, however the universe itself is not an appearance of the basis.

As noted by Malcolm in the quote you posted; the aspect of the basis called compassion is the energy of the display of the universe and all its beings. However when you are seeing the universe and sentient beings you are not actually seeing the appearance of the basis correctly, and for that reason one cannot truly say that the universe is an appearance of the basis. The aspect of compassion is the energy which serves as the cause of those manifestations, but the manifestations themselves are the result of delusion. Just like seeing a snake instead of a rope is not an accurate knowledge of the rope.

"In brief, those delusions also are not delusion that exist in the cause and basis, but as one does not understand the actual state of the basis one is stubbornly deluded about one’s appearances. For example when grasping to a seeming appearance that does not exist in the material, a rope appears to be a snake. Like a conch shell appearing yellow, the actual state of the basis has not been understood, and there is fixated delusion about one’s appearances."
-- Khandro Nyinthig [Per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:

Non-recognition is referring to non-recognition of one's nature.

Andrew108 said:
Non-recognition refers to the non-recognition of the nature of phenomena (past, present and future).

krodha wrote:
Yes, non-recognition of the nature of phenomena, though I am not sure what the 'past, present, future part has to do with anything in this context.

Andrew108 said:
There is no separate "one's nature" to recognize in distinction to other things.

krodha wrote:
Initially, there indeed is. The first definitive recognition that occurs in Dzogpa Chenpo is recognizing the nature of mind. That recognition is what overturns delusion and reveals wisdom. The 'nature' of so-called objective phenomena is revealed in its complete and unobscured nature later in the path. Sems nyid reveals the emptiness of the individual, but it does not necessarily reveal the emptiness of phenomena just yet.

Andrew108 said:
Perhaps when you say "one's nature" you actually mean nature of phenomena. This nature of phenomena includes both animate and inanimate. Realizing the nature of both animate and inanimate phenomena is the point. In this way the universe needn't change and we needn't see the universe through any conceptual lens in the hope that our universe will change.

krodha wrote:
Your championing of this alleged 'animate and inanimate' dichotomy is something which undoubtably stems from your misreading and misunderstanding of quotations like the one you referenced above. A misstep which leads you to then further solidify this misunderstanding by introducing your physicalist and scientific theories / rhetoric so that you can validate your reasoning to yourself. You are correct that recognizing the nature of the so called animate and inanimate is the point, but this does not mean that this proposed dichotomy has any validity to it. It is a figment of ignorance, it is the rope mistaken to be a snake. There is no inherent universe to change or not-change, the universe is a misunderstanding.

From the Uprooting Delusion tantra [Per Malcolm]:
"Because of a lack of mindful attention, self and other are grasped as a duality, and both outer and inner dependent origination occur. The whole universe arises through awareness looking externally. All sentient being arise through awareness looking internally. Through looking there, fearful appearances arise, through looking here, ‘self’ arises. Many mistakes arise from the single mistake about the appearances of here and there. Because of being mistaken about a self, there is a mistake about other, attachment to self, aversion to other. From the seed of attachment and aversion, the whole outer universe and inhabitants are mistakes."

Andrew108 said:
The injunction in Dzogchen is natural self liberation, integration. Be life rather than a container for life. Life shines as an extremely precious thing. You see that others, who have life, are equal to you in preciousness - just because of this fact of life. There is no need to take a position in regards to ignorance (however subtle) if such position leads to dismissive arrogance and negativity.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen is natural self liberation because the entire praxis [basis, path, result] from beginning to end is conducted from the standpoint of one's knowledge [vidyā] of uncontrived dharmatā. Your latter statement regarding 'dismissive arrogance' is undoubtably another projection of the shadow on your part, which is nothing new from you. I'm sure it is very hard to see that the entire way you carry yourself on these forums can be succinctly framed by the phrase 'dismissive arrogance'.

Andrew108 said:
As for the rest of your post then I certainly agree and I believe that Malcolm was in error by asserting 'no-reality'. Although it hardly matters. There is no real authority on the issue. It comes down to opinion and experience.

krodha wrote:
There is no error in asserting 'no-reality' in conventional discussion such as this. The error is only when the intellect is taken into the practice, and so the error you see in the statement of 'no-reality' is in no way the same as the error Jigme Lingpa was addressing. As for authority; the only authority to be found is that which we create ourselves, so in that sense you are correct that opinion is a fundamental force behind perceived authority.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 1:37 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Some people see this as being a provisional statement. Basically it doesn't fit for them. Doesn#t fit with their view.

krodha wrote:
Again, Dzogchen ultimately dispenses with the animate-inanimate dichotomy, and so your quote would be a provisional pointer which is intending to reveal how the animate and inanimate (are byproducts of delusion, which) are non-dual [advaya] from the standpoint of one's nature.

"After first being created by the energy [rtsal] of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient

(inanimate) and sentient (animate) both appear, but don’t believe it… As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru’s intimate instructions."
- Khandro Nyingthig [Per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Really?

How about:

"When phenomena, however they manifest, are not understood to be Pure Perfect Presence, there will be no realization through correction and practice."

So really the non-recognition is refering to the wasteful efforts of those who try to overcome ignorance through correction (via views) and practice (contrived meditation).

krodha wrote:
Non-recognition is referring to non-recognition of one's nature. The quote above is conveying that there can be no realization from the standpoint of non-recognition. No matter how much practice and/or correction is made, since it is predicated on delusion, any efforts made within avidyā will not bring one any closer to wisdom. Recognition is first and foremost.

Meditation is not foremost, realization is foremost;
If realization is not entered with confidence,
The meditator is merely meditating on a conceptual state,
The seeker is seeking with an afflicted clinging.
- kun tu bzang po che ba la rang gnas pa

Andrew108 said:
Mejung states:

"It is a total failure to construct a fixed reference point. It is a stupid view which looks for the emptiness of just-that-ness."

You and Malcolm do nothing other than offer fixed reference points and give advice about how to see and understand emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Right, because in recognition of dharmatā it is intimately known that phenomena have been non-arisen from the very beginning. Ergo, attempting to will phenomena to be

empty is functioning through the presupposition that there is something which actually needs to become empty. In such an act, which is executed from the standpoint of mind, all that is accomplished is reification of a subject relating to an object, which means one has constructed a fixed reference point. In the eyes of Atiyoga, the view is stupid because it fails to recognize uncontrived dharmatā, and so the individual attempts to discover dharmatā through contrived effort.

For example; Jigme Lingpa states:
"Here the external forms that are perceived are not designated as empty of self. When emptiness is made an intellectual object, the form and emptiness aspects of the object arise in the intellect. However since the perceived forms have no intrinsic characteristics, those forms should not mix with the intellect. Therefore the statement, 'Emptiness is not other than form, nor form other than emptiness,' should be taken as an axiom"

He also states that from the standpoint of vidya; "appearances are not cut with the razor of emptiness", rather, they are known to have been empty from the very beginning (although the definitive expression of their emptiness may not be ascertained until later in the path. Either way, the meditation of Dzogpa Chenpo is resting in uncontrived dharmatā).

"In the gol shor tshar gcod seng ge'i ngar ro, Jigme Lingpa enumerates four mistaken approaches to emptiness, which he calls the 'four ways of straying [shor sa bzhi].' These are borrowed from the Mahāmudrā tradition, where they are to be found at least as far back as Dagpo Tashi Namgyal (1512-87), who enumerates them in his Legshe Dawai Özer. They are: (i) straying into the condition where emptiness is an object of knowledge, (ii) straying into taking emptiness as the path, (iii) straying into taking emptiness as an antidote, and (iv) straying into taking emptiness as a seal."
- Sam Van Schaik

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Yes and you also have definitive statements within the Dzogchen tantras such as:

"All phenomena of the animate and inanimate universe are manifestations of my nature."

krodha wrote:
That would be a provisional statement, since Dzogchen ultimately dispenses with the animate-inanimate dichotomy, and the universe arises from non-recognition of one's nature i.e. it is an illusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 8th, 2014 at 12:10 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Also the idea of there being an objective condition that beings are born into isn't problematic for Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
On the contrary, Samantabhadra specifically states that viewing one's so called environment as an objective condition shows great immaturity.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 4:38 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
I don't think anyone, at any point on this thread said the relative is all there is. If the ultimate lacks inherency the relative does as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 3:45 PM
Title: Re: The Dalai Lama Says Gay Marriage Is OK
Content:
Nighthawk said:
So gay marriage is alright but homosexual acts are not.... ok?

krodha wrote:
The Dalai Lama didn't say anything against 'homosexual acts'. He merely stated that certain traditions may have guidelines and one should be mindful of that. Apart from that he said as long as both people are safe and the sex is consensual there's no issues.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 10:36 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Bob, regarding the kindergarten view: In the context of the buddhadharma, only when you come to realize there is no solace, peace or purpose to be found in samsara, will your path towards liberation begin. Otherwise you will always think there is meaning to be found in graduating from a projected kindergarten, and you will attempt to find refuge in that without any possibility of it providing shelter. Just as the improvements and acquisitions in a dream cannot deliver lasting peace, the improvements and acquisitions of samsara cannot either. As long as you identify with the possibility of a

greater or more refined experience beyond the pale of this so called kindergarten, you are building sandcastles.

This is why the bhāvacakra is a wheel, why samsara is a cycle, no point is higher or lower than another. Every realm, including the god realms and so on, are delusion and suffering. Buddhahood and liberation are not depicted on the wheel for a reason. You cannot cross a shoreless ocean.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Returning to my trusty copy of "Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two", there seems to be some discussion related to this point. In appendix 3, "The View Expounded in the Guhyagarbha, the Root Tantra of the Mayajala Cycle", taken from the commentary of Yonten Gyamtso, we find the following: It could, however, be objected that since the perceptions of the Noble Ones are their own subjective experience (rang snang), they are not the same thing as the impure appearances that we experience now. The answer to this is that, in general, the “thing” that is observed by all has no reality as an extramental object. 636
Note 636 reads as follows: blta bya thun mong ba. This is a complex issue. The question is: Does there exist an objective, commonly present substrate for the different perceptions of beings, whether in or beyond samsara? To answer in the affirmative implies a belief in the existence of something that is in itself independent of, and unrelated to, perception. But there is no such thing. It is obvious, however, that something must be posited even though nothing exists as such, otherwise there is no subject for discussion. Gyalwa Longchenpa (in his Precious Treasury That Fulfils All Wishes) and Mipham Rinpoche (in his Lamp of Certainty) define this “something" as “mere appearance" (snang tsam, the opposite of nonappearance or absence)— the common undifferentiated basis for the contrasting perceptions of the six classes of beings. Other than mere appearance, there is nothing. [KPS = Khenchen Pema Sherab]
This seems to me to be a kind of idealism. One thing I find confusing is why someone who held this view would think there were other beings?

Edit: now that I reread it I don't think I understand what it means to say that snang tsam is "the common undifferentiated basis for the contrasting perceptions of the six classes of beings".

krodha wrote:
This is just saying for the sake of conventional discourse and communication of these notions, a common 'objective noumenon' ('objective, commonly present substrate', as they put it) is posited so that the idea of the six classes experiencing the same phenomena (a river for example) as various things (as mentioned above; nectar, blood, etc.) can be implemented. However ultimately there is no such thing, since when it comes down to it the varying sentient beings of the six classes, along with their sensory

spheres, sense organs, etc., all lack inherency.

For instance, in the rdzogs pa chen po kun tu bzang po ye shes klong gi rgyud, Vajra Realization asks Samantabhadra:

"Since the sensory spheres that manifest in that way are delusory perception, why does an object, such as a house, manifest to all sentient beings as the same thing?"

Thus spoke Samantabhadra: "In the case of the perceptions of realized beings, delusory perception is never experienced. For nonrealized beings, on the other hand, perception manifests for each of the six families according to their general class. Therefore there are different perceptions for each of the six families; for instance, although there is just one single body of water, it is experienced as nectar by the gods, as embers by the hell-beings, as blood and pus by the hungry ghosts. This is because those who are included in the karmic perceptions and dynamic forms of a particular family are given simultaneously one type of delusory perception, which is merely the coarse way their sensory spheres, senses, and thoughts manifest."

The 'single body of water' is posited conventionally, for the sake of the point being made. This however does not mean there actually is an objective body of water out there which is being interpreted by the senses, because ultimately the senses and so on do not withstand scrutiny (and therefore whatever the senses may be interpreting or translating is equally unfounded, in the ultimate sense).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: A pretty cool religion
Content:
krodha wrote:
Robert Beer discusses the thangka iconography and imagery of rainbows and rainbow body in his book 'The Encyclopedia of Tibetan Symbols and Motifs'.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 1:51 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
bob said:
Would you want to remain in kindergarten perpetually?

krodha wrote:
Kindergarten and graduate school are equal as far as samsara goes. There are no levels or grades, the so called higher realms are just as deluded as the so called lower realms. So it isn't about remaining in kindergarten perpetually, but rather the perpetual cycle of samsara.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 7th, 2014 at 1:43 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
There is. Ask a brain surgeon.

krodha wrote:
The good ol' Mustang Cave physicalist/materialist view.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:54 PM
Title: Re: A pretty cool religion
Content:
smcj said:
So that's a real style? It's not Alex Grey?

krodha wrote:
Yeah that is the traditional depiction of rainbow body in thangka art.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 10:15 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
When Devaputra asked Śākyamuni, "Who made Mt. Meru, the sun and moon?," the Buddha said:

"In answer to that, surely no creator exists other than the karmic potentialities and habitual patterns and conditioning of our thought processes. These define and label appearances, reifying and objectifying them, forming them accordingly. All things are created by our own minds."

Again, Devaputra asked the Buddha, "Our habitual thought patterns and conditioning may inform the nature of appearances, but from whence comes the solidity and density of Mt. Meru, the sun, the moon and so on?" And the Buddha replied:

"In Benares there once lived an old woman who visualized herself as a tiger and transformed her human body into the body of a tiger, and the people of Benares, having set eyes upon her, fled, and the city was deserted. If in a very short time an old woman can effect such a transformation by visualization, is it not indeed probable that appearances have been created in the same way, when the mind has been conditioned by karmic propensities instilled since beginningless time?"

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:15 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here's David Germano on the 'appearances and mind' topic:

"'Designating appearances as the dharmakāya obscures me,
designating whatever appears as mind obscures me,
designating wisdom as mind obscures me'
- The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra

To expand on this, nowadays common fools say, 'Appearances are your own mind! Appearances are the dharmakāya! Wisdom [ye shes] is our mind!' Really there's no difference between such people and the insane who say whatever pops into their mind: 'The head is the ass!' 'Fire is water!' 'Darkness is light!' Thus I consider these people ignorant, since they are even more conceited than such madmen. If appearances are our mind, then it follows that our mind has colors and so forth. It would entail that even when you are absent, your mind would exist in the area where you previously were, since the appearances there continue to exist (despite your leaving). Furthermore, it would entail that through one thing being born, everything is born; and through one thing dying, everything dies. When ten million people see a vase, it would entail that the entire vase is (part and parcel of each person's own particular) mind, and just so, all those individuals would be of a single mind. Since all phenomena appear in the scope of a Buddha's 'enlightened knowing of things in all their plurality', it would entail that cyclic existence is the Buddha's wisdom [ye shes]. When a sentient being sees a Buddha, it would necessarily follow that this Buddha is distorted, since s/he is the sentient being's mind. Additionally it would entail that this sentient being is a Buddha, since the Buddha is the sentient being's mind. This position would also entail that these appearances could become totally adrift in a single instant, just as in a single instant our mind's movements drift here and there. Thus these and many other absurdities are entailed (by identifying appearances with the mind).

If appearances are the dharmakāya, then it would entail that appearances are beyond appearance and non-appearance, since the dharmakāya is beyond appearance and non-appearance. It would follow that the dharmakāya would be a distorted appearance, and that it would be apprehensible in terms of a substantial thing and its concrete qualities, since these appearances are distorted appearances apprehended in terms of substantial qualities. Alternatively, it would follow that it would be impossible for these appearances to appear to (ordinary beings') distorted perspective, since the dharmakāya is the ultimate reality and, as such, can never appear to a distorted perspective."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 3:13 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
'Malcolm said:
While it is clear that Dzogchen definitely posits the basis as a set of generic characteristics that belong to individual minds, it does not posit that appearances are mental factors.

smcj said:
So this is how you're distancing yourself from the Cittamatra?
Malcolm said:
One can experience only one's mind. For this reason Shabkar states in Flight of the Garuda:

Ignorance appearing as the five poisons is also the mind.
Self-originated primordial wisdom appearing as vidyā is also the mind...
There are no appearances at all apart from the mind.

smcj said:
(formatting mine)

Malcolm, I think you're in denial about having succumbed to the Cittamatra view. An intervention may be in order.

krodha wrote:
smcj, the statement usually goes; appearances are not mind, but nor are they separate from mind.

The former statement avoids the cittamatran view, and the latter allows for dependent origination.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
I really don't get #1. How can it not be spontaneously present? Or does that mean something like "automatically realized"?

(And I edited my previous post to be a little more polite. You quoted it before the edit went into effect.)

krodha wrote:
The reasoning I have is: If the basis had characteristics of defects or virtues, spontaneously present from the beginning, this would contradict original purity and

thus be a faulty belief. Practicing the path would not be possible, and even if one practiced the path it would be impossible to be liberated.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 2:00 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
In the sixfold faulty definitions of the basis [gzhi] described in The Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra, your suggestion here is listed as the number two faulty definition of the basis (the belief that the basis is indefinite).

smcj said:
Ok, cough it up. What are the other five for us dilettantes?

krodha wrote:
There are two types of understanding in reference to the basis [gzhi]:

(a) The basis as an object of knowledge held to be absolute.
(b) The basis as original purity [ka dag].

(a) Here is the Basis as an Object of Knowledge held to be Absolute:

It has six aspects (all of which are inaccurate).

(i) The belief that the basis is spontaneously present.
(ii) The belief that the basis is indefinite.
(iii) The belief that it is the definite and determinate foundation.
(iv) The belief that it is totally changeable.
(v) The belief that it can be said to be anything whatsoever.
(vi) The belief that it is multifaceted with various aspects.

These six aspects are faulty beliefs. They are partial and biased and should not be accepted in this context as the true basis. Through them you would have no more than a partial understanding of the natural state.

(b) The basis as original purity [ka dag]:

(vii) Original purity [ka dag] (Held to be the only accurate view).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 1:52 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind

Content:
Andrew108 said:
4. It's inconceivable. Beyond words. Ambiguous. Without fixed identity. Can't be known. This feature of reality has consequences.

If you ever read Camus you can come to a good understanding of the poverty of religious positions and the richness of ambiguity. In any case all you can do is get with life - how life is is how you are.

krodha wrote:
In the sixfold faulty definitions of the basis [gzhi] described in The Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra, your suggestion here is listed as the number two faulty definition of the basis (the belief that the basis is indefinite).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2014 at 1:18 AM
Title: Re: African Americans & people of Color, & Buddhism in the W
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here's a video of Lama Choying Rangdrol discussing Buddhism on Oakland California public access. He brings up Garab Dorje's three words which strike the essence and presents the teaching in a context that relates to the community:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:59 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
All the time you say there is no reality you are dealing in reality. So this 'no-reality' is something you hope for. You also think this makes you smart. This is life negative. But I guess you will twist this to say you are being life positive. Such is the way smart people who are also fantasists never let go. Problem comes when you infect other people with this nonsense. This really is like the story about the Emporer's new clothes.

krodha wrote:
Sound logic. I also hope no one else gets infected.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
@Conrad...Because even though he says there is no reality he still believes in accomplishment. So there is a contradiction. He is saying this 'no reality' has value.

krodha wrote:
That 'no reality' is simply the cessation of ignorance. Liberation is an exhaustion, an unbinding, a release, a collapse, an extinguishing, a cessation etc. which comes from the accurate knowledge of our nature reaching its full measure. The attainment is non-attainment, it is the direct apperception that the very factors the process (of attainment) is predicated upon are thoroughly unreal, and the total purification of the latent residual habituations of delusion which linger in the wake of that recognition. That 'non-attainment' does not negate the attainment though, because that falling away and cessation is itself the liberating insight which brings about release.

In the direct recognition of our nature it is seen that there has never been anything which was bound, nor anything which required liberation. That seeing reveals the unreality of samsara and nirvana, and the definitive and living freedom from samsara [bondage] and nirvana [liberation], is itself liberation.

This is what is meant by samsara and nirvana being nondual [advaya] from the standpoint of dharmakāya.

That being said, it is crucial that these paradoxes are understood correctly, because otherwise the mind can attempt to grasp at these notions... which only results in nihilism. You end up with people who say 'oh there is nothing to do, everything is already perfect and there is nothing to attain nor anyone to attain it'... that is the delusion of the mind, which if identified with (and clung to) will sever any chance of liberation.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
'Freedom from extremes' means that you fail to locate anything which can accord with an extreme. In the mere appearance of X there is no X, nothing that can possibly (i) exist, (ii) not-exist, (iii) both, (iv) or neither. This isn't an assertion of non-existence, because non-existence would require something to have existed in the first place. When we recognize our nature, it is intimately understood that everything has been in a state of perfection, free of arising or cessation, from the very beginning (or since beginninglessness).

It isn't merely a metal position or a state of poisitonlessness like one is withholding assertion or refraining from imputing characteristics onto what appears. It is that within the very appearance itself, there is nothing that appears. You directly perceive that there

has never, ever, been anything 'there'.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:58 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Especially since Dzogchen deals with reality as it is rather than ultimate/relative varients.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen also deals with ultimate and relative variants, as was pointed out earlier in this thread:

Malcolm said:
Your problem is that you want to avoid any discussion of the relative. But Dzogchen tantras are not so shy, and they acknowledge the two truths also, as the String of Pearls states:
The universe and inhabitants have always been empty,
the ultimate endowed with the form of the relative.

krodha wrote:
The only difference is that Dzogchen does not posit 'two truths', but rather the sole truth of vidyā. However for Madhyamaka the two-truth dichotomy is ultimately a pedagogical methodology, the 'two-truths' are valid for its path in relative application, but ultimately neither survive in the end, and the same is true for Dzogchen and its single truth. That doesn't deny the ability of these principles to provide direct experiential liberation, but when it comes down to it there is nothing that reality truly 'is', because reality cannot be found when sought.

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed;
Independent of the conventional no [ultimate] truth can be found."
- Bodhicittavivaraṇa

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
There is reality. That is what we are trying to understand. ''Ultimately there is no reality'' is the same as saying that ultimately there is no information, no energy, no display. Dzogchen doesn't refute reality.

krodha wrote:
Yes it is the same as saying ultimately there is no information, no energy, no display

(though non-arisen display does not cease).

For an example, even though ultimately this dichotomy (of dreaming and waking realities) is also unreal, in a relative sense and for the sake of the discussion; one can compare this principle to the appearance of information, energy and display in a dream. Is the appearance of information, energy and display encountered in a dream truly valid? Upon waking up from sleep, can that information, energy or display be found? No they cannot, and the same can be said for awakening in the context of our nature.

"The object of knowledge in dream is not seen when one awakes. Similarly the world disappears to him who is awakened from the darkness of ignorance. The creation of illusion is nothing but illusion. When everything is compound there is nothing which can be regarded as a real thing. Such is the nature of all things. As the figments of a dream dissolve upon waking, so the confusion of Samsara fades away in enlightenment."
- Mahāyānaviṁśikā

And if you want to attest that the application of this is different when it comes to Dzogpa Chenpo, Longchenpa begs to differ (as posted earlier in this thread):

"The significance of this can be summarized by the essential fact that, regardless of what manifests, even as it does so it has no independent nature:

'Sensory appearances, moreover, arise naturally due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa], and so their nature is described in a purely symbolic way as one of interdependent connection [dependent origination]. Even in the very moment that things seem to arise due to that dynamic energy they do not do so without being subject to extremes or divisions - with no question of whether or not something arises - and even 'dynamic energy' is just a symbolic term, with no finite essence whatsoever. So within the context [dharmatā] that is never subject to transition or change, nothing strays in the slightest from awakened mind.'

Even the statement that things arise as samsara and nirvana due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa] is merely conventional, for in essence nothing has ever existed as anything in the slightest - nothing being distinct in itself as the process of samsara or nirvana arising, or as some 'thing' that arises."
- chos dbyings rin po che'i mdzod ces bya ba'i 'grel pa

...and hence you have statements such as these:

"Everything arose from non-arising; even arising itself never arose."
- Vimalamitra [Per Malcolm]

"From that which involves no arising, everything arises; and in that very arising, there is no arising."
- Guhyagarbha Tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 2:59 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Positing that ultimately there is no reality is a bit strange.

krodha wrote:
When you encounter a reflection of the moon in water, ultimately there is no moon.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 2:50 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
alpha said:
Doesn't this imply that once the budhahood has been achieved there will be a moment of instability at some point or another and the vidya will again fall into ignorance ? Doesnt this actually happen to practitioners all the time ?

krodha wrote:
Mere recognition of vidyā is initially unstable because karmic propensities have not been completely exhausted, buddhahood is not one's mere recognition of vidyā though, buddhahood is the result. Any propensities which have the potential for re-arising on the path are exhausted in buddhahood, and so the result therefore said to be irreversible. Buddhahood is described as a cessation, and what ceases is cause for the further arising and proliferation of delusion regarding the nature of phenomena.

For this reason, nirvana is said to be 'permanent', because due to the exhaustion of cause for the further proliferation of samsara, samsara no longer has any way to arise. However nirvana is also a conventional designation which is only relevant in relation to the delusion of samsara which has been exhausted, and so nirvana is nothing real that exists in itself either. Neither samsara nor nirvana can be found outside of the mind.

As Nāgārjuna states:
"Neither samsara nor nirvana exist;
instead, nirvana is the thorough knowledge of samsara"

Tsele Natsok Rangdrol states:
"You might ask, 'Why wouldn't confusion reoccur as before, after... [liberation has occured]?" This is because no basis [foundation] exists for its re-arising. Samantabhadra's liberation into the ground itself and the yogi liberated through practicing the path are both devoid of any basis [foundation] for reverting back to becoming a cause, just like a person who has recovered from a plague or the fruit of the se tree."

He then states that the se tree is a particular tree which is poisonous to touch, causing

blisters and swelling. However once recovered, one is then immune.

Lopon Tenzin Namdak also explains this principle of immunity:
"Anyone who follows the teachings of the Buddhas will most likely attain results and purify negative karmic causes. Then that person will be like a man who has caught smallpox in the past; he will never catch it again because he is immune. The sickness of Samsara will never come back. And this is the purpose of following the teachings."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
this is why it makes no sense to say the basis is one's unfabricated mind: ultimately there is no "you" or "your mind", you & your mind are appearances of the basis. otherwise you are making your mind the basis of the basis!

krodha wrote:
Ultimately there is no basis either. These are all conventions.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Well, I'm a little confused. From "Treasury of Precious Qualities, Book Two", translator's introduction: In the context of the Great Perfection, thugs rje means, in the words of Yonten Gyamtso, “pure and unadulterated awareness that has not yet stirred from its own true condition or state,” but which has the potential to do so.

krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc Achard has said that thugs rje literally translates to "Lord [rje] of the heart [thugs]".

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 8:04 AM
Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen
Content:
alpha said:
One doesnt need to do shamata that way necessarily.
Doing A's , as Rinpoche mentions so many times with every webcast, leads to shamata in the initial stages and latter on to instant presence.
That is why he repeats this so many times because doing A's generates all the stability one needs.

krodha wrote:
True, he says "you should not think that in this practice there is an inexorable, 'bureaucratic', sequence of progressive stages... according to the Dzogchen teaching, if you see that a certain stage of the practice is not necessary then you can leave it our altogether! If on the contrary you are not succeeding in your practice with ease, then it is indispensable to 'conquer' the state of nepa [wyl. gnas pa, eng. calm state] by practicing fixation as much as possible."

I haven't heard him state that sounding the A is all one needs though. In the text I'm referencing [Introduction to the Practice of Contemplation] he presents the use of sound (sounding the 'A' and so on) as a supplementary tactic for coordinating fixation. I could see Song of Vajra being a sufficient practice for inducing the calm state, since it has some considerable length to it, but in only sounding the A alone one would have to do a considerable amount of A's. Whatever works for the individual is good though, we're all different.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
And according to Ontrul Tenpa'i Wangchuk [Per Lama Tony]: "The Adzom Drukpa camp puts the disciples to work on this [śamatha, etc.] for a period of four to five years. And Guru Mipham said:

'This is it! It might be causal ālaya, nevertheless, if you do not do it this way, authentic wisdom will not be born in your mindstream.'

Meaning that this is the method for placement of the mind! This method must be used and then, because of it, wisdom that is the result of the method can be realized."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 4th, 2014 at 6:57 AM
Title: Re: Dhyana (samten) in Vajrayana, especially Dzogchen
Content:
Clarence said:
runs counter to what CNN says in all his webcasts?

krodha wrote:
Chögyal Namkhai Norbu says that śamatha [zhi gnas] is a vital preliminary that cannot be bypassed. Stating that the achievement of 'stable śamatha' (which eventually leads to 'released śamatha') is an indispensable aspect of Dzogchen practice, he says, "Here, this is the realization called stable shine. It is very important to achieve this state of stable shine, and you have to practice in order to attain it."

According to Rinpoche there is a natural progression of śamatha with the aim of attaining "the state of shine, that subsequently must become stable shine", and he advises practice which begins with fixation on an object, and then moves onto fixation without an object when the time is right.

Norbu Rinpoche states that in the beginning our śamatha is fabricated, but in time (when the state of śamatha is attained) śamatha becomes 'natural śamatha', however even 'natural śamatha' is an intermediate level. In order to progress from the intermediate levels of śamatha and achieve stable śamatha, practice has to be developed with gradual integration of movement, almost like training the three doors which occurs in the context of the natural state.

When stable śamatha is eventually achieved, the final step in śamatha is 'released śamatha', and Norbu Rinpoche states "When you have achieved released shine and remain in the continuation of this state, you have finally become a Dzogchen practitioner."

He also describes four main defects of practice which must be remedied when necessary: (i) torpor [bying ba], (ii) obfuscation [rmugs pa], (iii) agitation [rgod pa], (iv) dispersion [thor ba]. Urging that for senior practitioners it is of utmost importance to be vigilant regarding the fourth 'thor ba'.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The basis is only valid conventionally if you hold to a view of the base. Any view you have about the base is conceptual and it is only through the use of concepts that we believe we might 'know' what the basis is and that it is valid conventionally . However, as is stated in Kunjed Gyalpo:

"Views create the base for seeing the real condition. Views are methods to experience (meaning). But, because there is no object to be conceived as the unborn (essence), when practitioners look, there is nothing to be seen in just-thatness."

Taking a scholarly view and trying to work out what the basis is, leads to adopting a position. Adopting a position, by for example asserting that the basis is one's unfabricated mind, doesn't really lead to anything other than holding to a dogma.

The strange thing about dharmakaya is that really it can't be pointed out. That ambiguity of not finding and of not being able to hold on to dharmakaya is significant. It is a very useful ambiguity. In the case of Dzogchen, ambiguity and wisdom are not that different.

Wisdom here in Dzogchen, does not mean you are able to descriminate objects and see

clearly a well-defined position. The idea of wisdom as being powerful knowledge is a myth here. 'Dzogchen Wisdom', where you embrace ambiguity, is just the fact of life itself. So wisdom has no goal. It just the display. You don't need to have wisdom/enlightenment in order to see how things really are. So you don't need to find mind or establish a basis.

Giving up the need to know is part of the way focused meditation works in Dzogchen. Dzogchen is about letting go of dogma, of self-libertaing positions, of not holding to a position that delineates itself from other philosophical positions, even awareness has no when or where. There is a need to give up Dzogchen as well - or give up the kind of cowardly Dzogchen that is used to sepearate you from others based on how refined your view is.

krodha wrote:
No Andrew, it's only valid conventionally because it is empty, but glad to see you're still spouting the same rhetoric you left the other forum with.

In your attempt to critique my point you make it for me. Even supplying a quote to show how the basis is conventional.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 3:30 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
Personally I prefer terms like authentic, valid, true, and such over "exists". "Exists" suggests something manifest, and therefore conditioned phenomena. Obviously the Base is not conditioned phenomena.

krodha wrote:
The basis is valid conventionally, sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 2:46 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
smcj said:
So therefore if ChNN disagrees with those that assert that "the Base as conceived in Dzogchen does not exist", he is asserting that the Base as conceived in Dzogchen does exist, right?

krodha wrote:
The basis is ka dag and therefore free of extremes. The extremes that conditioned phenomena adhere to, such as existence and non-existence, arise due to ignorance of the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 2nd, 2014 at 10:28 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Malcolm said:
The general basis (spyi gzhi, not gzhi gzhi) is just a set of characteristics...

krodha wrote:
So 'gshis' and 'gzhi' are just alternate phonetic renderings of the same Tibetan term [གཞི]?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 5:06 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Capriles states that the gshis in reference to the basis [gzhi] is pointing to the ngo bo [essence] of the basis. He states that in Kagyu terminology the meaning of gshis is loosely the same as the meaning of ngo bo in the teachings of the Nyingmapa. For this reason 'gshis' ends up being paired with 'ngo bo' to elucidate this notion 'ngo bo gshis', and this term is used to reference the ngo bo aspect [essence] of the basis shining forth, which is the first level of realization associated with the gdangs mode of manifestation of energy, correlating to the (non-arising of the) inner dbyings [inner subjective dimension and reference point] and the dharmakāya.

So gshis gzhi is apparently referencing the true condition of the essence of the basis, which once ascertained reveals self originated primordial wisdom [rang byung ye shes].

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:56 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
"neutral noetic capacity in the basis". its amazing that everyone just lets that slip by, like its just plain ol' Buddhism.

krodha wrote:
For the most part it just seems like a proposed solution to the issue of reconciling how the noetic capacity which either expresses itself as wisdom or deluded consciousness initially forms.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:09 PM

Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
so who fails to recognize the basis?

krodha wrote:
The neutral noetic capacity [shes pa lung ma bstan] in the basis. This is of course simply regurgitating what has been covered in past conversations between you and Malcolm on this matter.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 1:50 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
ok then, sentient beings proceedeth from the basis.

krodha wrote:
Only sound, light and rays proceedeth from the basis. Sentient beings proceedeth from non-recognition of the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 12:28 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
kind of, except it could be said that all there is is sentience and the so-called "external universe" is just projections of sentience (that is, sentient beings, who are themselves "projections" of the basis, as it were)

krodha wrote:
The outer and inner dbyings arise when the thugs rje isn't recognized as self-display, causing the rtsal to be reified as conditioned phenomenal existents.

I wouldn't say wisdom and 'sentience' are synonymous in any way. Also, the basis doesn't project anything, 'projections' occur via sems.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 11:55 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
If alpha is referring to what I think he is, ChNNR says there that "gshis gzhi" has the same meaning as "dharmadhatu", and he describes it as "the basis of everything". His

point, in contrasting it with the gzhi, is that the gzhi is the state or condition of an individual, as opposed to the gshis gzhi.

krodha wrote:
I had always been under the impression that the so called external universe [outer dbyings] (which would constitute everything other than the individual) in its fundamental nature, is the rtsal of the gzhi.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 10:51 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
alpha said:
That is the model CNNr has explained more than three decades ago in a talk where he clearly differentiates two kinds of basis.He calls it "gshis gzhi" and he says that if one finds himself in the condition of "gshis gzhi" , one goes beyond time and becomes one with everything where he integrates with the entire field of phenomena.Rinpoche also makes a parallel and speaks of similarities between this state -gshis gzhi-and the state of the hindus when they talk about being one with Brahma.

krodha wrote:
Thanks! I take it this may be the same thing, or similar: Rangjung Yeshe Wiki has 'ye gzhi'i gshis' (condition of the primordial basis).

http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/ye_gzhi%27i_gshis

The dichotomy is interesting though. So the gshis gzhi correlates to the outer dbyings, and the gzhi to the inner dbyings?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 8:35 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:

alpha said:
There are two kinds of basis.
One is universal and is the state of all things, all phenomena, beings, trees, rocks. mountains, this universe that universe and the basis of the individual which refers to a specific condition.

krodha wrote:
Is this a reference to the dual basis model? Basis [gzhi] and all-basis [kun gzhi]?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 6:57 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
the basis is the basis of all phenomena of samsara and nirvana, including sentient beings and their minds. A mirror is the basis for all reflections, but it is not contained in the reflections. You said "The basis is a generic set of qualities, essence, nature and compassion, that all minds possess.". This is like saying "The mirror is a generic set of qualities that all reflections possess." This makes no sense.

krodha wrote:
It would be more like saying "The capacity to reflect is a generic quality that all mirrors posses", or "The capacity to reflect is a generic quality which is naturally implied where reflections are present." Where you find a capacity to reflect, you find reflections. Where you find water, you find wetness. Where you find fire, you find heat. Where you find a mind, you find a latent and discoverable nature.

Granted this is a somewhat off topic, but insisting on taking the metaphor of the mirror literally (and implementing the notion of the mirror itself) lends to the idea that there is a 'something' (no matter how subtle or allegedly inconceivable) that the basis is. So running with that logic, naturally the line of reasoning goes that the mirror would be the basis for reflections yet would not be contained in the reflections themselves, so you set yourself up with this 'something other' which is a source, much like in Vedanta.

Personally I don't think that the metaphor is meant to be used in quite that way, and not every teacher implements the mirror-metaphor in that manner. Chögyal Namkhai Norbu for example (in referencing the mirror-metaphor), implements the notion of the mirror's innate capacity or potentiality to reflect (rather than the mirror itself), and seeks to convey how the reflections are not found apart from that capacity, and not at all where that capacity is absent. In this way the mirror itself is an extraneous aspect of the metaphor and it isn't necessary to explore the mirror itself, or the literal implications of reflections requiring a reflective surface or substance, that is going too far in my opinion. The main point is that capacity to reflect. A mirror, or a body of water have that capacity, and where that capacity is present you find reflection. That capacity is nothing in itself though, and is only ever known through the display of the reflections themselves.

"Our primordial potentiality is beyond form, but we have a symbol, and when we have a symbol then we can get in that knowledge. It is very easy to understand with an example. If you want to discover the potentiality of a mirror, how can you go about it? You can neither see or touch the nature or potentiality of a mirror, nor can you have contact with it in any ordinary way, the only way is to look in a mirror, and then the reflections will appear and through the reflections you can discover it. The reflections are not really the potentiality of the mirror but they are manifesting through that potentiality, so they are something visible for us. With this example we can get in the knowledge of the potentiality of the mirror..."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

"Why then do we have this symbol of primordial potentiality? Primordial potentiality in the Dzogchen teaching is explained with three principles: sound, light and rays. This does not mean that sound, light and rays are manifestations, but rather that these are the root of all manifestations. When you have this potentiality then there is always the possibility of manifestations. If we wonder, for example what the potentiality of a mirror looks like, we couldn't say very much, we could say for example that it is clear, pure, limpid and so forth, but we could not really have contact with it directly through our senses. In the same way sound, light and rays are the essence of potentiality. When we have this potentiality, if secondary causes arise, then anything can manifest.
What do we mean by secondary causes? For example, if in front of a mirror there is tree, or a flower or a person, the object instantly manifests. These are secondary causes. So if there is no secondary cause there is no manifestation. Thus in front of our primordial potentiality there are all the possibilities of manifestation of the secondary causes..."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Something I wrote some time ago on here:
...The mirror-analogy is commonly used in attempting to describe the 'nature of mind' and there is a common misconception which tends to arise from this analogy because the implementation of a mirror seems to convey a substantiated background (or unchanging source). I was attempting to point out that the analogy isn't meant to explore the mirror in itself as an unchanging basis, but solely the mirror's capacity to reflect. So the capacity is the aspect the analogy is exploring. Equating the nature of mind to the mirror's reflective capacity (but not the mirror itself). That the reflections are inseparable from that capacity, just like AEN elucidated with the fire-to-heat and water-to-wetness examples. That capacity isn't a conceivable quality, it isn't something which can be 'known' as a substantiated suchness. The capacity (to reflect) cannot be rolled, thrown or bounced, it has no shape, color, location, weight or height. There is nothing there one can point to and declare 'there it is!'. Yet in it's elusiveness it is still fully apparent in the presence of the reflections themselves. The capacity is evident because of the reflections and the reflections are evident because of the capacity, in truth they co-emergent and mutually interdependent qualities which are completely inseparable. Evident, clear and pure, yet unestablished, ungraspable and ephemeral.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
("creative power" = "rtsal")
I find the phrase "there is no question of its not arising" kind of intriguing. It doesn't seem to explain much.

krodha wrote:
Relevant excerpt from Longchenpa's chos dbyings rin po che'i mdzod ces bya ba'i 'grel pa (found on page 72 of Barron's 'A Treasure Trove of Scriptural Transmission'):

"The significance of this can be summarized by the essential fact that, regardless of what manifests, even as it does so it has no independent nature:

'Sensory appearances, moreover, arise naturally due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa], and so their nature is described in a purely symbolic way as one of interdependent connection [dependent origination]. Even in the very moment that things seem to arise due to that dynamic energy they do not do so without being subject to extremes or divisions - with no question of whether or not something arises - and even 'dynamic energy' is just a symbolic term, with no finite essence whatsoever. So within the context [dharmatā] that is never subject to transition or change, nothing strays in the slightest from awakened mind.'

Even the statement that things arise as samsara and nirvana due to the dynamic energy [rtsal] of awareness [rig pa] is merely conventional, for in essence nothing has ever existed as anything in the slightest - nothing being distinct in itself as the process of samsara or nirvana arising, or as some 'thing' that arises."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
"The mind that observes is also devoid of an ego or self-entity.
It is neither seen as something different from the aggregates
Nor as identical with these five aggregates.
If the first were true, there would exist some other substance.

This is not the case, so were the second true,
That would contradict a permanent self, since the aggregates are impermanent.
Therefore, based on the five aggregates,
The self is a mere imputation based on the power of the ego-clinging.

As to that which imputes, the past thought has vanished and is nonexistent.
The future thought has not occurred, and the present thought does not withstand scrutiny."
- Padmasambhava

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 1st, 2014 at 1:32 AM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
The 'basis' is a basis because (i) it is yet to be recognized, and (ii) it is the basis for the paths of delusion and liberation. Once the basis is recognized it is no longer the basis, it

becomes the path (of liberation), and when the path reaches its culmination it is then the result. Buddhas don't have a basis, they have the highest wisdom (which is simply what one would term 'the basis' in its fully unobscured expression, yet that wisdom is also an abstraction when it comes down to it).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 28th, 2014 at 2:55 PM
Title: Re: The basis is one's unfabricated mind
Content:
Sherlock said:
The view that Malcolm described, if his translations are accurate, resolves this problem: the basis is not a universal nature underlying all phenomena like in Samkhya. Maybe there is some way to resolve 'the universe arising out of the basis' idea with the basis being one's unfabricated mind, I don't know but I would find that interesting, but at least for now, it is enough for me that it distinguishes the Dzogchen view from Samkhya.

krodha wrote:
The universe arises out of the basis because it results from the non-recognition of the basis. The noetic capacity which recognizes or does-not-recognize, and the aspect of compassion which is or isn't recognized (to be self-appearance), are also aspects of the basis.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 3:14 PM
Title: Re: Why all the confusion ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Atanavat, do you live in an area where it is easy to find a teacher? I feel that would be beneficial for you. You're pursuing some tangential lines of reasoning which are predicated on misconceptions. Granted you are doing so to gain some clarification which is good, and hopefully you'll get some clarification on this thread, but a teacher would be able to answer these questions... might be something to consider.

Your contention that a lot of Buddhism doesn't make sense and is self-contradictory means you aren't understanding Buddhism correctly.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 1:30 PM
Title: Re: Bay Area Buddhist Question on how to release live animal
Content:
catlady2112 said:
I live in the San Francisco Bay area and I want to do that practice where you buy live animals and release them. Unfortunately it is dangerous to buy certain animals and release them in the wrong environment (like putting non-saltwater fish in the salty bay)

because you will cause their death. What are some safe animals/critters to buy in the bay area? And where can you release them in an environment where they have a chance to survive?

krodha wrote:
I'm from the bay area as well. Perhaps you can look into the local fisheries; crab, lobster, oyster and so on (depending on the season). I'm sure you would be able to purchase them from the fishery and find a safe place to release them, preferably somewhere far from where they are usually caught but still in a suitable habitat.

Either that, or maybe research the local fish which are caught in the area.

Be sure to give them the A' A HA SHA SA MA and dedicate the merit!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 27th, 2014 at 10:34 AM
Title: Re: Difference between consciousness and the mind
Content:
krodha wrote:
Mind and consciousness (as terms in themselves) may have subtle nuances associated with their respective definitions, but for the most part they are generally held to be synonymous.

An example being this statement from Nāgārjuna in his Bodhicittavivaraṇa:

For those who propound consciousness [only]
This manifold world is established as mind [only]

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 22nd, 2014 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.
Content:
krodha wrote:
Attachment and aversion are the binding factors. Badges and labels are just useful conventions.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 9:05 AM
Title: Re: Experience/sense fields/non-duality- Practice noticing T
Content:
krodha wrote:
Thomas, you may find the topics in this link relevant and informative...

Substantial and insubstantial nonduality:

https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2011/08/substantial-and-insubstantial-non.html?m=1

Mahāmudra, Dzogchen and the buddhadharma in general fall under the latter (insubstantial). Traditions such as Advaita Vedanta and the like usually fall under the former (substantial).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 12:35 AM
Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.
Content:
krodha wrote:
"The teachings must become a living knowledge in all one's daily activities. This is the essence of the practice, and besides that there is nothing in particular to be done. A monk, without giving up his vows, can perfectly well practice Dzogchen, as can a Catholic priest, a clerk, a workman, and so on, without having to abandon their role in society, because Dzogchen does not change people from the outside. Rather it awakens them internally. The only thing a Dzogchen master will ask is that one observes oneself, to gain the awareness needed to apply the teachings in everyday life."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 21st, 2014 at 12:29 AM
Title: Re: I am no longer a Buddhist.
Content:
philji said:
Wear your badge with pride
" I am a Buddhist"
Or " I am not a Buddhist"
Both are badges.

dzogchungpa said:
How about this one:

?

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 3:49 AM
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless
Content:
smcj said:
The Kagyu approach to Dharma can best be likened to the Nike Shoe slogan; Just Do It.

krodha wrote:
They're ten steps ahead of you!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 19th, 2014 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?
Content:
Rakshasa said:
In one experience, she woke up paralyzed suddenly one morning and saw an old lady sitting on her bosom and speaking in some ancient dialect in a straight face (which freaked her out, but she couldn't move). She called her mom, and her mom and some of the sisters confirmed that some of them have experienced the same thing some time in life (they live in different cities). It apparently had to do with an ancestor who faced great injustice, which I am not completely aware of, and wouldn't really like to go there.

krodha wrote:
It's called 'old hag syndrome', which is a common theme found in episodes of sleep paralysis spanning every culture for most of recorded history. Very interesting that everyone sees the old hag, and it is said that the hag is sometimes accompanied by a dark presence which stands and watches in the background. I've never experienced it myself but it sounds like quite the unnerving event to go though... good dharma practice!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless
Content:
pensum said:
Your definition of wisdom (ye shes), which i have highlighted above, does not appear (to me anyway) to concur with Tulku Urgyen's own, for he stated that "it is an original (ye) wakefulness (shes pa) that is not dependent upon an object." He also stated that rig pa and rang byung ye shes are often synonymous: " Rang byung ye shes is also called rig pa." Though of course it is always important to keep in mind that the specific definition of rig pa varies depending upon the context.

krodha wrote:
Right, it is a shes pa that does not depend upon objects, because it knows the non-arising nature [dharmatā] of so-called objects [dharmins]. Therefore it does not arise concomitantly with objects. Shes pa which arises concomitantly with an object is

fabricated by definition since it takes on the guise of being a fixed reference point existing in relation to objects.

The kun byed rgyal po states:
"Self-originated wisdom [rang byung ye shes] is the primordial nature of vidyā [rig pa]; wisdom that realizes an object, because it arises from that object, is not self-originated."

Also as Malcolm has pointed out; that wisdom arises from oneself, it is one's own wisdom, that is the other aspect of its meaning.

Rig pa is only equivalent to rang byung ye shes if it is knowledge of one's nature. Rig pa can also represent one's mere clarity of mind which is associated with the vijñāna skandha. Though rigpa as mere clarity is a provisional and deluded expression which is by no means definitive like rang byung rig pa. So yes context is vital.

At any rate, here is the definition of wisdom from the rig pa rang shar per Malcolm:
"If one knows [shes] the buddhahood that has always been [ye] naturally formed by nature,
there will be buddhahood of clear realization.
That is the definition of wisdom [ye shes]."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 7:13 AM
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
This is what it gets down to. This basic awareness that comes before any elaborate cognitions, "selfs", identities.
It is not an entity, but it is what defines all living organisms, sentient beings, buddhas.
it is what senses, even without sense organs, other objects.
If you think that organisms without sense organs cannot be aware of objects
then look at the body's immune system.

Individual beings are developments from it
and because of the endless variety of conditions
it manifests differently as the composite arising of thoughts, of beings.
That's why I say that ultimately, everything is either a manifestation of(this basic) awareness,
or an object of awareness.

What are the Sanskrit / Tibetan words for this basis?
"Yeshe" (ye shes)?

krodha wrote:
The 'awareness' as 'what senses' that abides prior to, during, and after various

cognitions correlates to the 'neutral indeterminate awareness' [shes pa] mentioned earlier in this thread. Although for most sentient beings that shes pa is so wrapped up in deluded cognition and imputation that it is essentially mind [sems] and consciousness [rnam shes], because it has become compromised through fixation on those afflictive processes. The knowing aspect is rig pa, however since it has become associated with deluded cognitions and does not know its state it is ignorance [ma rig pa].

Wisdom [ye shes] is what that neutral shes pa becomes while in recognition of one's nature. The sanskrit etymology makes this quite clear in that wisdom [jñāna] and afflicted consciousness [vijñāna] are opposites of each other (shown by the presence or absence of the prefix 'vi'). Not because they truly are different capacities, but because the former; jñāna [ye shes] is the manner in which that indeterminate awareness [skt. jñatā, tib. shes pa] expresses itself when it knows its nature, and the latter; vijñāna [rnam shes] is the way that same indeterminate awareness [skt. jñatā, tib. shes pa] is expressed when it is ignorant of its nature. The factor that makes the difference is the knowledge [skt. vidyā, tib. rig pa], or ignorance [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa] of one's nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 18th, 2014 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here are the sixfold faulty definitions of the basis [gzhi] from The Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra in case anyone is interested. Compiled from David Germano's and Tsele Natsok Rangdrol's translations of this section:

There are two types of understanding in reference to the basis [gzhi]:

(a) The basis as an object of knowledge held to be absolute.
(b) The basis as original purity [ka dag].

(a) The Basis as an Object of Knowledge held to be Absolute:

It has six aspects (all of which are inaccurate).

(i) The belief that the basis is spontaneously present.
(ii) The belief that the basis is indefinite.
(iii) The belief that it is the definite and determinate foundation.
(iv) The belief that it is totally changeable.
(v) The belief that it can be said to be anything whatsoever.
(vi) The belief that it is multifaceted with various aspects.

These six aspects are faulty beliefs. They are partial and biased and should not be accepted in this context as the true basis. Through them you would have no more than a partial understanding of the natural state.

The following is the seventh understanding of the basis which is held to be the single accurate view.

(b) The basis as original purity [ka dag]:

(vii) Original purity [ka dag].

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 1:45 AM
Title: Re: Make Life Meaningless
Content:
conebeckham said:
Actually, I don't know that Malcolm's most recent postings are "CNNR" approved, so to speak.

smcj said:
There was another thread where Malcolm quoted ChNN as saying Dzogchen was best understood from the Prasangika perspective and definitely not the Shentong. (Seeing the "basis" as an undifferentiated reality would be taking a Shentong perspective I believe.) I take Malcolm at his word.

krodha wrote:
"That view established intellectually we need to establish consciously in dependence upon one’s capacity of knowledge and on convention. The way of establishing that is the system of Prasanga Madhyamaka commented upon by the great being Nāgārjuna and his followers. There is no system of view better than that."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

"...Madhyamaka explains with the four 'beyond concepts,' which are that something neither exists, nor does not exist, nor both exists and does not exist, nor is beyond both existing and not existing together. These are the four possibilities. What remains? Nothing. Although we are working only in an intellectual way, this can be considered the ultimate conclusion in Madhyamaka. As an analytical method, this is also correct for Dzogchen. Nagarjuna's reasoning is supreme."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 17th, 2014 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?
Content:
kirtu said:
I hesitate to mention this, and I don't know if it is a bhuta, but I knew a boy (he was 14 at the time) in Hawaii who created a presence for protection from his family, esp. from a step-parent. He did this based on concentration and invocation of spirits (so sorcery of sorts). The kids in the family felt the presence and on at least two occasions so did the

step-parent. This presence stayed until they moved.

Kirt

krodha wrote:
Sounds more like tulpa phenomena, but definitely in that same genre, and just as interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 4:51 PM
Title: Re: is there a teacher in the house? or at least some advice
Content:
rubix said:
Don't need a teacher the visions are done.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 16th, 2014 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?
Content:
krodha wrote:
What causes bhūtas to be tied to a certain location? I've lived quite a few places in the bay area where I grew up, and a couple years ago I did some frequent moving due to different circumstances, but I remember distinctly that there was an uncomfortable and almost ominous presence at one place I was living, and then the next place I moved was just fine. Then after moving yet again, the next location was (once again) very heavy and uncomfortable, to the point that I actually moved apartments in the same building because of it (and the next apartment - within the same building - wasn't all that much better), but then after moving away from there, the next place was great with a wonderful atmosphere.

For awhile I was attempting to reconcile the fact that these entities were my own projections, however that didn't seem to be the case, especially if the atmosphere was changing (from uncomfortable to wonderful) every time I moved.

I remember the one location (that was so bad that I had to change apartments in the same building), was so intense that the janitor said he didn't even like to go in there to do maintenance, and if he did he said he would not spend more than five minutes in there. It truly was horrid.

So I suppose the bhūtas were tied to those specific locations? How does this occur?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 5:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy

Content:
krodha wrote:
I like this central theme you have going on lately dzogchungpa, more and more sense being made every day

dzogchungpa said:
Yeah, you air types are always a bit wacky.

Malcolm said:
I have virgo rising, keeps my feet on the ground.

dzogchungpa said:
Now it all makes sense.
So what's up with all the cig car rhetoric?

Malcolm said:
It's rhetorical.

dzogchungpa said:
OK, now it all makes sense.
Thanks for the "clarification", "Malcolm".

Malcolm said:
I thought you understood that Kyle was my emanation...

dzogchungpa said:
A Nirmalcolmkaya! Now it all makes sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:19 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I went with the english translation for added effect.

heart said:
So you know how to spell in Swedish then? Perhaps you are a Dane?

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Ha I wish I could spell in Swedish, you told me a long time ago that it translates to Tigershield!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
heart said:
Like I said, rigpa doesn't last. That is the meaning of "not ripened" and so on.

/magnus

asunthatneversets said:
Seems we are in agreement then, Sir Tigershield.

heart said:
The spelling is a bit off but I of course feels honored by your interest in my persona.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
I went with the english translation for added effect.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
monktastic said:
(1) Recognize baby / unripened / conceptual rigpa (a partial but sufficient recognition of the nature of the mind)
(2) Practice trekcho and successively release grasping
(3) Recognize rangjung rigpa with certainty (realization)
(4) Stabilize it

Teachers seem to vary in whether and how often they admit this distinction between "baby" and "rangjung" rigpa, and even me saying it here may be harmful. On the other hand, many students may be helped by understanding this (and my teacher agrees that it makes sense to share).

krodha wrote:
Yes, this is true in what I see as well. The mere clarity of mind is also given the name 'rigpa', because it truly is rigpa in essence. However it does not know wisdom, and so it is simply the cognizance [of mind] which is the mere 'noticing' of the stillness and movement of conditioned relative mind. It is a sufficient foundation for Dzogchen practice, but it shouldn't be mistaken as the definitive rigpa of the path [rang byung rig pa] which knows its state. The definitive discernment is not present in the mere clarity of mind. Not until the nature of mind [sems nyid] is recognized.

Both Tsoknyi Rinpoche and his father Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche point this difference out:

"This early stage of knowing or noticing whether there is stillness [of mind] or thought occurrence is also called rigpa. However, it is not the same meaning of rigpa as the Dzogchen sense of self-existing awareness [rang byung rig pa].
Great masters traditionally give something called pointing-out instruction, which literally means bringing one face to face with one's true nature. What is this nature that is being introduced? A practitioner of shamatha who has cultivated a sense of stillness to the extent that there is no longer any dividing point between thought occurrence and simply resting experiences a certain quality of knowing or presence of mind. This knowing is what the practitioner is brought face to face with - or rather, the very identity of this knowing as being rootless and groundless, insubstantial. By recognizing this, one is introduced to self-existing awareness, rangjung rigpa."
- Tsoknyi Rinpoche

"In the case of stillness, occurrence and noticing, the word rigpa is used for noticing. Self-existing awareness is also called rigpa. The word is the same but the meaning is different. The difference between these two practices is as vast as the distance between sky and earth."
- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 14th, 2014 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
heart said:
The point he seems to be doing is that ignorant sentient beings are actually full blown Buddha's, vidya in this sense is probably better translated as cognizance as Erik used to do. He isn't really making the point that vidya needs a gradual improvement as some seems to think.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
The point is that vidyā, while in essence is undefiled, can become associated with the contamination of non-recognition, karmic traces and habitual tendencies which cause it to become confused, and when that occurs vidyā becomes one's mere clarity [cognizance] of mind.

"General delusion [avidyā] is caused by the stain of vidyā [rig pa] not recognizing the manifest basis, through which vidyā itself becomes polluted with delusion. Though vidyā itself is without the stains of cognition, it becomes endowed with stains, and through its becoming enveloped in the seal of mind, the vidyā of the ever pure essence is polluted by conceptualization. Chained by the sixfold manas, it is covered with the net of the body of partless atoms, and the luminosity becomes latent."
- Longchenpa

It is true that these afflictive traces are empty from the very beginning, however that doesn't mean we are innately in recognition of this, and even after recognition of wisdom has occurred, traces still continue to surface. This is why the nature of mind is not equivalent to primordial wisdom, because the nature of mind is endowed with traces which must be exhausted through familiarization with the view.

The 'gradual improvement' or refinement of vidyā is the entire path of Dzogchen. Beginning with the ignorance [avidyā] of a sentient being where vidyā appears as the mere indeterminate clarity of mind, one then seeks to recognize the nature of mind. Once recognition of the mind's nature has occurred avidyā is then overturned, but karma is still arising incessantly and habitually. It is true that while resting in the view, those karmic propensities arise as wisdom, but in the beginning the individual will eventually succumb to those propensities, distraction will ensue and the view will be temporarily lost (just as you said, this is the point where rigpa doesn't last). As a result of this oscillation between distraction and vidyā, practice is divided between meditation (effortless resting in the natural state) and post-meditation (everyday relative experience). Meditation and post-meditation are not fully intermingled until the path of no more learning, which is essentially buddhahood.

Dharmakāya (as unobscured buddha mind) only becomes fully evident once obscurations and traces are cleared. The less one's knowledge of wisdom is obstructed, the more 'refined' one's vidyā becomes:

From the Necklace of Precious Pearls Tantra:
"The dharmakāya is the exhaustion of contamination."

and

"When divested of this mind, one is expansively awakened into buddhahood."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
Malcolm said:
No, that is not the meaning of "unripened", the meaning of unripened, as clearly explained in the VIma Nyingthig, is that vidyā is defined as an awareness that defiled by many cognitions. In this case there is really no difference between what is termed the clarity aspect of the mind and vidyā.

krodha wrote:
So these first two of Vimalamitra's five definitions are essentially synonymous?

The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: “the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names”, is one’s mere non-conceptual self-knowing

awareness defiled by many cognitions.

The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis [i.e. the human body] creates all cognitions when present in one's body, and is present as the mere intrinsic clarity [of those cognitions] is called "unripened vidyā".

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 2:02 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
heart said:
Like I said, rigpa doesn't last. That is the meaning of "not ripened" and so on.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Seems we are in agreement then, Sir Tigershield.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
krodha wrote:
From Dudjom Rinpoche:
"Similarly: first, the rigpa [vidyā] of having had the introduction is like the first part of the early dawn; in the middle, the rigpa of having gained assurance, free from equipoise and post-attainment is like the daybreak; and finally the rigpa of having gained liberation from extremes is like the sun shining."

And Mipham Rinpoche states:
"The training of rigpa comes in three steps: recognition, training and finalization."

Dudjom Lingpa:
"Having simply identified vidyā, some people, who lack even a trace of any meditation, claim they have experienced the extinction into dharmatā and there is nothing more to spiritual awakening than this. That is an enormous mistake! The qualities of realization mature through the power of gradual practice. This is how you must reach the state of liberation."

And wrote this some time ago:
...to unpack the way rigpa relates to conditioning further:

The knowing capacity of mind i.e. clarity is the most coarse form of rig pa [skt. vidyā]. Chögyal Namkhai Norbu calls it 'rigpa mistaken as illusory mind'. He also refers to it by the name Vimalamitra gave it, which is 'the vidyā that apprehends characteristics'...

Defined by Vimalamitra here:
"The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: 'the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names', is one's mere non-conceptual self-knowing awareness defiled by many cognitions." [Per Malcolm]

It is 'rigpa' because it is the same capacity which is refined with insight, but that coarse form of rigpa is simply the mere knowing of mind. Knowing which is associated with dualistic perception is a defiled cognition. As opposed to knowing associated with the kāyas, which is the rigpa which serves as the basis, path and result in Dzogchen.

Until the clarity of mind is recognized as non-arisen, via recognition of the nature of mind [tib. sems nyid, skt. cittatā] the discerning vidyā of the path is not present. Once the nature of mind is directly ascertained, primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes] also becomes evident, and the discerning knowledge which subsequently results is the vidyā that serves as the foundation for liberation, because it knows the kāyas. Which is to say that there is no mistake about what one's nature is. That vidyā, is the antithesis of avidyā [delusion], and can effectively discern mind, and ālaya (afflictive basis of mind) from the dharmakāya.

For most, that (discerning) vidyā comes on as a flash of experiential insight, however due to karmic propensities it isn't stable and fluctuates. For that reason one's initial discernment is termed 'unripened vidyā'. Vidyā ripens via the dissolution of karmic traces which sustain delusion and obscure wisdom. The process of ripening is the path, and when afflictive traces are completely exhausted, one realizes emptiness and the path becomes the result i.e. vidyā as dharmakāya.

It is the same rigpa all along, refined through insight and integration, however the rigpa as mere knowing (cognizance) isn't equivalent to the full measure of rigpa as dharmakāya. Not due to being two separate rigpas, but due to the former being mind and the latter being completely emancipated from mind.

"That being so, it is very important to distinguish mind and wisdom because all meditation is just that: all methods of purifying vāyu and vidyā are that; and in the end at the time of liberation, vidyā is purified of all obscurations because it is purified of the mind."
-- Stainless Space by Longchenpa [per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
heart said:
I don't think that is correct, according to the teachings I received rigpa is never imperfect or underdeveloped.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Searched for a few citations on this, here is one from Jean-Luc Achard which is good:

"Saying that Rigpa is impermanent does not make it a mental factor. Rather in the logic texts of Dzogchen that we have in Bon, Rig pa is styled as impermanent [mi rtag pa] because it's actual experience (be it visionary or not, no matter), depends on one's recognition of it or not. The natural state is defined as permanent [rtag pa] because it is eternal [g.yung drung], immutable [mi 'gyur], etc., and whether we realize it or not, it does not matter from its side. But so long as we regress from this state of total Knowledge, then we're in impermanence. When realization has dawned in the continuum and we don't regress from it, we are 'permanently' in this state. Actually, it's the diachrony of language that forces us to use these distinctions: when one does not regress from Rigpa, the notions of permanence and impermanence have not any importance anymore.

If Rigpa was not impermanent, we would be in its state constantly. This is not the case since we are in ignorance and dualistic grasping most of the time. This sad situation is essentially due to distraction. Rig pa fluctuates: until we are sufficiently familiarized with it (through retreats for instance with hours longs contemplation sessions), we are in a state defined as unripened Awareness [ma smin pa'i rig pa]. Others would translated this as 'immature intrinsic awareness'.

Dante wrote:
I dont recall seeing any Dzogchen texts where rigpa is considered to be like that

Jean-Luc wrote:
You can find it in some of Longchenpa's works when he describes the arising of the rigpa 'from within' the Base. You can read it in the Precious Tresury of Words and Meaning [Tshig don rin po che'i mdzod], in which he says p. 192-193 (more or less, sorry my translation into english is not as accurate as i would it to be since i translated back from the french):

'Thus, since Awareness [skt. vidyā, tib. rig pa] which as flashed out of the Base is not (yet entirely) ripened, one errs in the six destinies of the three realms because of (our) individual karma, and this (means being) first deluded because of the twelve links of interdependency...'

(p. 192 : de yang rig pa gzhi nas 'phags te ma smin pas khams gsum rigs drug tu so so'i las kyis 'khor ba de yang dang po rten 'brel bcu gnyis las 'phrul te...). In the Yabzhi, there are several other similar occurences. If you want another version of the above passage, see Buddha Mind, p. 209. At the level at which this description of Rigpa takes place, Rigpa is defined as unripened, or immature on non-entirely sublimated [ma smin pa] because it remains a potential for discerning our real nature, not a de facto data. Its liberating qualities are not YET entirely expressed and will be so more or less until Buddhahood is reached. Rigpa is the knowledge of the natural state, as long as we are

not Buddhas, it's important to make the distinction. Actually, more precisely, Rigpa is the Discernment that enables us to distinguish mind (sems, as a discursive ego-centered grasping) from Mind itself (sems-nyid, as the pure nature of mind). Without this fundamental Dis-cernment, we are certain to remain in the identification with sems (not with sems-nyid)."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
Simon E. said:
Its worth emphasising that none of us are smart enough to get this by figuring it out.

asunthatneversets said:
This discussion regarding the so-called gradual refinement of rigpa isn't really a case of trying to figure anything out. It is a common theme found in these teachings.

Simon E. said:
I notice that you did not quote my second sentence. Which was the main point of my post.

krodha wrote:
Well, that part goes without saying.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
Simon E. said:
Its worth emphasising that none of us are smart enough to get this by figuring it out.

krodha wrote:
This discussion regarding the so-called gradual refinement of rigpa isn't really a case of trying to figure anything out. It is a common theme found in these teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
krodha wrote:
This of course also depends on the capacity of the individual concerned. As referenced in the initial post with 'cig car rhetoric' framing the instantaneous path. However cig car ba's, being as rare as stars in the daytime, is not a title I would gather any of us here could go by. So there is a bit of gradual refinement that occurs with each of our

respective rigpas, and that 'process' takes on varying forms, as we are all different.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
smcj said:
The phrase "a little bit pregnant" comes to mind.

asunthatneversets said:
Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure and self-perfected. However your knowledge [rig pa] of that wisdom is not, and requires refinement, that is the path.

heart said:
Rigpa just not lasting so long, there is nothing imperfect or undeveloped with it.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
It's termed 'unripened' vidyā. Which isn't imperfect in itself, but since latent propensities don't allow one to rest in vidyā without distraction it can be termed 'imperfect' or 'undeveloped' when placed in the context of the refinement that occurs between the initial introduction and the result.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 1:17 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen rhetoric and the gradual / instant dichotomy
Content:
smcj said:
The path is gradual, not the state, but then that is true of every path in Vajrayana.
The phrase "a little bit pregnant" comes to mind.

krodha wrote:
Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure and self-perfected. However your knowledge [rig pa] of that wisdom is not, and requires refinement, that is the path.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 10th, 2014 at 7:57 AM
Title: Re: Prevalance of the experience and some advanced questions
Content:
krodha wrote:
Garudha, you should seek a qualified teacher if you are interested in Dzogchen. Many experiences can come on spontaneously for people depending on their karmic circumstances. Investigating those experiences is all well and good but coming to a

personal conclusion that what you experienced was rigpa, or any other species of insight, is pure conjecture. This is the type of thing that needs to be addressed by a teacher. Dzogchen cannot be learned from books, it requires a living transmission. If you have indeed already encountered such insight then it will become clear through following the intimate instructions of a qualified guru. Otherwise you run the risk of chasing fantasies, and I would hope you value your precious time enough to avoid wasting it. If you truly have a natural inclination for the teachings then find a teacher so you can focus that in a productive way.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 8th, 2014 at 3:40 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
Malcolm said:
it is "self" because omniscience transcends both self and non-self

dzogchungpa said:
As far as I know, there are no scare quotes in Sanskrit or Tibetan.

krodha wrote:
Because for the Indians and Tibetans who originally authored these texts, the fact that these conventions were merely inferential was a given. We in the west tend to interpret them as being referential, therefore a little scare quote may be required now and again.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 3:25 PM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
rachmiel said:
Thanks, everyone, for your takes on the meaning of Buddha-nature.

The reason I brought up Buddha-nature with respect to svabhava is because of this (Wikipedia):

"... in the tathāgatagarbha sutras (notably the Nirvāṇa Sūtra), the Buddha states that the immortal and infinite Buddha-nature - or "true self" of the Buddha - is the indestructible svabhāva of beings."

krodha wrote:
It was pointed out on the 'The Self Is Real According to T.Page" thread, that the theories of 'true self' in the Nirvāṇa Sūtra are due to translating 'atman' too literally, and that the term 'atman' in the context of the Nirvāṇa Sūtra actually means 'essence' or 'nature'. It does not mean 'self' and therefore there is no 'true self' which is referenced (or even inferred) in the Nirvāṇa Sūtra at any time.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 3:10 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also this goes over the differences between tathāgatagarbha (of various interpretations) and the Brahman of Vedanta:

Madhyamika Buddhism vis-à-vis Hindu Vedanta (A Paradigm Shift) by Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche
http://www.byomakusuma.org/Teachings/MadhyamikaBuddhismVisAVisHinduVedanta.aspx

Excerpt:
"If the Buddha nature (Tathagatagarbha/Sugatagarbha) was really existing (sat) and not empty (nishwabhava), in the Sutra sense, like the Brahman of the Hindus, then the same fault that ancient Buddhist masters blamed on the Hindu Atman-Brahman would boomerang on these Buddhists too. An unchanging really existing thing cannot function in any way as function implies change (Tatva Sanghraha, chapter 7, section E, text 332-335 of Shantarakshita commentary by Kamalashila). Therefore, how can such a Tathagatagarbha that is unchanging have any qualities as it cannot function in any way. If it is answered that the function of the Buddha's qualities are inconceivable (acintya/sam gyi mikhyab), a further question arises that is, how can a conceivable Tathagatagarbha (as to say it exists is to bring it down to the level of conception and thus conceivable) have inconceivable qualities? For the Tathagarbha to have inconceivable qualities, it would also have to be inconceivable. We now come to the point of Nagarjuna that the Tathagarbha must also be free from the four extremes (tetralemma) which means empty of real existence. Therefore the whole Shentong/Rangtong issue is superfluous. And if the Tathagarbha becomes really existing then Buddhism loses its main thesis that differentiated it from Hinduism from its very inception.

We find even Hindu scholars as early as 300 AD like Vatsayana through Bharahar Sutra (Sutta) trying to prove that the Buddha actually taught the Atman but the Buddhists did not understand. This statement implies that there were no Buddhists who understood the Buddha. It further implies that until the time of Vatsayana, Buddhists did not agree with the Atman theory. However, in most kinds of Shentong (except the Dolpopa Shentong), Buddha nature is also empty and emptiness means unfindable that is free from the four extremes as per Nagarjuna-Chandrakirti.

In the tradition of the Mahasiddha Lord of Yogins (Yogeshwar) Virupad, who is one of the famous eighty four Mahasiddhas as well as a great scholar and an abbot (Upadhyaya/Khenpo) of Vikramashila; luminosity (prabhashwar), clarity or pure awareness is the store house consciousness (alaya vigyana) which is the relative truth and the Tathagarbha is emptiness and the ultimate truth. The unity of the two is the

unity of Samsara and Nirvana which is inexpressible and experienced only by Aryas (Aryasamahita), those who have attained the Bhumis. In short, the unfindability of any true existence is the ultimate truth (paramartha satya) in Buddhism, and is diametrically opposed to the concept of a truly existing thing called Brahman, the ultimate truth in Hinduism.

There is also another problem with a really existing Tathagatagarbha that is not empty. If it is “really existing” then it cannot be indivisible with Samsara which is empty. Then the mind (Chitta) cannot be a Buddha and even worse is that the whole of Buddhist Tantra/Vajrayana would be subverted, as Samsara which is empty cannot be transformed into Nirvana, which according to the Shentong theory is not empty. The whole of Buddhist Tantra is based on the principle of transformation and that is why it is called the way of transformation (parinati marga). Vajrayana would become redundant and Sankara Vedanta would be the true Buddhist Way."
- Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

And,

"Hence,to say that the Tathagarbha exists is to make it conceivable, expressible and within the domain of concepts. As the inimitable Sakya Pandita says, that would be like bringing the Tathagarbha down to conceptual proliferation (prapancha). Or, in the context of this essay, it is to make the Tathagarbha just another synonym for the Hindu Atman-Brahman which it is not. In the Mulamadhyamaka Karika, Nagarjuna very clearly mentions ‘tathagato nisvabhavo….’ that is ‘the Tathagata is empty (nisvabhava) of real existence’ (Mulamadhyamaka Karika, Tathagata Parikshya, chapter 22, verse 16). If the Tathagata is empty (nisvabhava), how can the Tathagatagarbha be really existing like the Brahman of the Hindu?"
- Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 3:08 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
rob h said:
Another thing with the idea of a self : isn't it basically the same as some forms of Hinduism in that case, but instead of saying Brahman, the word Tathagata/Tathagatagarbha is used? I'm looking up Advaita Vedanta and can see hardly any difference when it comes to the idea of release to be honest. I'm not saying it's wrong, just that it's kind of bizarre how similar it is. (is this the case of a sub-school of Hinduism being heavily inspired by Buddhism? It looks like it.)

Example from the Advaita wiki page :
"Brahman" too has a broader meaning than "pure consciousness". According to Paul Deussen, Brahman is:

Satyam, "the true reality, which, however, is not the empirical one"

Jñānam, "Knowledge which, however, is not split into the subject and the object"
anantam, "boundless or infinite"
That's from the section "Identity of Atman and Brahman" here :

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advaita_vedanta#Philosophy

You could say the same about the Tathagatagarbha, right? My main concern with this philosophy is that people form concepts and attach to them, but I guess that with the right teachers/guidance/awareness that shouldn't be a problem. I'm starting to think moksha is fairly similar to nirvana, but at the same time release from death and rebirth is said to have been a late development in the concept, so surely inspired by Buddhism.

Adviata also has virtually the exact same three natures/svabhavas as Yogacara, which was also a surprise to see.

krodha wrote:
From earlier in this thread:

Malcolm said:
There are various ways to interpret the Uttaratantra and tathāgatagarbha doctrine, one way is definitive in meaning, the other is provisional, according to Gorampa Sonam Senge, thus the tathāgatagarbha sutras become definitive or provisional depending on how they are understood. He states:

In the context of showing the faults of a literal [interpretation] – it's equivalence with the Non-Buddhist Self is that the assertion of unique eternal all pervading cognizing awareness of the Saṃkhya, the unique eternal pristine clarity of the Pashupattis, the unique all pervading intellect of the Vaiśnavas, the impermanent condition, the measure of one’s body, in the permanent self-nature of the Jains, and the white, brilliant, shining pellet the size of an atom, existing in each individual’s heart of the Vedantins are the same.

The definitive interpretation he renders as follows:

Therefor, the Sugatagarbha is defined as the union of clarity and emptiness but not simply emptiness without clarity, because that [kind of emptiness] is not suitable to be a basis for bondage and liberation. Also it is not simple clarity without emptiness, that is the conditioned part, because the Sugatagarbha is taught as unconditioned.

Khyentse Wangpo, often cited as a gzhan stong pa, basically says that the treatises of Maitreya elucidate the luminosity of the mind, i.e. its purity, whereas Nāgarjuna's treatises illustrate the empty nature of the mind, and that these two together, luminosity and emptiness free from extremes are to be understood as noncontradictory, which we can understand from the famous Prajñāpāramita citation "There is no mind in the mind, the nature of the mind is luminosity".

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 6:00 AM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
rachmiel said:
Buddhism rejects the reality of svabhava. All is emptiness = NOT svabhava. (Except for Buddha nature? I'm unclear on that.)

krodha wrote:
Your buddha nature is your latent potentiality for awakening, and it is precisely because we lack svabhāva that awakening is possible. We as sentient beings are ignorant of our nature, and because we fail to recognize it, we are confused. Our current predicament (as beings wandering in cyclic existence), is much like mistaking a rope lying in a dark room to be a snake, if you are thoroughly convinced it is a snake and someone else states it is actually a rope, you may very well not believe them. The so-called snake actually has 'rope nature', but until you recognize that for yourself, you remain confused. In the same way, all sentient beings have 'buddha nature', because your innate nature is that of a buddha, however the fact that our innate nature is that of a buddha doesn't matter at all unless it's discovered.

If a child is a brilliant guitarist, but lives in an area of the world where there are no guitars, the fact that his talent is latent within him makes no difference. Until he encounters a guitar, picks it up and learns to play, unleashing that potential... the fact that he indeed has potential to be a great guitarist is nothing more than a latent possibility.

Likewise, all beings are endowed with buddha nature, but for the child who lives in circumstances where there is no access to teachings, the fact that his buddhahood is latent within him makes no difference. Until he encounters the dharma, learns how to apply it in his own experience and unleashes that potential... the fact that he indeed has potential to be a fully awakened buddha is nothing more than a latent possibility.

One's buddha nature is a potentiality which is latent within them, it must be either recognized or cultivated. Milk has butter nature, the butter is latent within the milk as a possibility, however unless the milk is churned, no butter will result.

"Listen to me. If you are asked what the difference is between the mind of the truly perfected Buddha and the mind of sentient beings of the three realms, it is nothing other than the difference between realizing and not realizing the nature of mind. Since sentient beings fail to realize this nature, delusion occurs and from this ignorance the myriad types of sufferings come to pass. Thus beings roam through samsara. The basic material of buddhahood is in them, but they fail to recognize it."
- Padmasambhava

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The premise I'm referring to is the very literal interpretation and translation of the term atman as 'self'. It was shown earlier in this thread, twice, that in this context the term atman [bdag nyid] means 'essence' or 'nature'.

There's a large difference between a self and an essence, especially when that essence is non-arising.

dzogchungpa said:
Well, take it up with Bronkhorst. Do the sutras he is discussing say that the Tathagatagarbha is non-arising? As he says It is indeed the "highest reality," which has no fundamental connection with the doctrine of universal emptiness.

krodha wrote:
They say the tathāgatagarbha is ones latent potential for awakening, which is no different than saying the dharmatā of dharmins is always already the case, yet unrecognized.

His statement that the tathāgatagarbha has no fundamental connection to the doctrine of universal emptiness may simply mean that the doctrines themselves are unrelated. If he is implying however that the tathāgatagarbha itself has no connection to universal emptiness, then he has deviated from the meaning of the buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 4:40 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I'm not sure what premise you are referring to. Bronkhorst seems to think that 'self' is a good translation of 'atman' in this context. I don't see much difference between saying that the tathagatagarbha/dharmakaya is an essence in beings and saying it's a self in beings. Words like 'self' and 'essence' are kind of vague anyway.

krodha wrote:
The premise I'm referring to is the very literal interpretation and translation of the term atman as 'self'. It was shown earlier in this thread, twice, that in this context the term atman [bdag nyid] means 'essence' or 'nature'.

There's a large difference between a self and an essence, especially when that essence is non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 7th, 2014 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page

Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Various texts use epithets for the tathagatagarbha and the dharmakaya like "eternal" (nitya), "unchanging" (dhruva), "joyful" (sukha), "self" (atman), and "pure" (subha, suci). We see in these the concept of the self that had been rejected by the Buddha. It appears that this idea held such a powerful sway that certain Buddhists could not resist it. We have already seen one reason for this attraction: it was unclear to many Buddhists why and how the Buddhist path could lead to liberation from rebirths. This explanation does not rule out the possibility that the notion of the tathagatagarbha as an eternal and joyful self may have originated within Buddhism, without non-Buddhist influence; or even that later non-Buddhists may have borrowed this notion from the Buddhists, as some scholars hold.

krodha wrote:
Yet this premise is shown to be false given that 'atman' does not mean 'self' in this context, but rather 'essence' or 'nature'.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 2:26 PM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
rachmiel said:
By essentially the same I mean aren't both svabhava and Brahman absent of conditions, causes, and attributes?

krodha wrote:
Yes Brahman would be a prime example of what Buddhism calls a svabhāva. Which means according to the buddhadharma, Brahman is little more than a facet of deluded mundane existence i.e. a misconception gone awry.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 12:26 PM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
krodha wrote:
Though you will sometimes see svabhāva used in reference to the idea of an essential nature which exists independently of causes and conditions. When it's used that way, Buddhism states that a svabhāva is impossible... as there is nothing which exists independently of cause and condition.

According to Buddhism, for something to truly exist it must exist outright and independently, unconditioned. However alleged 'existents' can only be found to originate dependently, so that core 'essence' or 'beingness' (that svabhāva represents), cannot be found when sought. One instead finds a collection of dependent factors - as designated by mind - which create the appearance of something, yet there's no 'thing'

within or apart from the collection of dependent factors.

If things truly had svabhāva, when those varying dependent characteristics were removed, the thing would still remain, because it would have a core essence or being which made it what it is. However this is not the case. A basketball is round, orange and striped, if you remove those characteristics from the basketball there would be no basketball. Which means that there is no svabhāva. The basketball is not a thing which possesses those characteristics, the basketball is only the characteristics. This means the basketball is a mere appearance, there is nothing truly within, behind or apart from the constituent appearances, and even those appearances are merely valid in relation to other appearances.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 5th, 2014 at 11:47 AM
Title: Re: Svabhava / Brahman
Content:
krodha wrote:
Svabhāva in the buddhadharma is emptiness [śūnyasvabhāva]. Buddhism, unlike Vedanta, does not posit a truly existent essence.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Proof of 6 Realms
Content:
krodha wrote:
Daniel Ingram has quite the list of recollected memories from past lives, and they are undoubtably interesting:

"As to world-cycles or the like, my past life experiences line up along the following lines, if you believe in such experiences having validity:

1) This life human.
2) Last life some sort of moderately powerful, clearly somewhat debauched male jealous god/sorcerer of some kind that was stabbed in the back with a dagger by a woman who he had wronged in some way, I think.
3) Some sort of mother skunk-like animal that was eaten by a large black dog or wolf.
4) Some sort of mother bat that was killed when the rock it was clinging to at the top of the cave fell to the floor.
5) Some sort of grim, gigantic, armored skeletal titan-like thing that ran tirelessly through space swinging a gigantic sword and doing battle nearly continuously without sleep for hundreds of thousands of years that was killed by something like a dragon.
6) Some gigantic, gelatinous, multi-tentacled, very alien being living in a very dark place for a very long time, probably under water, I think.

Other than some sense that the skunk-thing and the bat-thing were virtuous mothers, I

have no sense that there was any profound previous dharmic development at least back that far, and, in fact, have the distinct sense that the previous one was a bit of a cad and not very ethical. Take that all for what you will.

Daniel"

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: is there a teacher in the house? or at least some advice
Content:
krodha wrote:
Rubix, I hope you realize people aren't saying these things to be mean. You seemed to think the comments on the other thread were condescending, they were not meant to be. People are only saying these things because they want you to be successful and create a beneficial connection with the teaching.

What you're perceiving as criticism is others wanting to help you. Trust me, none of us here know you, and you don't know us, many of us don't even really know each other, but everyone here only wants the best for you. If you enter this with a preconceived idea of what your situation or circumstances are then you're going to be looking to validate that, and/or protect it.

At any rate, I hope you can at least drop your guard a little and try to be open to what people are saying. You asked for advice, but it seems your inquiry was slightly loaded, because when you received advice (and good advice from numerous people) it appears it didn't coincide with your expectations, which would lead one to suspect you may have been simply looking to validate some preconceived notions. One who is openly seeking advice would not have adverse reactions to the advice given, nor would they persist in attempting to find more 'advice' (at the expense of the advice already given). That isn't seeking advice, that is seeking validation, or confirmation, of a hopeful conclusion which has already been arrived at.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 4th, 2014 at 4:45 AM
Title: Re: is there a teacher in the house? or at least some advice
Content:
rubix said:
Was only asking about books doesn't matter anymore I found out what I needed to know I'm in the 5th stage I found it in one of my BOOKS

krodha wrote:
"Today some people are saying: 'The Dzogchen teaching doesn't need a teacher or transmission, you can learn it in a book and you can apply it'. This is really a very wrong view.
Nowadays in Western countries this kind of tradition or school is being developed but

you shouldn't follow it. If you want to really follow Dzogchen teaching, that is the wrong direction. Garab Dorje received the transmission from Sambhogakāya Vajrasattva who is connected with Dharmakāya Samantabhadra, and from Garab Dorje until today we have the transmission without interruption.
If there is no transmission you cannot enter into real knowledge, it is impossible. That is why here... it is saying that you can really have that knowledge only if you are connected with the three transmissions. The three transmissions are just like a current.
For example if you have a lamp and you want to light it up you must connect it with a current, otherwise there will be no light... To believe you can get this knowledge just by reading books is a fantasy."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 3rd, 2014 at 3:23 PM
Title: Re: Proof of 6 Realms
Content:
krodha wrote:
There is also an aspect of the six realms that correlates to states of mind. The Asuras would be anger, wrath, jealousy etc. The pretas or hungry ghosts would be greed, unfulfillment. The animal realm would be laziness, stupidity, torpor. The human realm would be equanimity, evenness. The hell beings would be depression, torment. The deva or god realm would be elation, happiness, bliss.

Your experience consists of cycling through these realms or states of mind. But they are all samsara, all impermanent, none last, none can satiate or free you from suffering, craving and grasping.

If you look at images of the Tibetan wheel of life, the bhāvacakra, these realms are all relative, and buddhahood is not found in the wheel, because buddhahood is not any of these states, nor is it accessible through them. These states or realms comprise mind, and buddhahood is not found within mind, however it is not separate from mind either.

Discover the nature of mind, and you will know buddhahood.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 1:39 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
^ this isn't an assertion of actions being inherent in objects because since vision cannot be established (inherently), objects of vision cannot be (inherently) established either. If they (vision and objects) arise they do so dependently, and dependent origination is not origination. The same goes for the rest of the senses.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 12:30 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
An assertion that there's action inherent in objects was never made. He was saying that if something is seen intrinsically, then it doesn't need to be seen, ergo vision is superfluous. And if something is intrinsically unseen, then the question as to whether vision is involved or not is already answered, because an unseen thing is not seen by definition, ergo vision is a non-starter in that case.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 12:04 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
And what flaw might that be?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 10:26 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
Well, I totally do not understand anything that you posted up until this point (above). That part about the jasmine flower just went right over my head. Can you explain it better?

krodha wrote:
When Greg unpacked the flower part further he wrote:

"Vision doesn't see itself. It is not reflexive. Vision is not pervaded by the property of being seen. So if it can't even pervade itself with a property it is supposed to have inherently, then how can it ever spread out and pervade other things? So therefore, the analogy with the flower fails. Vision is more like a knife that can't cut itself than it is like a flower that pervades itself with its own scent.

If it is the intrinsic nature of something to be seen, then vision doesn't see it (as it's not necessary), and non-vision doesn't see it (as it's not possible)..

If it is the intrinsic nature of something not to be seen, then vision doesn't see it (or then it would be seen and not unseen), and non-vision doesn't see it (because non-vision cannot see).

A visual object is either seen by vision or not seen by vision. If vision doesn't see it (because vision is superfluous), then it is not a visual object. If it is not seen by vision

because its own nature is to be unseen, then it is also not a visual object.

Therefore there are no visual objects.

The key to getting this logic is that the assumption of inherent properties make any relationships either impossible or superfluous."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 9:58 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
^ well yes if you attempt to approach these pointers through the lens of physicalist science, it definitely is not going to make sense.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: Yeti-Bigfoot
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's surprising there aren't more Yeti [gya' dred / mi dred] thangkas. The only one I've seen is displayed at Disney World in the Expedition Everest artifacts they have on display, which could very well be fake but its craftsmanship looks authentic enough.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 28th, 2014 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
han said:
Can you see your own eyes?" Nobody can see their own eyes. I can see your eyes but I can't see my eyes.

PadmaVonSamba said:
Wow, it's funny (to me) to read this today, because I was just discussing this fact with someone.
An eye cannot look into itself directly.
but it can look directly at a reflection of itself
and that reflection, and the awareness of that reflection validates that the eye is there.
Likewise, while awareness cannot see itself directly,
the fact that objects of awareness are experienced
validates that awareness operates.
.
.
.

krodha wrote:
Not according to Nāgārjuna. I mean, we can conventionally say that 'awareness operates' but ultimately 'awareness' and objects of awareness are unfindable.

Greg Goode wrote about this not too long ago:
"Nagarjuna argues that the faculty of vision cannot ultimately exist. And then neither can a seer or visual objects.

Then generalizes to other senses.

Even the first two verses deserve lots of contemplation:

3.1. "Vision, hearing, taste, smell, touch, and the inner sense (manas or the mind) are the six faculties; the visible and so on are their fields."

(This is the doctrine, and it is held that they exist inherently. This latter claim is what Nagarjuna will refute.)

3.2. "In no way does vision see itself.
If vision does not see itself, how will it see what is other?"

Verse 3.2 seems odd, because we would normally think that vision is not SUPPOSED to see itself. It is only SUPPOSED to see something other than itself, right?

Verse 3.2.a is a version of the non-reflexivity principle. The eye cannot see itself, the knife cannot cut itself.

Verse 3.2.b seems like a non-sequitur. Here is what the Indian commentaries said about it.

There are at least several ways to look at this:

-1-

Think of being seen as a property or attribute, something that pervades a substance. It is like the scent of jasmine pervades the jasmine flower before pervading the air around it. If the flower is not pervaded by its own scent, then neither can the air be pervaded by it.

So in this way, is vision itself pervaded by the property or essence of being seen? Clearly not. So, like the example of the flower, the property of being seen cannot pervade anything else.

So nothing is pervaded by the property of being seen, and the visible is not established. Vision is also not established.

-2-

If seeing is the inherent, intrinsic property of vision, then it must see all by itself, regardless of whether there is an object present. If vision depended on an object in order for seeing to work, then vision would not be ultimately, inherently existent. Seeing would not be an inherent property of vision.

But vision does not see by itself. So it isn't an inherently existent element, and can't inherently see anything.

-3-

Another way to look at vision is by the objects it sees.

Vision either sees the presently visible, or the presently invisible, or both, or neither.

Vision doesn't see objects that are presently visible, because they are already being seen. Because they are already being seen, they do not need vision to see them. So this vision is not what is seeing them.

Vision doesn't see objects that are presently invisible. Invisible objects have the property of not being seen, so nothing can see them.

Vision doesn't see objects that are both visible and invisible because of a combination of the first two reasons above.

Vision doesn't see objects that are NEITHER visible nor invisible because we can REVERSE the first two reasons above.

Therefore vision doesn't see. If it doesn't see, then seeingness is not its intrinsic nature. Then it makes no sense to think that vision exists in the ultimate way that it appears to.

If vision doesn't exist, then how can visible objects exist?"

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 2:54 PM
Title: Re: Yeti-Bigfoot
Content:
krodha wrote:
Apparently there's a yeti scalp which is kept in a monastery in Khumjung.

And here's a video of Traktung Yeshe Dorje telling a story about one of Do Khyentse's students encounter with a yeti:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }

https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 1:56 PM
Title: Re: Yeti-Bigfoot
Content:
krodha wrote:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche said that he had a pet yeti, or a yeti that lived nearby he used to feed when he was a young boy.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 10:26 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
I'm not alone in this thought. In her book on Kagyu Shentong Hookam's got the line somewhere, "So what if it sounds like another religion? If you are after the Truth what difference does it make?" (That may not be an exact quote, but close.)

dzogchungpa said:
From "The Buddha Within": This concept of Absolute Reality being a knowing, feeling, dynamic force that is the very essence of our being and our universe is vehemently rejected by many sections of the traditional Buddhist community. The reason no doubt is that it is too suggestive of a theistic principle; Buddhism has traditionally held itself aloof from theistic formulations of religious doctrine. Nevertheless, as Khenpo Tsultrim aptly points out, if Buddhism is fundamentally about discovering truth, the mere fact that a certain doctrine sounds like someone else's is no rationale for rejecting it out of hand. However, a major preoccupation of Buddhist scholars over the centuries has been to maintain a clear distinction between themselves and theistic religions. Interestingly, this tendency continues as Buddhism spreads to the West.

krodha wrote:
I'd say it's more so that according to Buddhism, those other doctrines are merely reifying, edifying and fortifying a self that cannot be found in the first place.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 8:52 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
...but it sounds mighty like neo advaita.
Ok, so what if it is? What negative consequences are there? Will it suddenly make one's practice impotent or invalid? Presumably Dolpopa's practice was quite fruitful, and his paradigm was the most extreme. Was his realization somehow askew? I'd trade my

practice for his anyway.

I'm not alone in this thought. In her book on Kagyu Shentong Hookam's got the line somewhere, "So what if it sounds like another religion? If you are after the Truth what difference does it make?" (That may not be an exact quote, but close.)

The point being that all Mahayana schools claim to be able to actually meditate in uncontrived emptiness. Presumably all Mahayana schools have produced enlightened practitioners over time. That is what validates the school. These discussions come from how they choose to articulate what that is like in order to discuss it and for those that have not had the experience.

krodha wrote:
One of the issues with so-called 'neo-advaita' is that it lacks both the dichotomies of (i) 'conventional and ultimate' and/or (ii) 'delusion and wisdom', and without those aspects of the teaching, persons, places, things etc. (what the dharma refers to as conventional designations), are taken to be truly non-existent (often because they are 'concepts'), and that subtle objectification results in the mind grasping at those notions, and you end up with a bunch of people who truly believe there is no self, etc. So it's a bunch of selves who believe they don't exist.

Traditional Advaita Vedanta is much more refined, but it still posits the existence of an unconditioned and uncaused, universal self. Though its praxis is backed by a long standing tradition, and so it doesn't have as many inconsistencies and issues when compared to the new wave 'neo-advaita'.

I don't think Dolbulpa's gzhan stong is quite the same as Vedanta.

The big differences between the Advaita view and that of the buddhadharma is that the Advaita non-duality is 'advaita', which is accomplished by subsuming relative existents into a truly established and inherently existent ultimate nature. That ultimate nature exists in relation to relative phenomena, is the source of that relative phenomena, but is not that phenomena and is beyond the relative.

The non-duality of the buddhadharma is 'advaya', which is discovered through a freedom from the extremes of existence and non-existence (and both and neither). The ultimate nature is the non-arising of the relative, and so there truly is no inherent ultimate nature. The ultimate nature in this case is inseparable from the relative, for example; when Nāgārjuna states: 'samsara and nirvana, neither of these truly exist, instead, nirvana is a complete and through knowledge of samsara'.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 5:41 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
thigle said:

If one practice "giving up practice", it's "practise", because he constructs a reified concept and therefore "thing" called "giving up practice", because there's a form of expectation, which want to have something from "giving up practice". That's grasping. One makes a "thing" out of the fact of giving up practice. Complementary to grasping, now it seems there's something like a "giving up practice'nes". It's anything "behind", like a "big brother, which is reified-identified with "giving up practice". It's really great, if one can detect this, because now it's really possible to interrupt this artificial focus. You can't, because you are afraid, you "can't see something" what you expect from doing "giving up practice"? Great, you detect it once again.

At some point one has enough. Neither "practice" nor "non-practice", so what will be left? Naturally loosed, therefore neither distracted yet focused. Not as "practice" or reified "non-practise", but as a self-obvious non-constructed fact, not "made" by anything or anyone. Now, transparency/knowledge is self-obvious.

"Self-obvious" doesn't mean "automatic". It's just without any need for an extra artificial knowledge-focus like this: "transparency is self-obvious". You can't tell "from where" immediate knowledge comes from, because it doesn't matter from itself from where it comes from. The fact that "it doesn't matter" is immediate "knowledge", not to distinct from what appears, therefore everything is obviously "transparent"-like or "insubstantial"-like, primordially without any need for a base.

Marginal note: One cannot overemphasize the importance of this. "Naturally loosed, neither distracted yet focused", is not about doing or practicing "to be naturaly loosed". It's not about "to remain" naturaly loosed. But some people do that in perfection. Therefore they believe, they are "naturaly loosed" and that's the big goal. Such a "reified non-practice" tends to a special "state" of consciousness. Now the disciple maybe think: "It's really the big goal, because of my true "natural relaxation", there's some-"thing" like "clarity" or "openness" or whatever. But his "clarity" or "openness" or whatever are only reified concepts, based on grasping/ignorance. This is really different from the terms "naturally relaxed" or "naturally loosed" in our context. What sounds the same, may also be different.

Sry for my bad english

krodha wrote:
The 'natural' part of the practice arises as a result of recognizing the nature of mind. If that recognition hasn't occurred, no matter how relaxed or loose we remain, the mind is still acting as a reference point and is mediating experience, which means that delusion is still present, and there is nothing natural about ones practice. Resting in mind is a necessary preliminary practice for most, but it shouldn't be confused as the definitive view.

There's (i) non-fixation which is resting in the clarity of mind (as a reference point), and then there's (ii) non-fixation resting in the nature of mind (free of a reference point). Confusing the former for the latter causes a lot of issues.

Per Dudjom Lingpa; the clarity of mind can be referred to as the 'relative' nature of mind, but this (clarity) is not the ultimate nature of mind. The 'ultimate' nature of mind, meaning the minds definitive nature, is sems nyid i.e. the recognition of the non-arising of the mind (sometimes parsed as 'nondual clarity and emptiness'). That recognition frees up the illusory reference point of mind and so mind no longer mediates experience and appearances self-arise [rang byung] and self-liberate [rang grol].

The clarity (cognizance) of mind alone implies a subtle reference point and a subtle grasping, because clarity is susceptible to conditioning. But when clarity is sealed with emptiness, that reference point is freed up and the grasping is cut. This is why, for example; tregchö [khregs chod] is sometimes defined as cutting the binding on bundle of wood. The binding represents the delusion which keeps clarity conditioned and sustains the artificial reference point of mind. Clarity alone (divorced of the recognition of its emptiness) is merely the neutral indeterminate cognizance of the ālaya. All sentient beings function from the standpoint of the ālaya and mind.

An allegedly natural resting in the clarity of mind is simply śamatha, when that clarity is recognized as empty, the knowledge that the mind has been beginninglessly non-arisen gives rise to the 'natural' resting you are alluding to, which is the vipaśyanā of the natural state. The former entails effort, even if one thinks they are resting effortlessly. The latter is the true effortlessness.

Tulku Urgyen discusses how resting in mind is not equivalent to the definitive view:
"The glimpse of recognizing mind-essence [sems nyid] that in the beginning lasted only for a few seconds gradually becomes half a minute, then a minute, then half an hour, then hours, until eventually it is uninterrupted throughout the whole day. You need that kind of training. I mention this because, if the goal of the main training is to construct a state in which thoughts have subsided and which feels very clear and quiet, that is still a training in which a particular state is deliberately kept. Such a state is the outcome of a mental effort, a pursuit. Therefore it is neither the ultimate nor the original natural state.

The naked essence of mind [sems nyid] is not known in shamatha, because the mind is occupied with abiding in stillness; it (mind essence) remains unseen. All one is doing is simply not following the movement of thought. But being deluded by thought movement is not the only delusion; one can also be deluded by abiding in quietude. The preoccupation with being clam blocks recognition of self-existing wakefulness and also blocks the knowing of the three kayas of the awakened state. This calm is simply one of no thought, of the attention subsiding in itself while still not knowing itself."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
krodha wrote:
Actually this passage from Dudjom Rinpoche is even better:

"Similarly: first, the rigpa [vidyā] of having had the introduction is like the first part of the early dawn; in the middle, the rigpa of having gained assurance, free from equipoise and post-attainment is like the daybreak; and finally the rigpa of having gained liberation from extremes is like the sun shining."

And Mipham Rinpoche states:
"The training of rigpa comes in three steps: recognition, training and finalization."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
...And rituals, or whatever other method one wants to use to familiarize with that nature is an indispensable aspect of the teaching.

Sönam said:
It does not sound very dzogchen at all ... maybe TB conceptualizations?

Sönam

krodha wrote:
I posted some of this elsewhere but it is relevant here and explains my point:

The guru gives you pointing out instructions, you recognize primordial wisdom, you rest in that knowledge [vidyā], unerringly, and that is the path. When that knowledge ripens to it's full measure your vidyā is dharmakāya, and you are a buddha. The basis, path and result are never apart from vidyā, because they are simply the refinement of vidyā via the exhaustion of traces. Our illusory and deluded experiences as sentient beings, are merely the complex interaction of these karmic traces, habitual tendencies and afflictive propensities.

Buddhahood is only attained when these propensities are exhausted, as Longchenpa elucidates:
"Ordinary beings are truly buddhas, but this fact is obscured by adventitious distortions, once these are removed, truly there is buddhahood."

There is no method to apply other than resting in vidyā. The path is familiarization, stabilization and integration in that view [tib. ta wa]. It is crucial that the view is maintained tenaciously and one cultivates non-distraction. If this isn't performed skillfully, then there is undoubtably a danger of regression into deluded mind. In time the view will become more and more effortless, however initially it is important to rely on practice and so on.

This principle is identical to the three testaments of Garab Dorje: (i) Introduction to one's nature [basis], (ii) Confidence in one's nature [path], (iii) Continuation in one's

nature [result].

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche:
"A seeming confusion obscures the recognition of the basis [gzhi]. Fortunately, this seeming delusion is temporary. This failure to recognize the basis is similar to dreaming. Dreaming is not primordial; it is temporary, it can be purified. Purification happens through training on the path. We have strayed from the basis and become sentient beings. To free the basis from what obscures it, we have to train. Right now, we are on the path and have not yet attained the result. When we are freed from obscuration, then the result - dharmakāya - appears. The liberated basis, path and result are all perfected in the realm of the single essence, the continuity of rig pa [vidyā].

In fact, there is no difference whatsoever between the basis and result. In the state of the basis the enlightened qualities are not acknowledged, but they are manifest at the time of the result. These are not new qualities that suddenly appear, but are like the qualities of a flower that are inherent in the seed. Within the seed are the characteristics of the flower itself. The seed holds the potential for the flower's color, smell, bud and leaves. However, can we say that the seed is the result of the flower? No, we cannot, because the flower has not fully bloomed. Like this analogy, the qualities of the result are contained in the state of the basis; yet, they are not evident or manifest. That is the difference between the basis and the result. At the time of the path, if we do not apply effort, the result will not appear."

So even after recognition the view must be maintained, this is what practice is for, otherwise karmic propensities will cause distraction and deviation to arise in one's condition, as Dudjom Rinpoche explains:

"The mere recognition of vidyā will not liberate you. Throughout your lives from beginningless time, you have been enveloped in false beliefs and deluded habits. From then till now you have spent every moment as a miserable, pathetic slave of your thoughts! And when you die, it’s not at all certain where you will go. You will follow your karma, and you will have to suffer. This is the reason why you must meditate, continuously preserving the sate of vidyā you have been introduced to. The omniscient Longchenpa has said, 'You may recognize your own nature, but if you do not meditate and get used to it, you will be like a baby left on a battlefield: you’ll be carried off by the enemy, the hostile army of your own thoughts!' In general terms, meditation means becoming familiar with the state of resting in the primordial uncontrived nature, through being spontaneously, naturally, constantly mindful. It means getting used to leaving the state of vidyā alone, divested of all distraction and clinging."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 4:16 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:

thigle said:
That's a good question, because the most of us conceptualize and reify the entire life unknowingly, therefore the most of us are always unknowingly "practitioners" from the complementary standpoint of a "big brother", which seems to be refied-identified with everything. That's ignorance and grasping, therefore it's really better to give up such artificial practice, especially if someone "want to become familiar" with primordially-natural knowledge/transparency.

Sry for my bad english

krodha wrote:
'Giving up' is ignorance and grasping as well. Only a direct knowledge of dharmatā constitutes a transcendence of artificial practice... and even then, ones knowledge is initially unripened, and will not reach its full measure until the realization of emptiness. Therefore familiarization and practice are required.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 27th, 2014 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
...
And rituals, or whatever other method one wants to use to familiarize with that nature is an indispensable aspect of the teaching.

Sönam said:
It does not sound very dzogchen at all ... maybe TB conceptualizations?

Sönam

krodha wrote:
TB?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 26th, 2014 at 1:29 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
Wayuu said:
I already did one direct introduction through webcast with Namkhai Norbu,

thigle said:
A "direct introduction" into what? The "natural state"? Really? If so, there's no need from itself for "rituals", because you're a "sotāpanna".

krodha wrote:
Yes direct introduction to your nature. And rituals, or whatever other method one wants to use to familiarize with that nature is an indispensable aspect of the teaching.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 25th, 2014 at 2:14 PM
Title: Re: two truths -Nagarjuna
Content:
krodha wrote:
'The truth of wordly convention' or more simply; 'conventional truth' is our relative experiences which consist of persons, places, things, and so on.

The ultimate truth is the emptiness of the conventional.

So an example of conventional truth is a car. The ultimate truth is the emptiness of the car.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 2:43 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
In most cases, the ātman is the ālayavijñāna [all-basis consciousness] or the ālaya [all-basis] mistaken as a permanently abiding conscious substratum which exists independently of causes, conditions and other phenomena. That error is the foundation for the grasping which gives rise to the jīvātman, ātman and so on. The dharma reveals that capacity to be empty, which collapses the delusion that sustains the notion of a self which can either exist or not exist.

Thrangu Rinpoche discusses this:
"When Buddha Shakyamuni introduced the Buddhist teachings [skt. dharma] he taught extensively on the subject of the mind. In the context of the lesser vehicle [skt. hinayāna], when explaining the five aggregates, the twelve sense-sources, and the eighteen elements, the Buddha explained the mind in terms of six collections of consciousnesses; eye, ear, nose, tongue, and body consciousness (i.e., the five sense consciousnesses), and the mind consciousness.
In the context of the great vehicle [skt. mahāyāna], however, Buddha Shakyamuni explained the mind in terms of the eight collections of consciousness: the seventh consciousness is the klesha-mind and the eighth the all-base consciousness [skt. ālayavijñāna]. The reason why these two types of consciousness were not taught in the lesser vehicle is explained in the sutras. There is says 'the absorbing consciousness is profound and subtle. If it were taken to be the self, that would not be appropriate.' The all-base consciousness functions uninterruptedly, like a flow of a river, by absorbing imprints and seeds. In many non-Buddhist philosophies - for example, that of the Indian Tirthikas - the true existence of a self is postulated. It could happen that the followers of

such philosophies take the all-base consciousness to be the truly existent self; this is a mistake. In the great vehicle, however, there is no entity as such that could be viewed as the self: indeed, there is no valid cognition that could prove the true existence of such a self. Since sometimes the body is taken to be the self and sometimes also the mind, there is no definite focal point for the self. It obviously follows that the self cannot be construed as being the all-base consciousness either."

tobes said:
But are you not simply appealing to a Buddhist authority to tell us what the Atman is?
It's never a good idea to get a Marxist to teach you about Liberalism.....

krodha wrote:
That wasn't really directed towards you or anyone, and I don't share your sentiments on this topic.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 11:34 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
You clearly dont know what the Atman is.

PadmaVonSamba said:
Yeah, actually, I think I do.
For example,
If atma it did not refer to an individual's essence, you wouldn't hgave the word 'mahatma' (maha + atma).
It comes from the vedic, and refers to what in Abrahamic religions is called a 'soul' , meaning that each person has their own.
But, just taking your argument as is,
answer what I asked before.
What distinguishes or separates your atman, or 'true self',
whatever you want to call it, from anyone else's?
Or, tell me:
How is your view of 'true self' different from the Vedic concept of a Brahman?
.
.
.

tobes said:
I think there's a good reason to propose that no one really 'knows' what Atman is, because it is usually alluded to as 'beyond (ordinary) knowledge, thought, definition,

conceptualisation etc'. i.e. if it is anything, 'it' surely remains in the sphere of very very subtle meditative experience.....and how precisely does one use one's own philosophical vantage point to shoot down another's meditative experience?

Buddhists of course, know how to (and love to) argue against it. That's basically our job! But I admit that I see a bit of a pretense in that occupation....

krodha wrote:
In most cases, the ātman is the ālayavijñāna [all-basis consciousness] or the ālaya [all-basis] mistaken as a permanently abiding conscious substratum which exists independently of causes, conditions and other phenomena. That error is the foundation for the grasping which gives rise to the jīvātman, ātman and so on. The dharma reveals that capacity to be empty, which collapses the delusion that sustains the notion of a self which can either exist or not exist.

Thrangu Rinpoche discusses this:
"When Buddha Shakyamuni introduced the Buddhist teachings [skt. dharma] he taught extensively on the subject of the mind. In the context of the lesser vehicle [skt. hinayāna], when explaining the five aggregates, the twelve sense-sources, and the eighteen elements, the Buddha explained the mind in terms of six collections of consciousnesses; eye, ear, nose, tongue, and body consciousness (i.e., the five sense consciousnesses), and the mind consciousness.
In the context of the great vehicle [skt. mahāyāna], however, Buddha Shakyamuni explained the mind in terms of the eight collections of consciousness: the seventh consciousness is the klesha-mind and the eighth the all-base consciousness [skt. ālayavijñāna]. The reason why these two types of consciousness were not taught in the lesser vehicle is explained in the sutras. There is says 'the absorbing consciousness is profound and subtle. If it were taken to be the self, that would not be appropriate.' The all-base consciousness functions uninterruptedly, like a flow of a river, by absorbing imprints and seeds. In many non-Buddhist philosophies - for example, that of the Indian Tirthikas - the true existence of a self is postulated. It could happen that the followers of such philosophies take the all-base consciousness to be the truly existent self; this is a mistake. In the great vehicle, however, there is no entity as such that could be viewed as the self: indeed, there is no valid cognition that could prove the true existence of such a self. Since sometimes the body is taken to be the self and sometimes also the mind, there is no definite focal point for the self. It obviously follows that the self cannot be construed as being the all-base consciousness either."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 10:54 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
...the Buddha doesn't follow through with the implications of a real No — if there's no self, how can there be rebirth?

Why is this so hard for people to understand?

krodha wrote:
Because it isn't a self that is reborn, but afflictive conditions.

xabir said:
Ven Dhammanando answered it well:

QUOTE(Darkknight @ Jan 8 2007, 06:17 AM)
Q. So there is no self (Atman). so what exactly is it that is reborn, and how does what is reborn pass from one body to another?
Thanks in advance for any answers received. bow.gif

Ven Dhammanando wrote:
The question is wrongly put and the Buddha's reponse when asked such a question was to reject it as an improper question. Having rejected the question he would then inform the questioner of what he ought to have asked: "With what as condition is there birth?"

The reason that it is an improper question is that rebirth is taught as the continuation of a process, and not as the passing on of any sort of entity. For a more complete exposition of the subject see Mahasi Sayadaw's Discourse on Paticcasamuppada.

Best wishes,
Dhammanando Bhikkhu

Another reply by Dhammanando:

QUOTE(Avalokiteshvara @ Jan 8 2007, 09:11 AM)
Wrongly put or not the answer is still the same.

Ven Dhammanando wrote:
The "what?" in the question takes for granted the very thing that the Buddha rejects — that there is some real entity in this life that is transferred to the being in the next life. Since this assumption is wrong, the question as phrased has no answer and must be rejected.

Best wishes,
Dhammanando Bhikkhu

(See: http://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.sg/2012/09/phagguna-sutta-to-

phagguna.html)

In the //Milindapanha// the King asks Nagasena:

"What is it, Venerable Sir, that will be reborn?"

"A psycho-physical combination [nama-rupa], O King."

"But how, Venerable Sir? Is it the same psycho-physical
combination as this present one?"

"No, O King. But the present psycho-physical combination produces kammically wholesome and unwholesome volitional activities, and through such kamma a new psycho-physical combination will be born."

krodha wrote:
and...

xabir said:
Malcolm's reply to this same question (lengthier):

QUOTE(Avalokiteshvara @ Jan 7 2007, 11:02 PM) I understand what you are saying but the "what" doesnt necessarily have to mean one thing like some real entity it could also mean many things. I dont think any assumptions were being made it is just a question anyway nothing right or wrong about it. * *

Malcolm wrote:
The point is that the question is phrased wrong requiring at best an ambigious answer that will confuse more than edify.

Buddha in fact discussed this with Sharputra saying that if he answers the question "yes there is something that undergoes birth" people will become confused and assume there is a permanent self that undergoes retribution of action and so on. Likewise, if he answers the question "no, there is nothing which undergoes rebirth" likewise there are those who will assume there are no consequences of action and so on and will therefore feel no compelling need observe the principles of karma and so on.

Therefore when asked the question "what takes rebirth" he points out that question itself is flawed.

The question should be "Why is there birth?" The answer to that question is easy. There is birth, i.e. suffering, because of affliction and action.

As long as the aggregates are afflicted, afflicted aggregates will continue to be appropriated.

In Madhyamaka it is explained there is birth because of the innate self-grasping "I am" appearing to the afflicted mind. It is asserted that what appropriates birth in a new series of aggregates is the mental habit "I am." That "I am" is baseless, has no correspondence in the aggregates or seperate from them or in any one of them, just as a car is not found in its parts, seperate from them, or in any one of the parts. Nevertheless, the imputation "car" allows us to use cars effectively. Likewise, the mental habit "I am" is proper as both the agent of action and the object upon which it ripens even though it is basically unreal and has no basis in the aggregates, outside the aggregates, or in any one of them, but allows us to treat the aggreates as a nominally designated "person".

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 10:48 AM
Title: Re: Is this a painting of Milarepa?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Milarepa. There are other paintings of him where he is depicted with green skin as well.

This is the explanation I found:
"At the age of 45, he started to practice at Drakar Taso (White Rock Horse Tooth) cave – "Milarepa's Cave", as well as becoming a wandering teacher. Here, he subsisted on nettle tea, leading his skin to turn green with a waxy covering, hence the greenish color he is often depicted as having, in paintings and sculpture."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 8:45 AM
Title: Re: Dream Yoga
Content:
dimeo said:
Hopefully someone can tell me if I'm off the mark here, but perhaps there's an idea that if we learn to see dreams as somewhat like life and life like a dream, then a whole new realm of potential possibility opens up to us. When in the teachings and sutras, there's teachings about 'emptiness' (shunyata) instead of it meaning the idea of 'nothing', another translation is 'potential' and 'openness'.

Quite typically a person will have a rather fixed idea in the mind toward perception of what is "true" and "real". With dream yoga perhaps this begins to change in daily life as well and we can learn to better see the open potential all around us?

krodha wrote:
Śūnyatā is never meant to be 'nothing', the sūtras are quite clear about that. And yes emptiness implies potentiality and dynamism, if things truly existed (because they would exist independently of causes or conditions) then there would be no way for

anything have dynamic potentiality.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 7:12 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
Yes, well you and I discussed that recently, and Malcolm clarified that the so-called 'subtle inner Madhyamaka' referenced by Dudjom Rinpoche is simply taking appearances to be mind.
Dudjom R. is not speaking about a "Mind Only" interpretation:

Whereas in the aforementioned tradition of Mind Only, the dependent nature is the ground of emptiness and is explained to be the absolute, empty of imaginary objects of refutation, here it is the absolute reality (chos-nyid yongs-grub) that is claimed to be empty of imaginary objects of refutation. Accordingly, the components, psychophysical bases and activity fields, which are dependently conceived, are said to be a ground which is empty of the imaginary self and its properties; and the ground which is empty of that dependent ground of emptiness is absolute reality. This ground of emptiness never comes into existence because it is empty of the phenomena of samsara, which are characterised as suddenly arisen and which are divided according to essential stains and substantial faults. However this ground is not empty of the amassed enlightened attributes of nirvana which spontaneously abide from the beginning.

Accordingly, it is said in the Supreme Continuum of the Greater Vehicle (Ch.l, v.155):
The seed which is empty of suddenly arisen phenomena
Endowed with divisive characteristics
Is not empty of the unsurpassed reality
Endowed with indivisible characteristics. (formatting mine)
Also noting that while Dudjom Rinpoche was no doubt a profound teacher, his view on this matter was by no means definitive or universally held.
Dudjom R.'s view is not binding on anybody, but he was the "Head of the Nyingma Lineage" as such.

krodha wrote:
Dudjom Rinpoche was definitely influenced by Kongtrul's gzhan stong.

At any rate, if you enjoy that view that is great, it isn't something that I find value in so much, but to each their own. We can agree to disagree.

I just don't see how this 'absolute reality' [chos nyid yongs grub] can be empty of conditioned phenomena i.e. 'imaginary objects of refutation' as Dudjom Rinpoche puts it, yet have truly established 'unconditioned' attributes or 'amassed enlightened attributes of nirvana which spontaneously abide from the beginning' as Dudjom Rinpoche coins it.

This doesn't add up to me, but that is ok. It is perfectly fine for ones nature to have enlightened qualities, though why those qualities would not be empty themselves is a curious notion.

The emptiness of something doesn't render it non-existent, null, void or unable to 'spontaneously abide from the beginning'. In fact, because things are empty is why they can be endowed with action, potency and can engage in interaction and so on. If things where inherently existent they would be fixed, dead, static, devoid of life, energy, movement and so on... inherently existent things (or attributes) are truly inconceivable, and I don't mean that in the way we may think the realized state to be 'inconceivable', I mean it in the sense that they are an impossibility.

Nāgārjuna's logic on this seems much more sound, to me at least:
"Since arising, abiding and perishing are not established,
the conditioned is not established;
since the conditioned is never established,
how can the unconditioned be established?"

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 6:06 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
Regarding gzhan stongs title as the alleged 'Great Madhyamaka', Malcolm also shared:
Malcolm wrote:
It is sort of ridiculous to term gzhan stong "great madhyamaka" since it is a term used to describe several different positions amongst Tibetan Madhyamakas i.e. gzhan stong; the early Sakya/Nyingma view of free from extremes that goes right back to Kawa Paltseg, and of course Tsongkhapa's formulation.

The Indian texts also show no consistency in how the term is used, the anonymous pramāṇavidhvaṃsanaṭippiṭakavṛtti refers to its adherents as "great madhyamaka" and rejects the so called cittamatra madhyamaka [that Bhava advocates in the passage you reference] as inferior.

In reality, in the Indian context, "great madhyamaka is a term mostly used in tantric treatises; even here however it is used in various different ways. The Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaṣaḍaṇgatantrapañjikā by Avadhutipāda states:
"The nature of the completion [stage] is said to be mahāmadhyamaka".
On other hand, the Śrī-ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭīkāvohitaṭikā by Padmavajra states:
So called "madhyamaka" is the dharma of the essence, the freedom from four extremes of the mahāmadhyamaka of the Mahāyāna and the awakening of the fortunate.
Dombi Heruka's Śrīhevajrasādhana states:
One should mediate on the great madhyamaka free from all signs.

And the Tantric Candrakiriti's Samājābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states
Having manifested the mahāmadhyamaka that is like space,
the sunlight of compassion benefits all sentient beings

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 6:00 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
I don't know about the Drikung Kagyupas, but my understanding is that the Nyingmapas hold the " Great Madhyamaka", a.k.a. "empty of other", a.k.a "shentong" to be the highest view. Or at least Dudjom R. was of that opinion. See D.R.'s "The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism" (a.k.a. "The Big Red Book).

On the other hand evidently ChNN does not subscribe to that idea. That is his prerogative, but then again he is known to march to the beat of a different drummer on a number of various issues.

krodha wrote:
Yes, well you and I discussed that recently, and Malcolm clarified that the so-called 'subtle inner Madhyamaka' referenced by Dudjom Rinpoche is simply taking appearances to be mind. Also noting that while Dudjom Rinpoche was no doubt a profound teacher, his view on this matter was by no means definitive or universally held.

smcj said:
asunthatneversets wrote:
Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.

smcj wrote:
I believe what D.R. said was that Prasangika view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached intellectually, and Great Madhyamaka view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached from an experiential/meditational perspective. He calls the Prasangika the "coarse outer Madhyamaka" as opposed to the "subtle inner Madhyamaka". He subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. I've got the quote(s) somewhere in the Big Red Book. I will look them up if you so desire.

Malcolm wrote:
I have already shown that this distinction made by many gzhan stong scholars is based on a misconception, and I even trotted out the passage in question.

viewtopic.php?f=102&t=13306&p=174083&hilit=outer+madhyamaka#p174083

So called subtle inner Madhyamaka is just taking appearances to be mind.

Greg wrote:
In the Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism (Red Book), pg 169:

. . . it is stated in the Jewel Lamp of the Madhyamaka by the master Bhavya (skal-Idan): "The Madhyamaka of the Prasangika and the Svatantrika is the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka. It should indeed be expressed by those who profess well-informed intelligence during debates with [extremist] Outsiders, during the composition of great treatises, and while establishing texts which concern supreme reasoning. However, when the subtle, inner Madhyamaka is experientially cultivated, one should meditate on the nature of Yogacara-Madhyamaka."

The note associated with the quote indicates "The quotation given here does not occur in the extant Tibetan text of Bhavya's Madhyamakaratnapradipa, rather it paraphrases passages found on fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the text: dbu-ma, Vol. Tsha."

As far as I know the terms "Prasangika" and "Svatantrika" are Tibetan innovation when used to describe discrete approaches to Madhyamaka. So I'm guessing this "quote" is a rather loose "paraphrase" indeed. Can anyone shed some light on what it actually says in fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the Madhyamakaratnapradipa: dbu-ma, Vol. Tsha?

Malcolm wrote:
It is basically an explanation of madhyamaka view from a Shantarakshita style perspective.

There is no mention of either prasanga or svatantra in the entire text. It is not a text by Bhavaviveka. Bhavya is a much later master, post Shantarakshita.

This passage basically states that Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti present a so-called "coarse outer Madhyamakas" when they speak from the relative truth point of view of śrāvakas; but then Bhavya also presents a couple of citations by Āryadeva and Candrakīrti which shows that in terms of the relative truth these three masters support the concept of mind-only in relative truth, and that this is the inner subtle madhyamaka.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 5:23 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
Well this is a gzhan stong exposition is it not? Even though Kongtrul's gzhan stong was a reforming of Dolbulpa's original, you know what you're getting. Surely not a view that Vajrayāna as a whole identifies with, in fact I would say it is a minority view.

To the Gelugpas it is heresy. To the Karma Kagyus it is orthodoxy. So you can take your pick. Whatever floats your dharma boat.

krodha wrote:
Not only the Gelug, but the Drikung Kagyu and the majority of Nyingma as well (who uphold that the definitive view is the traditional freedom from extremes taught by Nāgārjuna, and the like, i.e. so-called 'rang stong'), to name a few. For some reason, the traditional view is painted by gzhan stong pas as advocating for a negative view, why I'm not sure, because a freedom from extremes naturally avoids erring into either extreme.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 3:26 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
Every time I glance at this thread topic it looks like it says "'the Self is real' according to T. Pain" and I halfway expect a profound exposition via auto tune to happen.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 2:52 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
The Mantra perspective can be expressed in this way:
A subtle, indestructible individual, the great self or person, who is radiant awareness co-existent with the six impure elements, is in every way the basis for the accumulation of actions.

- Kongtrul

("subtle, indestructible individual" = "indestructible subtle atman" = "mi shigs pa phra ba'i bdag")

krodha wrote:
Well this is a gzhan stong exposition is it not? Even though Kongtrul's gzhan stong was a reforming of Dolbulpa's original, you know what you're getting. Surely not a view that Vajrayāna as a whole identifies with, in fact I would say it is a minority view.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 24th, 2014 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
...and especially in Vajrayana.

krodha wrote:
"The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears no similarity to the self [ātman] of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 3:48 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
smcj said:
There is no ground of awareness in the buddhadharma, and if one shows up it is a mere projection of deluded mind.
I'm not so sure you can make that a categorical statement.

krodha wrote:
Why is that?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 3:31 PM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
as soon as you say the "ground of awareness" or it is "unchanging" due to.....
then you are calling it True Self because those are the very meaning and definitions of what the True Self IS.

krodha wrote:
^^ This is Vedanta. There is no ground of awareness in the buddhadharma, and if one shows up it is a mere projection of deluded mind.

Also, if wisdom is 'unchanging' it is unchanging because it is the non-arising of phenomena. Meaning phenomena never arose in the first place, and that which hasn't arisen cannot cease, hence; ceaseless, unchanging, permanent and all the rest of the terms used to denote non-arising.

Truly though, 'unchanging' is one of the various inaccurate views of wisdom according to Dzogchen, but then again so is 'changing'.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 2:51 PM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Moreover, these sentient beings must have also discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conceptions of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self, because if they had not, their minds would inevitably grasp after such relative ideas. Further, these sentient beings must have already discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conception of the non-existence of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self. If they had not, their minds would still be grasping after such ideas. Therefore, every disciple who is seeking Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi should discard, not only conceptions of one's own selfhood, other selves, living beings and a Universal Selfhood, but should discard, also, all ideas about such conceptions and all ideas about the non-existence of such conceptions."
- Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra

And why is that? Because the 'self' is not a homogenous quality or capacity which can truly exist or not exist. 'Self' is a convenient conventional designation placed onto coarse and conditioned habits of grasping. The designation is attributed to a collection of habits and tendencies which construct and sustain the appearance of a personal reference point. The point of the dharma is to overturn those constituent and underlying tendencies, habits etc., which create the compelling feeling of 'I', 'me', 'mine', 'self'. The self is precisely these various tendencies which are constantly playing out as long as karmic influence is governing one's condition. So unless we have severed that afflictive patterning through profound direct insight, the self is there whether we say it is or it isn't. Because the tendencies are habitual in nature, and the self is precisely the tendencies (though truly the self cannot be found within or apart from the tendencies), those tendencies must be exhausted completely before there is liberation.

Overall though the buddhadharma focuses on those subtle patterns. The self is the patterning, which is founded on ignorance, and is built up from there. We as sentient beings comprise a thick buildup of traces, and one of the primary habits is that of grasping. If we look at the self as grasping, then we can start to see the way the self is unfolding moment by moment.

If grasping at the existence of the self occurs, the self automatically arises, because grasping presupposes a grasper and that which is grasped. In contrast, if grasping at the idea that there is no self occurs, the self automatically arises. If grasping at the thought that one should refrain from grasping occurs, the self arises once again. Each act of identification and grasping gives rise to the illusion of grasper and grasped. Only direct wisdom insight and exhaustion of latent traces can overturn this process. Meaning; the direct apperception that the grasping itself is founded upon misunderstanding and delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
Well yes, if you had to. But it would be unwise to haphazardly adopt or propagate such a view without first understanding the fine print associated with (and and implications of) that title in the context of the system concerned, in this case, Dzogchen. Your well known translator and doctor has gone out of his way to be clear about that. In fact you may recall a lengthy thread addressing precisely that point over on his forum, that you contributed to.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 at 6:54 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
'True self' or more accurately 'great self' [bdag nyid chen po] was Vairocana's term for the basis in Dzogpa Chenpo... but that doesn't mean it's literally a self or anything of the sort. Nor does it mean there is a true self. 'Ground of awareness' isn't a very good treatment of dharmakāya. Dharmakāya is the result as unobscured buddha mind i.e. emptiness. Dharmatā is the non-arising of dharmas, but more specifically one's nature which becomes apparent after recognition of the nature of mind [sems nyid]. Sems nyid i.e. cittatā implies anattā, in the context of the false reference point of mind [tib. sems, skt. citta], because it is the non-arising of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also for the record; I never claimed my view was exempt from the reality claims cutting both ways. My point would be rendered null and void if I did.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 9:09 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
^ no doubt!

As soon as I read the OP I thought "que Son of Buddha, in 3, 2, 1..."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
Being that this is a forum dedicated to the buddhadharma, the conclusion that the distinction ' is there in reality' is undoubtably going to implicate itself on numerous levels. Which is admittedly why a discussion of this nature is incredibly interesting.

For the record, I'm in no way calling for an abandoning of such distinctions, but am merely addressing the way we collectively relate to them, and the allegedly conclusive presuppositions they birth both consciously and subconsciously in relation to the perceived ecological hierarchies they necessarily imply.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: "the Self is real" according to T. Page
Content:
krodha wrote:
A gravitation towards either extreme (self or no-self), if envoked at all, is only ever elicited in conventional parlance. The heart of the matter is always the freedom from extremes i.e. emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
Jigme Tsultrim said:
"Reject the anthropocentric falsehood that maintains the oppressive hierarchy of mankind over the animals. "
It is not that which creates this alleged hierarchy, but history. Before the rise of man, the animals hunted and ate us as they saw fit.

asunthatneversets said:
Very true. I don't think it's an objection to the natural order of predator and prey. What's being addressed is the perverse subjugation and objectification of other beings as bio machines and so on... literally using them as a means to fulfill human interests. The anthropocentric falsehood he's addressing is simply the way that humanity's relationship to animals has evolved to be what it is today. Whether it's influences such as the church originally declaring that animals have no soul, which spilled over into scientific views, or otherwise. A prime example being the fact that in just the past five years, scientists have reformed their views to state that animals have consciousness, or that they have emotions etc. Which is ludicrous to think that many thought otherwise, the level of disconnect there is astonishing to say the least. I literally saw an article not even six months ago which said something to the order of; 'scientists declare that animals have consciousness'. Even the very titles 'animal' and 'human' sets humanity apart, Derrida has an excellent piece about this.

tobes said:
A while back I read Derrida's Beast and Sovereign, which may be the piece you're referring to. In any case, in that text (well, they were actually lectures) he was making a similar move. I find those kinds of arguments very unconvincing. It is very trendy to problematise the Aristotelian 'logocentrism' which has long pervaded western metaphysics and theology. i.e. that humans are privileged on account of their reason-speech. At the end of the day, I think the distinction holds. The day that zebras and turtles can organise themselves to build airports, raise taxes and debate philosophy on internet forums, is the day I change my view on the matter. I think it is compelling that 'animals' and 'humans' are distinct, on account of the ability that humans have developed to communicate and reason to the extent that they can build 'a shared world' or 'a civilisation'.

This doesn't deny that animals have consciousness, and in some cases, very sophisticated consciousness. Nor that they ought to have moral status, on account of the fact that they have sensation and feeling (an argument Singer makes). It simply preserves an obvious and necessary distinction. Derrida looks for binaries and seeks to deconstruct them. It is sometimes an interesting venture, but is also sometimes bordering on sophistry. In any case, neither the zebra nor the turtle are capable of following his logic, which seems to me to be the critical point.

krodha wrote:
The one I had in mind was The Animal That Therefore I Am:

Synopsis:
'The Animal That Therefore I Am is the long-awaited translation of the complete text of Jacques Derrida's ten-hour address to the 1997 Crisy conference entitled 'The Autobiographical Animal', the third of four such colloquia on his work. The book was assembled posthumously on the basis of two published sections, one written and recorded session, and one informal recorded session. The book is at once an affectionate look back over the multiple roles played by animals in Derrida's work and a profound philosophical investigation and critique of the relegation of animal life that takes place as a result of the distinction-dating from Descartes -between man as thinking animal and every other living species. That starts with the very fact of the line of separation drawn between the human and the millions of other species that are reduced to a single; the animal. Derrida finds that distinction, or versions of it, surfacing in thinkers as far apart as Descartes, Kant, Heidegger, Lacan, and Levinas, and he dedicates extended analyses to the question in the work of each of them. The book's autobiographical theme intersects with its philosophical analysis through the figures of looking and nakedness, staged in terms of Derrida's experience when his cat follows him into the bathroom in the morning. In a classic deconstructive reversal, Derrida asks what this animal sees and thinks when it sees this naked man. Yet the experiences of nakedness and shame also lead all the way back into the mythologies of man's dominion over the beasts and trace a history of how man has systematically displaced onto the animal his own failings or bêtises. The Animal That Therefore I Am is at times a

militant plea and indictment regarding, especially, the modern industrialized treatment of animals. However, Derrida cannot subscribe to a simplistic version of animal rights that fails to follow through, in all its implications, the questions and definitions of life to which he returned in much of his later work.'

And yes, granted humans have developed to communicate and reason to the extent that a 'shared world' and 'civilization' can be built; but I suppose the question would then have to be raised as to what constitutes being 'civilized'? Or what are the standards by which we are measuring and defining 'civility'? Civilization in and of itself seems to be an idea that has been anthropomorphized and is assumed to suggest (and match) what we as humans deem acceptable as a functional culture and socioeconomic structure. We even project this onto other "uncivilized" cultures within our own species, demonstrated succinctly via the threefold world categorization; first world to third world countries. However, does our 'technologically advanced' culture constitute 'civilization' any more than any other congregation, or organization of sentient beings on this planet, or elsewhere? Even in our technological advancements, we cannot seem to uphold the same standard of 'civility' in our relationships with each other as a species or in our relationship with our environment. Whereas animals and other indigenous populations of human beings have no such issue, who is more civilized in that context?

So there are various ways to looks at this, and I would have to argue that we as human beings, living in our technologically advanced societies, are far from civilized by any meaning of the word. We blindly worship our socioeconomic structures, and rape our environment of resources by any means necessary, and at any cost to support that structure (which in and of itself is failing, in all of its divine wisdom). In my opinion, the true civility is the ability to look into another sentient beings eyes, and see the same sentience staring back at me, no different than my own. Why on earth would I assume my own evolved reasoning and communicational apparatus makes me anything more than that other being? Neither the turtle or the zebra are able to follow such logic? What type of game is that? Holding another being to a standard outside of their innate ability which is founded upon the premise that our own abilities are the standard they should be able to meet (and shame on them for not being able to do so), how is that civilized? It is anything but.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 22nd, 2014 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
Jigme Tsultrim said:
"Reject the anthropocentric falsehood that maintains the oppressive hierarchy of mankind over the animals. "
It is not that which creates this alleged hierarchy, but history. Before the rise of man, the animals hunted and ate us as they saw fit.

krodha wrote:
Very true. I don't think it's an objection to the natural order of predator and prey. What's

being addressed is the perverse subjugation and objectification of other beings as bio machines and so on... literally using them as a means to fulfill human interests. The anthropocentric falsehood he's addressing is simply the way that humanity's relationship to animals has evolved to be what it is today. Whether it's influences such as the church originally declaring that animals have no soul, which spilled over into scientific views, or otherwise. A prime example being the fact that in just the past five years, scientists have reformed their views to state that animals have consciousness, or that they have emotions etc. Which is ludicrous to think that many thought otherwise, the level of disconnect there is astonishing to say the least. I literally saw an article not even six months ago which said something to the order of; 'scientists declare that animals have consciousness'. Even the very titles 'animal' and 'human' sets humanity apart, Derrida has an excellent piece about this.

All in all it should be blatantly obvious that humanity puts itself on a pedestal. But yes you're right, animals used to hunt us too, and still may in some regions of the world. What they don't do however, is put us in factory farms by the tens of millions, pump us full of antibiotics, milk us and systematically kill us for our meat or profitable parts. When a systematic killing of humans occurs we call it genocide, when a systematic killing of animals occurs, we call it the standard.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 8:33 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
This thread wouldn't be complete without a little love from Earth Crisis...

Earth Crisis - New Ethic

This is the new ethic.
Animals' lives are their own and must be given respect.
Reject the anthropocentric falsehood that maintains the oppressive hierarchy of mankind over the animals.
It's time to set them free.

PadmaVonSamba said:
Are they still allowed to kill and eat each other?
Is it okay for some primates to be omnivores?
.
.
.

krodha wrote:
Not my writing, but Karl Earth Crisis is a nice guy, I'm sure he'd give his opinion if you really wanted to ask.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Online videos of Tummo
Content:
krodha wrote:
^ very true.

Wanting to cultivate the physical heat of tummo to melt some snow or cut your gas bill in half during the winter isn't going to cut it, ha (not implying that was anyone's intentions here).

The physical heat of tummo is an expression of energy and correct practice, but those outer signs aren't the main point of tummo. Sure, the increase in body heat is beneficial for wandering yogis who need to survive the harsh climates where this practice hails from, but the 'heat' of tummo is truly meant as an inner process. Just as 'heat' is cultivated in the worldly yogas of the path of accumulation and joining. The increase of heat on the path (and in tummo) is the increase of wisdom [prajñā] i.e. the wisdom fire. The bodhisattva ideal being the main inspiration, just as it is elsewhere.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: Online videos of Tummo
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
I'm sure you can learn the basic tummo practice from a book from Lama Yeshe, why would he write instructions and practices on/for tummo if not to make the disciples taste the experience of tummo. Garchen Rinpoche has also a practice on the internet that is a tummo practice.

krodha wrote:
Books which feature an explanation of the sadhāna are supposed to be supplementary reference material for those who have received transmission and instruction from a qualified guru. Sure we're all grown adults and people can (and will) do as they please, but it is strongly advised that aspirants seek intimate instruction for practices such as tummo. Especially due to the fact that tummo is an energy practice which is working directly with rlung [skt. prāna] via drag rlung, kumbhaka and so on. The various extended holds, contractions, postures, specific breathing techniques etc. can be dangerous if executed improperly.

Plus there are various signs to watch out for, primarily the winds congregating in specific areas, which if is not addressed, adjusted and/or compensated for, can produce myriad imbalances and disorders of the winds. This is why one will generally receive tsa rlung instruction as well. In addition if the individual is lacking steady one pointed concentration (extended engagement, placement, stabilization etc.) the associated

visualizations aren't going to work. Not to mention that tummo is generally a retreat type practice, and will most likely not issue the same results for someone who is only dabbling in it for an hour (give or take) a day.

There's no problem with reading about tummo and familiarizing with the practice, so that when the opportunity arises to receive instruction you can ask questions and get clarifications. But the text or video instruction alone are insufficient, in my opinion at least, the living transmission (from the qualified guru) should be sought out above all else.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 21st, 2014 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
This thread wouldn't be complete without a little love from Earth Crisis...

Earth Crisis - New Ethic

This is the new ethic.
Animals' lives are their own and must be given respect.
Reject the anthropocentric falsehood that maintains the oppressive hierarchy of mankind over the animals.
It's time to set them free.
Their lives reduced to biomachines in the factory, farm and laboratory.
Dairy, eggs and meat, fur, suede, wool, leather are the end products of torture, confinement and murder.
I abjure their use out of reverence for all innocent life.
Wildlifes' right to live in peace in their natural environment
without this civilization's interference can no longer be denied.
Must no longer be denied.
To make a civilization worthy of the word civilized the cruelty must end, starting within or own lives.
Reject the anthropocentric falsehood that maintains the oppressive hierarchy of mankind over the animals.
It's time to set them free.
Veganism is the essence of compassion and peaceful living.
The animals are not ours to abuse or dominate.
I abjure their use out of reverence ...
I abjure their use out of reverence ...
I abjure their use out of reverence for all innocent life.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 11:34 AM
Title: Re: Memory and Impermanence
Content:
dharmagoat said:
It is not memory that makes a being aware, and it could be argued that memories serve to detract from awareness of the moment, so I question whether a being without memory would be in any way "dumbed down". There would be indifference to impermanence, but not necessarily any decrease in awareness.

And there would still be suffering based on unpleasant sensations.

krodha wrote:
True, memory does not necessarily make a sentient being aware, meaning; cognitive processes continue to function in the absence of the ability to retain memory. However there would be no retention of cognitive information and therefore one's condition would be no different than that of a newborn infant. Hence why working with individuals who suffer from dementia is essentially equivalent to working with a child.

'Dumbed down' is appropriate in this case because this scenario would be equivalent to simply functioning in the causal ālaya, with no hope of acquiring the type of insight needed to be liberated from a predicament of that nature.

Now on the other hand, if the individual is able to cut through memory via direct insight into its emptiness, that is a different story. In that case the influence of memory would be pacified through prajñā, and that species of insight would most likely collapse the ālaya, inducing a freedom from the delusory reference point maintained by memory and imputing ignorance. Quite the opposite of the 'dumbed down' abiding in the limited, karmically influenced structure of mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 20th, 2014 at 10:23 AM
Title: Re: Memory and Impermanence
Content:
krodha wrote:
If memory was absent or the ability to retain memories deteriorated, the individual's condition would still remain in a state of dumbed down indeterminate indifference. There would be no experience of impermanence just as there's no experience of impermanence in unconscious states. But that isn't equivalent to a true liberation from impermanence etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 5:51 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen
Content:
thigle said:
It seems in every way, that some people confuse "tantric preliminaries" with "dzogchen" and the "natural state" with an "artificial state".

krodha wrote:
The Dzogchen teachings also have preliminaries available for practitioners who need them, which is mostly everyone. Khor 'das ru shan is training which aids in distinguishing samsara and nirvana, meaning; distinguishing mind [sems] from the nature of mind [sems nyid]. Inner rushan is called the purification of the six lokas, and is a valuable practice which is considered to be a vital preliminary for man ngag sde practices.

It has nothing to do with tantric preliminaries and everything to do with the system of Atiyoga. If one is unable to recognize the nature of their mind then there is no way the natural state can be known. Any practice associated with Dzogchen which helps the aspirant to recognize their nature (initially or continually) can be called a 'preliminary'.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 19th, 2014 at 6:28 AM
Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen
Content:
mutsuk said:
With Thögel you don't visualize, you contemplate the arising of the dynamism of your natural state.

anjali said:
The dynamism of the natural state could also be contemplated through sound. An approach that seems not much discussed, even by way of theory. I'd be interested in hearing thoughts on this.

krodha wrote:
You may be referring to the practice of the sound of the elements. It seems that your sentiments regarding the overlooking of this practice is generally true, even historically, The Third Dzogchen Rinpoche writes:

"In the Heart Essence of Vimalimitra yet another approach is taken. To the preliminaries mentioned above, a practice involving the sounds of the four elements is added. In some systems stemming from this lineage, the practice of the four elements and the outer and inner separation practices [khor 'das ru shan] are not addressed, or are mentioned only in passing. In his Background Teachings on the Direct Leap [thögal] from the Guru's Quintessence, Longchenpa clearly emphasizes the importance of the preliminaries of the three gates relative to these other practices. In this text, he explains the preliminaries of the three gates as the main preliminary practices, while concerning the yogas of the four elements and the separation practices, he states, 'It is permissible

to precede the preliminaries of the three gates by training in the sounds and nature of the four elements and the conduct of the separation of samsara and nirvana, or to simply skip these steps.' Some instruction manuals omit these practices altogether."

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche mentions the practice of the sounds of the elements in his twenty one sems 'dzins text and states that the practice is discussed in the sgra thal 'gyur tantra.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 15th, 2014 at 6:43 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
This should spice up the conversation a little. If you remove the frontal cortex from the chicken, is it still suffering?

"...But Ford goes a step further and proposes a “Headless Chicken Solution.” This would involve removing the cerebral cortex of the chicken to inhibit its sensory perceptions so that it could be produced in more densely packed conditions without the associated distress. The brain stem for the chicken would be kept intact so that the homeostatic functions continue to operate, allowing it to grow."

more here...
http://www.wired.com/underwire/2012/02/headless-chicken-solution/

can samsara get any weirder?
.
.
.

krodha wrote:
The way this metaphorically mirrors the current socioeconomic system in general is uncanny. And the way it microcosmically frames our attitude towards (and relationship to) nature in general isn't even metaphorical. If only we could subjugate everything by process of lobotomy! (sarcasm of course)

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 8:26 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:

pueraeternus said:
What if the direct introduction didn't work?

theanarchist said:
Then you continue practicing sutra and tantra practices

krodha wrote:
Many practices are available to help refine or further reveal the intention of the introduction. Such as the four ting nge 'dzins [contemplations] of sems sde or the sems 'dzins and so on.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 11th, 2014 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
krodha wrote:
The apparent causal implications only ever arise in relation to one's knowledge of wisdom. Wisdom itself is complete but (for 99% of practitioners) our knowledge of wisdom requires refinement.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 4th, 2014 at 10:24 AM
Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's ālaya [kun gzhi] and ālayavijñāna [kun gzhi rnam shes]. The ālaya consciousness is the latter. Both can carry different meanings and may be defined differently depending on the tradition concerned.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 4th, 2014 at 9:12 AM
Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod
Content:
krodha wrote:
Guty are you dmr82 on vajracakra?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 1st, 2014 at 1:33 PM
Title: Re: Studying The Heart Sutra (Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya)
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Ceaseless Echoes of the Great Silence: A Commentary on the Heart Sūtra" by Khenpo Palden Sherab Rinpoche is another good text.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 2:03 AM
Title: Re: Alien & UFOs thread...
Content:
padma norbu said:
Just bumping because I get the feeling skeptics never heard of this before.

krodha wrote:
McKinnon makes a good point about the suppressed technology. I have no doubt that there is advance technology available at this point which is suppressed due to the fact that (i) it either hasn't been streamlined into a profitable form, or (ii) is not profitable at all and therefore will not see the light of day. The only reason we're all still using vehicles powered by gasoline is due to the fact that entire economies revolve around the oil trade and so on. These empires and corporations are not about to let their bread and butter fall to the wayside unless they can adjust their current structures, so that they evolve with (and compensate for) whatever the new reigning paradigm in energy would be. Money makes the world go 'round.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 1:40 PM
Title: Re: Alien & UFOs thread...
Content:
krodha wrote:
I saw a UFO while driving home from ganapuja about six months ago (in the SF east bay area). It was right over my car, and was flying pretty low. It didn't make any noise and it was triangular with various colored lights, flew very slow, practically hovering for about 20 seconds and then it picked up its pace and flew off. Bizarre experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 8:25 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
Wayuu said:
I have been told the same from some students in the comunity here, but doesn't that statements seem contradictory compared to what is said in the K.G.?

krodha wrote:
The kun byed rgyal po is speaking from the ultimate standpoint as primordial wisdom. The system of Dzogchen is a means to recognize primordial wisdom, integrate with primordial wisdom, and then actualize buddhahood. That is what practice is for.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 5:24 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals

Content:
Wayuu said:
Thanks for your replies asunthatneversets, have you asked this question to a qualified teacher?

krodha wrote:
Yes, and here is a qualified teacher clarifying this point:

"Lopon comments that while the practitioner is not distracted but is continuously in the natural state it is as if he or she is in space - whatever is done, no traces are left behind. As we said, whether you paint black or white on space nothing remains. The base that keeps the traces is lost; it is empty.
Of course this only applies to a practitioner who has achieved continuous contemplation. For other people who still grasp at their karmic traces this does not apply. When the Lopon first came to Swayambhu in Nepal in 1944 he met some Tibetans with whom he travelled for some days. One man was a former monk who had a wife and children and was carrying a huge load of luggage on his back. When he was a monk he had met Dega Rinpoche, a famous Dzogchenpa, in the mountains and consequentially he gave up his robes because he felt he was too tied up with the vinaya vows. But Lopon pointed out that he was equally tied up with his children. The man replied that in Dzogchen it is said that it does not matter what you do - so he was free to do anything and that was okay. But this is a complete misunderstanding of Dzogchen. The teachings only apply when you are totally absorbed in the natural state. It depends on your practice and only you can judge.
So it is a paradox that beginners must take actions even though the ultimate Dzogchen view has no action. The beginner must take a very strong action - a decision - otherwise there will be doubt and hesitancy. All the preparatory methods help us realize the natural state. But once it is seen and understood then the situation is different. The experience Dzogchenpa would not need to do preparatory practices at all."
- Lopon Tenzin Namdak

and another from him on the same issue:

"In the practice of Dzogchen, we do not find it necessary to do visualizations of deities or to do recitations like the Refuge and Bodhichitta. Some would say that these are not necessary to do at all, but this is speaking from the side of the Natural State only. They say in the Natural State, everything is present there already in potential, and so there is nothing lacking and nothing more to do to add or acquire anything. This is fine. But on the side of the practitioner, there is much to do and practices such as Refuge and Bodhichitta are very necessary. In its own terms, Dzogchen has no rules; it is open to everything. But does this mean we can do just what we feel like at the moment? On the side of the Natural State, this is true and there are no restrictions or limitations. All appearances are manifestations of mind (sems kyi snang-ba), like reflections seen in a mirror, and there is no inherent negativity or impurity in them. Everything is perfectly all right just as it is, as the energy (rtsal) of the Nature of Mind in manifestation. It is like white and black clouds passing overhead in the sky; they equally obscure the face of the sun. When they depart, there are no traces left behind. However, that is speaking

only on the side of the Natural State, which is like the clear, open sky, unaffected by the presence or absence of these clouds. For the sky, it is all the same. But on the side of the practitioner, it is quite different because we mistakenly believe these clouds are solid, opaque, and quite real and substantial. As practitioners we must first come to an understanding of the insubstantiality and unreality of all these clouds which obscure the sky of our own Nature of Mind (sems-nyid). It is our Tawa (lta-ba), or view, our way of looking at things, which is basic and fundamental, and we must begin here. Then we must practice and attain realization. So on the side of the practitioner, practice and commitment are most certainly required. The Natural State in itself is totally open and clear and spacious like the sky but we, as individuals, are not totally open and unobstructed."
- Lopon Tenzin Namdak

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
Wayuu said:
But when you say is useful for me you are talking about duality again... doesn't that just distract us? isn't better to go direct?

asunthatneversets said:
You as an individual are the result of confusion (or ignorance) about your primordial state. Your primordial state is originally pure and is always undefiled, however your knowledge of that primordial state requires introduction and refinement. The kun byed rgyal po is saying that from the perspective of your primordial state [primordial wisdom i.e. ye shes], practice, rituals and so on are extraneous, because your primordial state is naturally perfected. You as an individual on the other hand, need to refine your knowledge of your primordial state, and therefore for you, practice and rituals and so on, are necessary. So it's a paradox. The ultimate state requires nothing, but you in your relative condition do require practice. When your knowledge of your primordial state is complete (through practice and integration), there will no longer be a difference between you and primordial wisdom. Until that time though, relative effort is required.

Wayuu said:
What I understand is that effort is not the way in any condition, but as I said, I'm just a beginner, I will try to talk to a qualified teacher and let you know his opinion.

krodha wrote:
Skillful effort is required until the ultimate nature of mind [sems nyid] is recognized. Through that recognition, the ability to distinguish mind from wisdom occurs, and the practice then is to familiarize and rest in one's knowledge [rig pa] of wisdom [ye shes]. That practice is 'effortless', because effort necessarily entails a subject who is attempting to 'do something' or 'maintain something'. However there is nothing which is being 'done' in that sense, because that definitive rigpa is free of mind, and is therefore free of a subject which is mediating experience. So the praxis is simply resting in that

effortless natural state.

The definitive practice is effortless, however initially, some (skillful) effort is required. Good that you're maintaining a relationship with a qualified teacher though, the seemingly contradictory paradoxes like the issue you've raised here are precisely why the guru is an indispensable aspect of Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals
Content:
Wayuu said:
But when you say is useful for me you are talking about duality again... doesn't that just distract us? isn't better to go direct?

krodha wrote:
You as an individual are the result of confusion (or ignorance) about your primordial state. Your primordial state is originally pure and is always undefiled, however your knowledge of that primordial state requires introduction and refinement. The kun byed rgyal po is saying that from the perspective of your primordial state [primordial wisdom i.e. ye shes], practice, rituals and so on are extraneous, because your primordial state is naturally perfected. You as an individual on the other hand, need to refine your knowledge of your primordial state, and therefore for you, practice and rituals and so on, are necessary. So it's a paradox. The ultimate state requires nothing, but you in your relative condition do require practice. When your knowledge of your primordial state is complete (through practice and integration), there will no longer be a difference between you and primordial wisdom. Until that time though, relative effort is required.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
But if you want to know my opinion: when dreaming at night, stuff that happens makes sense, i.e. dream "causality" makes sense. After you wake up, the dream often appears in retrospect arbitrary and incoherent, and it would seem the height of folly to try to analyze how and according to what "causality" your grandmother turned into a bus . I believe this so-called waking reality is no different: while we're in the midst of it, it seems real, significant and consistent. When we die, or when we attain some measure of "lucid waking", it then seems like a weird or possibly mildly interesting dream, nothing more.
Now you sound like a Yogacarin.

krodha wrote:
It's the same for Dzogchen, and most other dharma systems.

"At no time throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes has there ever been an actual birth. There has only been the appearance of birth. There has never been actual death, only the transformation of appearances like the shift from the dream state to the waking state... throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes there has never been any actual experience of transition or going from one state to another, or any actual experience of being located in some other place. This is analogous to the images in a dream."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 9:21 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
The Buddha was also clear that what was not-self(anatta) was suffering.

krodha wrote:
Again, this inaccurate misconception of yours has been demonstrated by various individuals to be false.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 3:57 AM
Title: Re: enjoying samsara
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
According to Gampopa, the first two (of four) obstacles to liberation are attachment to the things of this life, and attachment to the pleasures of samsara. So tread lightly in your enjoyment!

Johnny Dangerous said:
What are the pleasures of samsara in this context though? is a feeling of freedom due to lack of clinging to the past for instance something that you can "enjoy" without more clinging?

krodha wrote:
One's life being more enjoyable is a common (and good) indicator that your relationship with the teachings is healthy. Gampopa is warning against complacency with samsara and attachment to aspects of samsara. Mindfulness of the cyclical and impermanent nature of samsara is what's important, things can go great and life can be good but what comes will go, and what arises will fall. That's the only point he's making. The fact that you made the OP in the first place shows that you're mindful of this already so you're good to go.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 3:36 AM
Title: Re: enjoying samsara
Content:
krodha wrote:
According to Gampopa, the first two (of four) obstacles to liberation are attachment to the things of this life, and attachment to the pleasures of samsara. So tread lightly in your enjoyment!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
I'm not asking about first causes, but rather bases of imputation in the Madhyamaka view. The whole magical person thing is bogus & irrelevant, as I have shown.

Malcolm said:
I already explained this: the basis of imputation is an appearance. Some trends on Madhyamaka then assert that appearances are mind. Since appearances/mind are not findable on analysis, they/it are equated with illusion. Illusions lack any inherent nature because they are dependent originations. Dependent originations are free from extremes and, in the final analysis, inexpressible. None of this is circular in anyway.

You ask, what dependently arises -- we can say all kinds of things, but in the end, it boils down to appearance. What are appearances? Dependent arisings. What dependently arises? Appearances. This is not a circularity, it is an equation appearances = dependent origination.

If you want to be more specific you can say what appearance? A rope or a car, for example. Upon what is a rope designated? It's parts. Upon what are the parts designated? Their parts, if they have any. If they do not have further parts, then they are designated upon moments, etc., until one runs out of bases of imputation. At that point, you have [intellectually] discovered emptiness, i.e., the absence of a ultimate or final basis of designation. At each stage of the analysis the previous basis of imputation no longer appears since it is has been deconstructed. As Shantideva points out:

When an existent or a nonexistent
does not exist in the presence of the mind,
at that time since there is no other aspect
[concepts] are fully pacified as there is no objective support [dmigs pa, ālambana].
yes, rigpa resolves all questions about the nature of reality, but there ain't no rigpa in Madhyamaka.
Actually, Shantideva's quote above shows that there is vidyā in Madhyamaka, as the

Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

The Dharma free from the extremes of conceptual grasping.
is directly perceived without dwelling on an object.

These two statements should be understood to have the same import.

krodha wrote:
Malcolm, should the rig pa rang shar quote say "the dharmatā free from extremes"? Or is "the Dharma free from extremes" correct in this context?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 10:15 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
I wouldn't say so. Nāgārjuna's entire exposition concerns what occurs after the basis isn't recognized in Dzogchen.
I would tend to agree with you, but a Gelugpa would not accept the idea of a "basis" at all. Once you say that there is a "basis", no matter how you define or don't define it, you've left Nagarjuna behind--unless you accept "In Praise of Dharmadhatu" as authored by Nagarjuna.

krodha wrote:
I'm not saying that Madhyamaka prescribes to the Dzogchen view. I'm saying that within the Dzogchen model, when it comes to what occurs from the standpoint of dependent origination occurring via mind and so on, it's perfectly acceptable to reference Nāgārjuna's view. I'm in no way saying that Madhyanaka by itself has anything to do with the basis or anything else.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 8:23 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
sure, but that does not address the fact that the traditional presentation of imputation requires a rope first. Im sure thats why paratantra was made up. you can break it down to atoms, but what is the "rope" that atoms are imputed on?

anjali said:
Depends on what you think emptiness is. It's not nothing, in the nihilistic sense. If you accept the trikaya model, then you have emptiness+cognizance+radiance. Throw ignorance into the mix, and you are off and running with endless fabrications.

gad rgyangs said:
discussing Nagarjuna & Madhyamaka from the Tantric or Dzoghchen POV is anachronistic.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't say so. Nāgārjuna's entire exposition concerns what occurs after the basis isn't recognized in Dzogchen. Dependent origination is the name of the game when it comes to the proliferation of mind and avidyā.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 6:02 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Either way, Dzogpa Chenpo never advocates for a substantial existence.

smcj said:
Neither does Great Madhyamaka advocate for a "substantial" existence. As I quoted Samba as saying on p. 19 of this thread, "the ineffable ground that is also empty (but not empti-ness-a-thing)" is a restating of the Great Madhyamak view.

krodha wrote:
Empti-ness-a-thing?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 5:49 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
Also, you simply reiterated what I wrote here, and this still isn't a valid grounds to assert that the Dzogchen and gzhan stong views are the same. Dudjom Rinpoche is clearly advocating for both views in context.
Yes, I restated what you wrote in clearer language. Yes, Dudjom R. advocates both views, one for an intellectual approach, one for a meditational/experiential approach.

Dudjom R. p.162 "The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism":

...the Madhyamika are divided into both adherents of the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka which claims there is no substantial existence, and the subtle, inner Great Madhyamaka of the definitive meaning. (underlining mine)

Dudjom R. subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. You are more than welcome to follow ChNN's lead on this, but his opinion is not universally held.

krodha wrote:
Either way, Dzogpa Chenpo never advocates for a substantial existence.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.
I believe what D.R. said was that Prasangika view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached intellectually, and Great Madhyamaka view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached from an experiential/meditational perspective. He calls the Prasangika the "coarse outer Madhyamaka" as opposed to the "subtle inner Madhyamaka". He subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. I've got the quote(s) somewhere in the Big Red Book. I will look them up if you so desire.

krodha wrote:
Also, you simply reiterated what I wrote here, and this still isn't a valid grounds to assert that the Dzogchen and gzhan stong views are the same. Dudjom Rinpoche is clearly advocating for both views in context.

On top of that, as to what is definitive and what isn't, this is always going to be a reflection of the individual concerned. That being said, there are many Dzogchenpas who consider Prasanga to be definitive, and others who attest that the third turning does not overturn or contradict the fundamental view championed by the second turning. Wanting to see something different is a common proclivity of those who err towards an eternalistic view.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 5:24 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.
I believe what D.R. said was that Prasangika is best if the subject of emptiness is approached intellectually, and Great Madhyamaka is best if the subject of emptiness is approached from a meditational perspective. I've got the quote somewhere in the Big Red Book. I will look it up if you so desire.

However, as I've said, ChNN disagrees, which is his right to do. So it is not as if there is a right and a wrong here, just different opinions by two qualified experts about a subject that is ineffable anyway.

krodha wrote:
The proper view of the basis is original purity [ka dag], which is a freedom from extremes.

As for an alleged controversy regarding the nature of the Dzogchen view in reference to gzhan stong and so on, I don't think there is one. Maybe for gzhan stong pa's there is. The only issue you're going to run into is wanting to see some aspect of Dzogchen as suggesting there is something which isn't empty. The system is very clear in its view, Honesty I'm not even sure where one would find some information to misinterpret so that they could err into a view of inherency.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
Not in the least. The basis [gzhi] is primordial wisdom [ye shes]. Completely empty.
Exactly so. That is the view. What is exactly so? That the basis in Dzogchen is similar to that of gzhan stong?
In my opinion, yes. However Dudjom R. subscribed to Great Madhyamaka/Shentong view also, so I'm in good company.

On the other hand ChNN does not, so it is controversial. It is not settled, nor will it be in our lifetimes.

krodha wrote:
Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.

Dzogchen itself is free of either view but if it has to accord with one, rang stong would be more accurate. As is seen with Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche's advocacy for Nāgārjuna's view being identical to the Dzogchen view, in the sense of both championing a freedom from extremes.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
I am of the opinion that Dzogchen's "ineffable ground that is also empty (but not empti-

ness-a-thing)" is a re-stating of Great Madhyamaka, a.k.a. Shentong view.

asunthatneversets said:
Not in the least. The basis [gzhi] is primordial wisdom [ye shes]. Completely empty.

smcj said:
Exactly so. That is the view.

krodha wrote:
What is exactly so? That the basis in Dzogchen is similar to that of gzhan stong?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
smcj said:
I am of the opinion that Dzogchen's "ineffable ground that is also empty (but not empti-ness-a-thing)" is a re-stating of Great Madhyamaka, a.k.a. Shentong view.

krodha wrote:
Not in the least. The basis [gzhi] is primordial wisdom [ye shes]. Completely empty.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
pensum said:
Well, whatever the case, at least we now have evidence that at least one quite remarkable siddhi is possible:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

asunthatneversets said:
Not trying to naysay, because it would be cool if this was legitimate, but I'm pretty sure that's a fly crawling on the camera lens.

pensum said:
Oh ye of little faith! Perhaps if he was not Hindu, but Buddhist you would view things differently.

krodha wrote:
I thought he was Buddhist. Whether someone is Buddhist or Hindu doesn't matter to

me! I don't allow my personal affinity for Buddhism to influence my judgement of things beyond the principles of the systems.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 12:06 PM
Title: Re: Non-meditation and distractions
Content:
krodha wrote:
The non-meditation they're speaking of is resting in the ultimate nature of mind [sems nyid] so it's free of a reference point. That is why it's called 'non-meditation', because it's free of mind, and is therefore free of an agent which is performing a meditation. Non-meditation from the standpoint of mind isn't possible, but (introduction from your teacher, along with) practices like śamatha, if done correctly, will help to create the right conditions for recognition of the mind's nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 11:29 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
pensum said:
Well, whatever the case, at least we now have evidence that at least one quite remarkable siddhi is possible:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

krodha wrote:
Not trying to naysay, because it would be cool if this was legitimate, but I'm pretty sure that's a fly crawling on the camera lens.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 5:33 AM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
If you ever get a chance compare the teachings of Ven Maha Boowa (Theravadan) to Ven Dolpopa (Shentong).

krodha wrote:
It's not surprising that two individuals who err into eternalism would be similar in their expositions.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: McKenna's Stoned Ape Theory
Content:
krodha wrote:
And some more... Joe Rogan talking about the Stoned Ape theory and the evolution of Humans. Taken from his The Joe Rogan Experience Podcast #79 with Redban And Jon Lajoie:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: McKenna's Stoned Ape Theory
Content:
krodha wrote:
Here's an interesting discussion about the 'stoned ape theory' between Joe Rogan and Graham Hancock, the topic comes up around 1:10:00

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 1:11 PM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Jeeprs "
The notion that nirvana is annihilation of the self is close to nihilist. Buddhism often sails very close to nihilism and attracts many people who have nihilist views. It's a very delicate matter. I don't think Buddhism is nihilist, but it's a very difficult question.
SN 22.46 Impermanent (2) pg 885 Ven Bodhi translation
"What is suffering is not-self"

whatever is devoid of a self is suffering,if Nirvana was devoid of a self it would be suffering also.

krodha wrote:

Your misconceptions regarding this notion have been addressed and refuted numerous times.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: The Feeling Is The Prayer (?)
Content:
krodha wrote:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche has said the same thing, he spoke of students who simply go through the motions with their practices and don't incorporate the feeling and intention of the practice, and they come to him and ask why their practice isn't going well. He said the intention and the feeling are paramount in our practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Jnana Sagara
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Isn't Jnana Sagara Yeshe Tsogyal?

krodha wrote:
She immediately came to mind when I saw this thread as well... it's how she is referred to in her mantra.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:48 AM
Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?
Content:
ngodrup said:
Is there a DC member in the San Francisco Bay Area who is good
at constructing a Namkha? I would like in-person assistance or
to have one made for me. Thanks.

krodha wrote:
Do you go to Dondrub Ling at all? I know there's been a Namkha workshop there before, and we just did a Namkha rite last month for someone during a group puja. If not I can probably get you in contact with someone though.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 9:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Caz said:

Is this Rigpa the same as Clear light ? or is it a seperate entity ?

krodha wrote:
(Started this post before I saw Malcolm's reply but figure I'd post this anyway) As far as Clear Light goes I'm not very well versed, but perhaps this will point you in the right direction:

cloudburst wrote:
I wonder if you feel that very subtle mind of clear light and view of Dzogchen are same? If not, what is difference?

Malcolm wrote:
If by "subtle mind of clear light" you mean an "uncontrived momentary awareness" (ma bcos pa shes pa skad cig ma), then the view is similar.

cloudburst wrote:
I suppose I do not know if this is what I mean, as this terminology falls outside my experience. How is this uncontrived momentary awareness different from my moment to moment uncontrived awareness?

Malcolm wrote:
The difference is summed up nicely by "Parting From The Four Attachments "If grasping arises, it is no the view."
(The above is from this thread:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=3483)

This also may be helpful:

Clarity, Rigpa and Interpretations of Clear Light:
https://dharmaconnectiongroup.blogspot.com/2013/06/clarity-rigpa-and-interpretations-of.html?m=1

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:09 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
What is the difference between primordial and non gradual? Primordial is the reality right? Having that actually become beneficial, that's where it's either gradual or non gradual.

krodha wrote:
Gradual and non-gradual are modes of realization, wisdom is originally pure and is therefore free of such partialities. As described in these statements from Longchenpa shared by Malcolm some time ago:

"Because an object to realize is not established since that ultimate dharmatā is beyond mind, a so called 'realization' in the relative is described to be solely a deluded concept."

And,

"Here, since it is demonstrated there is nothing to be realized, nothing introduced, beyond view and meditation, it is called 'beyond realization and non-realization'."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 7:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure [ka dag] and naturally perfected [lhun grub], all that is required is recognition. From the standpoint of wisdom the whole charade of samsāra and nirvāna is illusory and unreal.

Caz said:
If its naturally perfected why is it unmanifest ? If it is Primordial and naturally perfected why is there Samsara in the first place ?

krodha wrote:
It is manifest, just unrecognized. Samsāra seems to appear due to the non-recognition of wisdom, but like a spinning fire wheel it is just an illusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 6:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Caz said:
How can Buddhahood be Inherently accomplished when it is not manifest ? If it was Inherent as suggested then by nature it would be unchanging and hence never unmanifest yet sentient beings still experience Samsaric suffering and have to work hard to accomplish Enlightenment.

The potentiality is always present but how could Buddhahood be present in the mind of an ordinary being ?

krodha wrote:
Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure [ka dag] and naturally perfected [lhun grub], all that is required is recognition. From the standpoint of wisdom the whole charade of samsāra and nirvāna is illusory and unreal.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 10:21 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
Indeed don't reject meditation, so long as you also don't accept it. To me, this is like creating a hypothetical universe and arguing why it won't help or hurt anyone so there's nothing to worry about.

krodha wrote:
It's because mind is an illusory reference point which arises due to grasping [accepting and rejecting]. Since one's nature it is free of mind, it is free of acceptance and rejection. If one conceptualizes vidyā free from mind, or grasps at realization as something that can be acquired, then mind will arise.

The quote is also saying that if the statements in the first paragraph are interpreted as advocating for a rejection meditation or realization, and this notion is grasped to, then mind will arise. There's nothing to realize from the standpoint of vidyā, because vidyā is free of mind [subject relating to objects]. There's also nothing to meditate upon from the standpoint of vidyā, because vidyā is free of mind [subject involved in contrived meditation].

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 7:11 AM
Title: Re: Thamal gyi shepa vs. baby rigpa vs. rigpa (etc.)
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tsoknyi Rinpoche, Dudjom Lingpa and Jean-Luc Achard are reputable sources. But your scrutiny is both understandable and warranted so no worries.

For the sake of being clear though, that wasn't advocating for a binary model. The expression of rigpa as mere clarity is simply the mind, Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche refers to it as 'rigpa mistaken as illusory mind'. The authentic rigpa that the praxis of Dzogchen is based on is the knowledge of our nature, which is accessed through recognition of the mind's nature. Clarity alone lacks discernment and can't differentiate mind and wisdom, but it's a suitable basis for one's initial practice (and a necessary one for most).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Thamal gyi shepa vs. baby rigpa vs. rigpa (etc.)
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tsoknyi Rinpoche (among other teachers) say that one's mere clarity [cognizance] which registers whether there is stillness or movement [of mind, etc.] is referred to as rig pa. However it isn't rigpa in the sense of rang byung rig pa which arises as knowledge of

primordial wisdom [ye shes], that is spoken of in Dzogpa Chenpo.

The former is the mere clarity of mind (encountered in śamatha etc.), Dudjom Lingpa refers to clarity as the 'conventional nature of mind' (as opposed to the true nature of mind i.e. sems nyid). The latter results from recognizing the nature of mind [sems nyid]. The latter rigpa is the true meditation, Tsoknyi Rinpoche goes on to say that we may meditate for an hour and only glimpse our nature (which is the actual meditation) for 3 or 4 seconds. The more we practice the more frequent those flashes or instances will become, the point is to familiarize with that nature and allow those moments to become prolonged.

Jean-Luc Achard says that in this sense, our rigpa is (at first) an impermanent occurrence which fluctuates while on the path. When we no longer fluctuate back and forth between rigpa and mind we are Buddhas.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 10:36 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
I have a really hard time maintaining awareness, sometimes I barely get through the visualization before I fall asleep heh. Dreams are more vivid of course...

krodha wrote:
Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche says that for building familiarization and clarity with the visualization, you can start with visualizing the thigle at your heart, and then add another stacked on top of the first, then another on top of that etc. So you end up building a chain of stacked thigles which extend up through your throat and head to the crown. Once you get to the crown of the head you can start to subtract the thigles one by one until you finish with the single thigle in the chest. He said this exercise will strengthen your ability to visualize, and the vividness of your clarity [cognizance] will also increase.

Also the body staying completely relaxed helps, and try not to move. You can scan your body piece by piece and totally relax that section as you go along. Tension in the jaw, tension in the throat, wherever there's tension make sure to totally relax.

And don't visualize too intensely, Norbu Rinpoche says the visualization is supposed to help you relax mostly. Keeps you from following discursive thought etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
smcj said:

There are paths where the subject never comes up. I know western Karma Kagyu graduates of 3 year retreat that know nothing of the subject, and some become irate if you try to raise it. They don't want to even hear about it.

krodha wrote:
My Drikung Kagyu teacher is adamant about it, and says buddhanature is profound emptiness... the 'vajra' in Vajrayāna means emptiness, etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 3:44 AM
Title: Re: Locality of nibbanna
Content:
flowerbudh said:
Might we all be in nirvana already and we just don't know?

asunthatneversets said:
It's more that buddhahood is an innate quality. This is sometimes conveyed with the concept of buddha nature [tathāgatagharbha], we all have inborn Buddha potential because our fundamental nature is primordially pure [as profound emptiness]. The fact that we are ignorant of this is the root of samsara. When we recognize this inborn nature, and dispel our afflictive conditioning, fully integrating with our nature, then that is nirvana [buddhahood / dharmakāya].

dude said:
I agree with you.
On second thought, I'd say that perception of emptiness, while very high, still falls short.

krodha wrote:
A perception [recognition] of emptiness would fall short, the realization of emptiness [dharmakāya] however, is a complete knowledge, and wouldn't fall short. In some traditions that realization can occur in a more refined manner, but ultimately buddhahood is buddhahood. The realization of emptiness is liberation.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 2:31 PM
Title: Re: Locality of nibbanna
Content:
flowerbudh said:
Might we all be in nirvana already and we just don't know?

krodha wrote:
It's more that buddhahood is an innate quality. This is sometimes conveyed with the concept of buddha nature [tathāgatagharbha], we all have inborn Buddha potential because our fundamental nature is primordially pure [as profound emptiness]. The fact that we are ignorant of this is the root of samsara. When we recognize this inborn nature,

and dispel our afflictive conditioning, fully integrating with our nature, then that is nirvana [buddhahood / dharmakāya].

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 4:50 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Malcolm said:
The only reason I brought up the distinction was because Dante made reference to the gzhi snang concept. Had he advanced the bodhicitta gambit, the discussion would have taken a different turn.

krodha wrote:
Just for the sake of clarity, say the bodhicitta gambit had been referenced; what would be an example of a proper response in that context? Appreciate the tip though, the prospect of varying treatments (of these principles) within the tradition is definitely interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
In order to see the basis as it is, rather than the deluded superimposition (samaropa) we normally perceive, we have to uproot the all-basis, the so called ālaya.
this is causal as frak.

krodha wrote:
"Those who, not understanding this, mistake the ālaya for the dharmakāya, are like blind men wandering in the desert without a guide. Because of their confusion about the vital points of the basis and result, they have come to a standstill on the path that accomplishes buddhahood in one lifetime."
- Jigme Lingpa

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:16 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
By 'the mind which seeks to reject views' I meant a mind which deprecates the idea of views altogether and therefore would attempt to abstain from expressing views.

Malcolm said:
All that is required for this is the famed non-affirming negation.

A negation does not necessarily the negator holds a view of his or her own.

krodha wrote:
I just meant that sems is grasping by definition, so sems can't reject its own proliferation in the name of non-grasping, because the very act (of rejection) only accomplishes further grasping.

Grasping and proliferation are only severed via recognition of the mind's nature. If one isn't resting in the nature of mind, the ālaya remains in tact whether views are expressed or not. So might as well express views, but do it skillfully like you said. That's all I was attempting to say.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

tobes said:
I agree with all of this.

Except: a/ For you are clearly rejecting views and accepting what you consider to be apart from (or beyond) views, which is itself a view. This is inescapable. The moment a subject relates to an object, acceptance and rejection [attachment and aversion], are immediately present. There's no harm in implementing the conventional.

I'm simply not doing/advocating that.

krodha wrote:
Ah, I wasn't implying you were advocating for that, apologies if it appeared that way.

tobes said:
All I'm saying is that taking down the Vedanta via Buddhist critique produces, in your words: The mind which seeks to reject views has merely adopted a new view.

If we both agree that there's no real issue with that, then let's move on.

:anjali:

krodha wrote:
By 'the mind which seeks to reject views' I meant a mind which deprecates the idea of views altogether and therefore would attempt to abstain from expressing views. For instance; saying that one should refrain from critiquing Vedanta because it entails lapsing into views, is still promoting a view. Much like the idea of abandoning 'acceptance and rejection' itself entails rejection (and acceptance).

That was my only point; the mind can't escape views, and so the idea of the mind rejecting involvement with critiquing Advaita (in the name of preventing a lapse into views), is itself a lapse into views. So in the context of views, you're damned if you do (critique) and damned if you don't. Only the nature of mind [sems nyid] is free from views and afflictive proliferation, the mind [sems] IS views and afflictive proliferation. There's no sense in trying to curb afflictive fixation and proliferation with the very instrument (the mind) of fixation and afflictive proliferation.

Further, since these issues are resolved by recognizing the nature of mind, the transcendence of views is revealed experientially via that direct insight, and does not come about by rejecting critique or views.

I get that there is value in being mindful of not getting lost in the thicket of views, but if we're aware of that, and understand our situation then (in my opinion) it's okay to explore these differences. Doing so can actually aid in refining our path and creating advantageous (relative) discernment.

In Dzogchen this discernment is called bsam rig, and there is value in cultivating that discrimination, even on a relative level with separating and defining tenet systems and traditions.

Here, Jean-Luc Achard defines bsam rig:
"bsam-rig [knowing discernment] which is the knowledge you generate when you study and get experiences of the teachings (it is a fluctuating phenomenon according to the capacities of the individual; the more you study correctly, the more you knowing discernement is developed)"

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 1:15 AM
Title: Re: Which school of Buddhism, if any are the closest to Adva
Content:
krodha wrote:
Yes gzhan stong [shentong or zhantong] is the closest to Advaita. Especially Dolpopa's teachings like KonchokZoepa said.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 5:29 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Wow Tobes we posted the same exact sutta at the same exact time.....weird.

Also the Samyutta Nikaya is filled with like 30 suttas where the Buddha is teaching that Anatta(not self) is suffering,that which leads to suffering,and it goes as far in one sutta

to say that whatever is without a self belongs to mara.

asunthatneversets said:
Actually, the Buddha never once taught that not-self is suffering, and xabir thoroughly refuted this erroneous claim of yours various times due to your inability to traverse your own confirmation biases. Apparently all for naught.

You continue to blatantly misinterpret the sūtras you post as alleged evidence to substantiate your deluded eternalist notions.

Son of Buddha said:
you sure about that?

SN 22.46 Impermanent (2) pg 885
At Savatthi. "Bhikkhus, form is impermanent.... Feeling is impermanent.... Preception is impermanent.... Volitional formations are impermanent.... Consciousness is impermanent. What is Impermanent is suffering. What is suffering is nonself. What is nonself should be seen as it really is with correct wisdom thus: This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self."

P.S. take the Buddhas word for it.
"Sn 22.59 O monks, since form is not-self, therefore form leads to affliction."

the reason why form leads to suffering is because it is not self.
BUT if form were self then..... please finish that sentence with what the Buddha actually said.

krodha wrote:
You are misinterpreting, misrepresenting and misunderstanding these quotes, but if you didn't benefit from the lucid explanation xabir gave you before, then there's no sense in revisiting and readdressing these points now. I enjoy many activities, but repeatedly beating my head against a wall is not one of them.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 5:21 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
tobes said:
I agree that distinction and discrimination is necessary and warranted. But what could that possibly be, if not lapsing into a view?

:anjali:

krodha wrote:
Views are unavoidable and implied in dualistic interaction. There is no way for the mind to escape views, the mind is a point of reference by definition. Discursive thought

proliferates and feeds off its own momentum, and our reality unfolds.

Our expressed views are merely conventional fabrication, both accurate and inaccurate depending on context... no harm can come from discursive proliferation if you understand the nature of your relative condition.

The cessation of views is accomplished by recognizing the unreality of the mind that suggests them, but departing from views is not something the mind can execute from its own relative vantage point. A cessation of views is impossible in the absence of the wisdom which directly apperceives the emptiness of mind. And so views simply appear, they're extrapolated, and are useful tools. The mind which seeks to reject views has merely adopted a new view.

The negation of (and desire to go beyond) views [acceptance and rejection] is itself a subtle rebirth of the acceptance and rejection dichotomy. For you are clearly rejecting views and accepting what you consider to be apart from (or beyond) views, which is itself a view. This is inescapable. The moment a subject relates to an object, acceptance and rejection [attachment and aversion], are immediately present. There's no harm in implementing the conventional.

So express your views loud and proud, and if you lapse into a view then so be it.

"All discursive thoughts are emptiness, and the observer of emptiness is discursive thought. Emptiness does not destroy discursive thought, and discursive thought does not obstruct emptiness."
- Nyoshul Khenpo Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 4:17 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Wow Tobes we posted the same exact sutta at the same exact time.....weird.

Also the Samyutta Nikaya is filled with like 30 suttas where the Buddha is teaching that Anatta(not self) is suffering,that which leads to suffering,and it goes as far in one sutta to say that whatever is without a self belongs to mara.

krodha wrote:
Actually, the Buddha never once taught that not-self is suffering, and xabir thoroughly refuted this erroneous claim of yours various times due to your inability to traverse your own confirmation biases. Apparently all for naught.

You continue to blatantly misinterpret the sūtras you post as alleged evidence to substantiate your deluded eternalist notions.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 2:57 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
futerko said:
...It seems that although the difference it seems to me that the implications for practice are quite far reaching.

asunthatneversets said:
The Self [Brahman] of Advaita essentially fortifies and reinforces the personal self, and so (according to the buddhadharma) it fails to transcend samsara. Shakyamuni realized Brahman and found that it did not match the 'liberation free of birth and death' he had heard of, so he pressed on and actualized dharmakāya.

tobes said:
Surely this lapses into the view that 'the other team' has the wrong view.

krodha wrote:
The Dzogchen tantras refute Advaita by name. Shakyamuni's doctrine of anātman is a direct response to the ātman/Brahman of Vedanta.

It surely isn't as petty as 'lapsing into a view that the other team has it wrong', but the distinction and discrimination is necessary and warranted.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 11:32 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
futerko said:
...It seems that although the difference it seems to me that the implications for practice are quite far reaching.

krodha wrote:
The Self [Brahman] of Advaita essentially fortifies and reinforces the personal self, and so (according to the buddhadharma) it fails to transcend samsara. Shakyamuni realized Brahman and found that it did not match the 'liberation free of birth and death' he had heard of, so he pressed on and actualized dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 6:19 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:

dzogchungpa said:
Yes, I know. I was just pointing out that that kind of thinking would not be unfamililar to them.

asunthatneversets said:
It would be unfamiliar to them though, because for the Advaitin, cit is inherently existent and is therefore independent of causes and conditions.

dzogchungpa said:
I think it would be familiar to them, they would just disagree with the Buddhists.

krodha wrote:
If they agreed they would be a proponent of the dharma. This is the defining principle which separates the two traditions.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 4:37 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Yes, I know. I was just pointing out that that kind of thinking would not be unfamililar to them.

krodha wrote:
It would be unfamiliar to them though, because for the Advaitin, cit is inherently existent and is therefore independent of causes and conditions.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 1:37 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
brendan said:
It is suppose to be the path that leads to the cessation of suffering…not the path of claims and free will.

krodha wrote:
Not sure what claims and free will have to do with anything, but ok.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:29 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
brendan said:
Yes but Upaya is still stained due to there still being suffering.

To claim otherwise seems like madness.

asunthatneversets said:
Upāya is the dharma, it is the skillful means set forth by the Buddhas. Your upāya is complimented by prajñā, which comes with skillful application of the teachings.

brendan said:
On paper.

krodha wrote:
In practice. I mean, even on paper it makes sense. As a beginner, some initial confidence (even 'faith') is surely required, but the point is to apply the teaching received from a qualified guru. The guru has perfected the two accumulations [upāya and prajñā] and so s/he can properly evaluate your needs and effectively discern the best route for you. Then within the praxis itself upāya is required on your part, this is where a relationship with the teacher comes into play.

We all have varying capacities, so the means vary as well, and you therefore initially rely on the wisdom of the master. In time, as your own wisdom flowers, prajñā reveals the innermost guru [dharmakāya] (unless you are of high acumen and recognized vidyā via introduction, then you're naturally endowed with discernment on the outset).

Prajñā [shes rab] and vidyā [rig pa] are nearly synonymous.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 10:38 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
brendan said:
Yes but Upaya is still stained due to there still being suffering.

To claim otherwise seems like madness.

krodha wrote:
Upāya is the dharma, it is the skillful means set forth by the Buddhas. Your upāya is complimented by prajñā, which comes with skillful application of the teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:38 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
'Permanent' and 'unchanging' in the buddhadharma, are different from 'permanent' and 'unchanging' in Hindu Vedanta etc.

Buddhahood is 'permanent' in that it's irreversible. Emptiness is 'permanent' and 'unchanging' because it is non-arising. That which is non-arisen is unborn, what does not originate does not cease, ergo the terms 'permanent' and 'unchanging' are sometimes used to describe dharmakāya.

Dharmakāya is nothing like Brahman.

Anders said:
Come now. It's a lot like Brahman, which is why they are so often compared.

Which is not to say there or not more or less subtle differences. But they obviously have a great many strong similarities.

krodha wrote:
Not even close to Brahman.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:56 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
xabir said:
According to Malcolm, KTGR had to concede in a debate with him in the end that Shentong is no different from Advaita except its emphasis on Buddhahood.

monktastic said:
Wonderful! If KTGR does not (or cannot) distinguish his own view from that of Advaita (except for its emphasis on Buddhahood), that's good enough for me. It suggests to me that not everyone with realization uses the same words to describe "it."

Edit: if they did, I'd begin to harbor deep suspicions about its purported complete ineffability.

krodha wrote:
However the implications of that is the gzhan stong view deviates from the general view of the Buddhadharma. Meaning from the perspective of teachings like Dzogchen, Madhyamaka, etc., gzhan stong errs into an extreme view.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 9:12 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
'Permanent' and 'unchanging' in the buddhadharma, are different from 'permanent' and 'unchanging' in Hindu Vedanta etc.

Buddhahood is 'permanent' in that it's irreversible. Emptiness is 'permanent' and 'unchanging' because it is non-arising. That which is non-arisen is unborn, what does not originate does not cease, ergo the terms 'permanent' and 'unchanging' are sometimes used to describe dharmakāya.

Dharmakāya is nothing like Brahman.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 8:33 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tweaked this subtly from a previous post on a different forum, apologies for the length, but it addresses the differences.

By way of a friend I came across this quote by Trungpa Rinpoche from his book 'Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism', which discusses the nature of the 'supreme absolute being' that is referenced by Ramana Maharshi and other Advaitins. From a Dzogchen (and dharmic) perspective, that supreme absolute being is essentially the pinnacle of samsara, which means it's not a pinnacle at all but is merely a relative position in the wheel of beginningless cyclical existence. Trungpa explains, this 'supreme absolute being' is actually a formless god realm, and due to it's implications it is a 'gigantic beast'. It is nothing like the buddha's dharmakāya.

Quoting my friend Robert who shared this; "I should add (as a disclaimer) that Chogyam Trungpa uses here a metaphor of a monkey trapped in Samsara and transmigrating and being reborn in various realms." Here's the quote:

"Then the monkey discovers that he can go beyond the sensual plea-sures and beauties of the god realm and enter into the dhyana or concen-tration states of the realm of the formless gods, which is the ultimate refinement of the six realms. He realizes that he can achieve purely men-tal pleasure, the most subtle and durable of all, that he is able to maintain his sense of a solid self continuously by expanding the walls of his prison to seemingly include the whole cosmos, thereby conquering change and death. First he dwells upon the idea of limitless space. He watches limit-less space; he is here and limitless space is there and he watches it. He imposes his preconception on the world, creates limitless space, and feeds himself with this experience. Then the next stage is concentration upon the idea of limitless consciousness. Here one does not dwell on limitless space alone, but one also dwells upon the intelligence which perceives that limitless space as well. So ego watches limitless space and consciousness from its central headquarters. The empire of ego is com-pletely extended, even the central authority cannot imagine how far its territory extends. Ego becomes a huge, gigantic beast.

Ego has extended itself so far that it begins to lose track of the bound-ary of its territory. Wherever it tries to define its boundary, it seems to exclude part of its territory. Finally, it concludes that there is no way of defining its boundaries. The size of its empire cannot be conceived or imagined. Since it includes everything, it cannot be defined as this or that. So the ego dwells on the idea of not this and not that, the idea that it cannot conceive or imagine itself. But finally even this state of mind is surpassed when the ego realizes that the idea that it is inconceivable and unimaginable is in itself a conception. So the ego dwells on the idea of not not this, and not not that. This idea of the impossibility of asserting anything is something which ego feeds on, takes pride in, identifies with, and therefore uses to maintain its continuity. This is the highest level of concentration and achievement that confused, samsaric mind can attain."
- Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche

Ramana Maharshi is referring to the 'Self' (i.e. Brahman i.e. Universal Self) when he says 'supreme absolute being', and so Trungpa Rinpoche is discussing how this state is essentially just super-sizing the present 'ego' (or relative samsaric self) so that it becomes eternal and changeless. Instead of liberation, this only serves to reify and fortify the self. The Brahman is defined as 'existence [sat], consciousness [cit], bliss [ananda]', Trungpa specifically references the idea of 'limitless consciousness' and explores how the 'empire of ego is completely extended', implying that our sense of existent selfhood expands to the point that it transcends the usual six realms of existence and enters the realm of the formless gods. He then specifically cites the practice of 'neti-neti' [not this, not that] which is employed in both samkhya and adviata praxes in order to arrive at the knowledge of Brahman (supreme absolute being).

Both Dzogchen and Buddhism in general adamantly reject the notion of a supreme absolute being:

"Mahamati: Bhagavan, the non-Buddhists make assertion a Self as 'A permanent creator, without qualities, pervasive and imperishable'.

The Bhagavan replied:
'Mahamati, my teaching of tathagatagarbha is not equivalent with the assertion of the Self of the non-Buddhists. Mahamati, the Tathagata, Arhat, Samyak Sambuddhas, having demonstrated the meaning of the words 'emptiness, reality limit, nirvana, non-arisen, signless', etc. as tathagatagarbha for the purpose of the immature complete forsaking the perishable abodes, demonstrate the expertiential range of the non-appearing abode of complete non-conceptuality by demonstrating the door of tathagatagarbha. Mahamati, a self should not be perceived as real by Bodhisattva Mahasattvas enlightened in the future or presently.'"

For the non-buddhists who propagate the view of a supreme absolute being i.e. Self as Brahman, they define that Self as pure consciousness [cit] which is eternally existent 'being' [sat]. Dzogchen and Buddhism see both consciousness and existence as symptoms of ignorance. For Dzogchen, both consciousness [cit] and existence [sat] are byproducts of afflictive dependent origination which arise as a result of the non-

recognition of the basis [skt. ṣthiti/sthāna, tib. gzhi], and both are therefore relegated to the ālaya [tib. kun gzhi]:

"Any kind of consciousness whatever, whether past, future or presently arisen, whether gross or subtle, whether in oneself or external, whether inferior or superior, whether far or near must, with right understanding how it is, be regarded thus: 'This is not mine, this is not I, this is not my self.'"
- Anatta-lakkhana Sutta

Dzogchen defines six wrong views which are attributed to the basis [gzhi]... the third negates the Self of the non-buddhist tirthikas: "Concerning the belief that it is definite: If that were the case, change would be impossible. The fault would be that the defilement of ignorance could not be purified. If the basis were exclusively unchanging, then it would necessarily be the same as asserting a permanent self."

Longchenpa states:
"The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears to similarity to the Self of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'Self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality."

Since the Self of the non-buddhist paths is said to be inherently existent, it also advocates svabhāva, a view which is seen as illogical and impossible in the eyes of the buddhadharma:

"Svabhāva is by definition the subject of contradictory ascriptions. If it exists, it must belong to an existent entity, which means that it must be conditioned, dependent on other entities, and possessed of causes. But a svabhāva is by definition unconditioned, not dependent on other entities, and not caused. Thus the existence of a svabhāva is impossible."
- Nāgārjuna

Dzogchen upholds a view of niḥsvabhāva, because ka dag [the original purity of the basis] forbids svabhāva. Even though (per Malcolm), ka dag is itself "termed ngo bo, or svabhāva; while lhun grub is termed prakriti or rang bzhin" the difference being that ka dag signifies an empty essence, unlike the svabhāva championed by non-buddhists.

Svabhāva (along with abhāva etc.) is refuted using the same logic employed by Madhyamaka, a freedom from extremes demonstrated succinctly via Catuṣkoṭi Tetralemma:

"The natural state of the basis is free from elaboration [extremes]:
It is not existent - even the conquerors cannot see it;
It is not nonexistent - it is the basis of all samsara and nirvana;
It is not both or neither - it goes beyond being an object of speech..."
- Jigme Lingpa

"The mandala is completed in the nonconceptual path,
freeing the bonds of proliferation of thoughts and so on,
free from the empty phenomena of intentions and so on,
beyond being and nonbeing, negative and positive objects, and so on,
liberated from phenomena that fall into an extreme."
-- Rigpa Rangshar Tantra [Per Malcolm]

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
catmoon said:
I laud your efforts to combat the pseudo-thought of conspiracy theorists, it really needs to be done, but it has to be done accurately.

krodha wrote:
If this is directed towards my interaction with PadmaVonSamba then I have to argue that no conspiracy theory or pseudo-thought has been presented. All that has occurred is questioning the presently accepted model surrounding the scientific evidence we have. If that's pseudo-thought, then science might as well throw in the towel now.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 13th, 2013 at 11:18 AM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
krodha wrote:
All I'm saying is the reigning paradigm isn't bullet proof, and there is continually new evidence appearing which contradicts it.

I also never said the evidence itself is associated with belief, though the model erected around the evidence surely is.

My point with the length in lifespan, was merely to say that 'if' conditions allowed, it may be possible. That is all. You seem to be extrapolating that I'm asserting that these theories are indeed flawless and true, I am not. I haven't made any definitive claims, you are the only one guilty of that.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 13th, 2013 at 10:51 AM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
Evolution is a fact.

krodha wrote:
No one has questioned evolution. Only the validity of the reigning model.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 13th, 2013 at 10:29 AM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
ClearblueSky said:
I thought you were implying bigger= longer lifespan, I'm sorry if I misunderstood you on that part. What were you implying if not that, relating to the whole Kasyapa Buddha/human lifespan thing?

krodha wrote:
The point, was that if conditions allowed an organism to be larger in scale, it isn't far fetched to theorize that conditions can allow for a lengthened life span. I'm not suggesting lifespans of thousands of years is or ever was possible.

ClearblueSky said:
And you are bringing up these things about secret 3 million year old human skeletons in coal

krodha wrote:
Well, they surely aren't secret, you can read about them if you have the interest.

ClearblueSky said:
"blindly following darwin", "Forbidden Archeology" conspiracies, and talk about humans walking around 2 billion years ago. There's not much need to even point out that there's no even remotely accepted scientific basis to any of that

krodha wrote:
Well of course, welcome to science, the fraternity of paradigms. The reigning paradigm is what flies, all else is rejected. Very much like a belief system.

ClearblueSky said:
and taking those things and saying "Darwin's is just another theory too" is the same reason I don't really bother engaging creationists that believe the earth is 6,000 years old in a debate.

krodha wrote:
Yes, god forbid systems of belief are peddled and promulgated. It's like the pot calling the kettle black.

ClearblueSky said:
They are not both just theories, one is largely accepted science with heaps of evidence, the other is fringe belief/ or ancient belief.

krodha wrote:
Largely accepted science yes, heaps of evidence is another thing though... sparse evidence to piece together a theory with holes in it, is more like it. Even today scientists are unsure how the leap to modern man took place, various theories are posited in that regard. Even that hallucinogens may have played a role; 'the stoned ape theory', for example. You would be hard pressed to declare that there is any unassailable evidence to back up the reigning theory regarding the origins of mankind. All you have is a paradigm you have been presented, and you ate it up hook, line and sinker.

Year by year there are various discoveries which challenge the accepted paradigm, yet due to peer pressure, many scientists do not want to speak out in favor of the 'fringe' evidence for fear they will lose their credibility, labeled quacks and charlatans by people just like you, who merely tow the party line and regurgitate shit you've been force fed.

Göbekli Tepe for example, surely challenges the extant paradigm in regards to what man was capable of during that era [epipaleolithic]. Scientists know today that there has been major earth events which have drastically changed the topography and climates of the planet. There is strong evidence that Antartica used to be a rainforest, and there have even been one or two maps discovered which show Antartica as a dry and/or tropical climate. Pole shifts being the explanation for how the drastic climate changes came about. So no, our history is far from certain. If you find certainty in the model you precribe to, then you are choosing to believe that a model and theory is correct, and are therefore no better than the Creationists you ignorantly cast aspersions at.

ClearblueSky said:
It's not just updated science. Ancient beliefs, beautiful as many are, just weren't evidence-based in the way we'd consider "science" today, and it's not really an accurate comparison.

krodha wrote:
And likewise, the models of reality being uncovered with quantum mechanics and so on is something which would have been considered equally non-evidence based, not too long ago. Science is a constant shift in paradigm, yet the reigning paradigm will always linger, the fact that children are still taught in school that everything is made of atoms being a prime example. It has been said, and it's undoubtably true, that you can measure scientific progress funeral by funeral.

ClearblueSky said:
Regardless, it would at least be helpful if you could provide the source to that quote, so we can see what you are quoting from.

krodha wrote:
That quote is from Michael Cremo, but there are numerous individuals like him with intersting theories and discoveries. I enjoy Graham Hancock and others of that ilk as well. Unfortunately nothing it appears you would be interested in, after all, we wouldn't want to pry and question things now would we?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 12th, 2013 at 2:31 PM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
krodha wrote:
Now, I'm not saying this is indeed factual or true, but I see no issue with remaining open to the possibility, and entertaining the theory. After all, Darwin's model is simply a theory as well:

"Just a dozen years after Charles Darwin published The Origin of Species in 1859, growing numbers of scientists and other educated persons considered it impossible, indeed laughable, to suppose that humans were anything other than the modified descendants of an ancestral line of apelike creatures.

According to Darwinists, the first undisputed fossil evidence for life on earth goes back about 2 billion years. They say the first apes and monkeys appeared about 40-50 million years ago. The first ape-men (called Australopithecus) appeared about 4 million years ago. These were followed by other apemen called Homo habilis, Homo erectus, and Neanderthal man. The first human beings of modern type (Homo sapiens sapiens) appeared only 100,000 or 200,000 years ago. Civilization, according to modern scientists, is less than 10,000 years old.

Those who blindly follow Darwin's ideas on human evolution do not see the pattern of suppression inherent in scientific investigation. However, Michael A. Cremo and Richard L. Thompson of the Bhaktivedanta Institute investigated hundreds of scientific reports showing that humans or near humans were living millions of years ago in the Pliocene, Miocene, or earlier periods.

This evidence was not regarded as anomalous by the scientists who introduced it in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, since they were contemplating theories of human origins that were compatible with this evidence. Then, with the development of the modern theory that humans like ourselves evolved within the past 200,000 years in the Late Pleistocene, this evidence became highly unacceptable, and it vanished from sight.

Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race presents a representative sample of this anomalous evidence suggesting that humans have been on the earth for millions of years, just as the ancient Sanskrit writings of the Vedic literatures describe. The Vedic histories inform us that humans have existed since the beginning of the day of Brahma, about 2 billion years ago.

Cremo and Thompson conclude that even the conventionally accepted evidence does not offer a cohesive picture of the missing link; instead, the multiplicity of proposed evolutionary linkages among the hominids in Africa creates a very confusing scheme of human evolution. They call for a drastic revision of the now-dominant assumptions about human origins."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, November 12th, 2013 at 2:07 PM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Semi off topic but I know that due to differences in atmospheric pressure, life forms used to be much larger in scale. There's a scientist who has recreated the atmospheric conditions for prehistoric fish in a modern day fish tank. The fish grew nearly 2 or 3 times the size of modern fish (of the same species) living in present day conditions.

So perhaps it's not too far off base to theorize that lifespans may be longer, given the conditions allow.

ClearblueSky said:
Bigger does not= longer lifespan. Elephants live 60 years, clams can live 400 years. I think that if anyone believes that a human being has literally lived for 20,000 years, that human beings existed more than about a 200,000 years ago (and didn't evolve from similar species), or that the planet earth was ever literally layed out as described in Buddhist cosmology, they've got a lot more views they need to work on than just Buddhist practice. Believing in modern science to a practical degree is not a "limited view", but believing that these things have to literally be true to keep ones faith is a rather limited view.

krodha wrote:
Two straw man arguments there; (i) I never suggested 'bigger' implies a longer life span, and (ii) I never suggested one should literally prescribe to any views.

Interestingly and allegedly, there has been an in tact modern human skeleton found in a 3 million year old coal deposit, among other anomalies of that nature. Some theorize that the human race is far, far more ancient than modern science chooses to believe, but that's a different topic.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, November 11th, 2013 at 1:29 PM
Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas
Content:
krodha wrote:
Semi off topic but I know that due to differences in atmospheric pressure, life forms used to be much larger in scale. There's a scientist who has recreated the atmospheric conditions for prehistoric fish in a modern day fish tank. The fish grew nearly 2 or 3 times the size of modern fish (of the same species) living in present day conditions.

So perhaps it's not too far off base to theorize that lifespans may be longer, given the conditions allow.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 2:46 PM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
At any rate, this Bentinho character rips off Dzogpa Chenpo,

xabir said:
Does he?

He's teaching his own version of neo-Advaita, never heard of him discussing anything about Dzogchen but I might be wrong.

krodha wrote:
Not sure if he still does, but he used to teach his own interpretation of the three kāyas, it was quite blatant. He doesn't mention Dzogchen at all that's why it's essentially reinterpreting and repackaging it. He was accused of this by others early on in his career, perhaps he abandoned that aspect of his teaching due to that, I'm not sure. But I agree his teaching is his own version of neo-advaita, beyond that I'm unfamiliar with him, apart from hearing of his eccentric behavior as of late.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 12:38 PM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
At any rate, this Bentinho character rips off Dzogpa Chenpo, and in the end, of course, doesn't even teach Dzogpa Chenpo.

I'd go with Chatral Rinpoche's advice on this, of his 7 guidelines in one of his letters, number 4 is:

4. Do not sell out Dzogpa Chenpo under different pretext for your own personal benefit.

And number 6:
6. Do not cheat others in the name of Dzogpa Chenpo by giving initiations or teachings which you have never received from a legitimate high lama or Guru and [have] not done practice by yourself.

Adamantine said:
Thanks sun, can you provide us with the entire list please?

krodha wrote:
Declaration:

a) I wish to say a few important guidelines with regard to misuse of my humble name by different Buddhist monks, yogis, and lamas – those who are either visiting Taiwan or [have] settled down in southeast Asia in different countries despite of my repeated appeal to everyone. It is a matter of big surprise for me that several Buddhist Lamas whom I have never even met in my lifetime nor never given them any teachings, are also using my humble name continuously for their personal monetary benefit which is an extreme matter of shame and a big fraud. Wearing monk's robes, cheating, and misleading lay people are a serious crime and breaks all Buddha's principal Vows. [You are] sowing serious [negative] Karma for yourself and at the same time ruining Buddhism. I feel sorry for such gross negative activities by [these] Buddhist lamas, khenpos, yogis, and monks residing abroad. I strongly object to those who are using my name directly or indirectly by any means.

My constant guidelines and advice to all persons [whether he is a] reincarnated lama, yogi, khenpo or ordinary monk, with whom I happen to meet from day to day, are always same and are [stated] below:

1. If you are a serious Buddhist student and Dzogpa Chenpo (Dzogchen) practicitioners, one should spend your life in retreat with minimum comfort and giving up all luxuries of attachment.

2. Do not waste your time in touring all foreign countries including Taiwan – [this] is fruitless.

3. Do not beg for donations [using] different excuses such as construction of a big monastery, stupa, zangdokpalri, or bumtsog; big offerings; or setting up a new Buddhist center.

4. Do not sell out Dzogpa Chenpo under different pretext for your own personal benefit.

5. Always be humble and do not try to expose yourself in front of others even though you may have [some] knowledge [of] Buddhism.

6. Do not cheat others in the name of Dzogpa Chenpo by giving initiations or teachings which you have never received from a legitimate high lama or Guru and [have] not done practice by yourself.

7. Finally, I myself never have [even the] slightest desire to visit any foreign country nor have I any specific reason [to do so].

b. In the past, I have experienced several occasions, that despite my unwillingness and objection, reincarnate lamas, yogis, khenpos and monks who have come to see me are taking photographs with me by force under different pretexts. Due to electronic supremacy, people are coming with different types of electronic equipment so as to record my voice or photograph me, which are not easy to detect by people of my age.

c. Hence, I [hereby] notify all the Buddhist followers all over the world, do not, I repeat, do not believe the person who is possessing such photographs or are making false claims that he or she is my student in the past or present. Please do not believe [them] on just showing a photograph, video, [or others items with me]. Therefore, I, the undersigned with full consent, reject such types of false claims made by different Buddhist centers, monasteries, institutes, reincarnate lamas, khenpos, yogis, and ordinary monks henceforth.

In conclusion, once again, I sincerely appeal to all Buddhist followers all over the world and Buddhist Centers including the people who are taking interest in Buddhism religion; kindly take note of my above cited humble declaration and suggestions. After seeing this article in newspapers, I hope [that] everyone would clearly understand me and my personal opinion hereafter.

Dated April 19, 2007

Thanking you,

Declaration by Chatral Sangay Dorje

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 12:18 PM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
krodha wrote:
At any rate, this Bentinho character rips off Dzogpa Chenpo, and in the end, of course, doesn't even teach Dzogpa Chenpo.

I'd go with Chatral Rinpoche's advice on this, of his 7 guidelines in one of his letters, number 4 is:

4. Do not sell out Dzogpa Chenpo under different pretext for your own personal benefit.

And number 6:
6. Do not cheat others in the name of Dzogpa Chenpo by giving initiations or teachings which you have never received from a legitimate high lama or Guru and [have] not done practice by yourself.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 9th, 2013 at 10:04 AM
Title: Re: Tattoos on the chakras
Content:
krodha wrote:
I have a photo somewhere of a man who manifested a hung/hum symbol on his body strictly through practice and visualization. I'll post it when I can. It's obviously not a

perfect hum symbol, but you can tell that's what it is.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, November 9th, 2013 at 8:32 AM
Title: Re: Tattoos on the chakras
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm covered in tattoos, they're no big deal to me but probably depends on the individual. Not sure about the dharma symbols, I know the Japanese leave the central area of their torso (usually associated with the central channel) un-tattooed so their traditional tattoo body suits resemble a jacket. Whether that has to do with the chakras or not I'm not sure, but I'd imagine it does.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:34 AM
Title: Re: Isn't Karma extrapolation?
Content:
Alfredo said:
The oath you swear may be voluntary, but whether the universe rewards or punishes you for particular classes of action is supposed to be hard-wired.

krodha wrote:
It is common to see karma as a form of universal retribution, and I think this is where your question of ethics etc., is coming from. Karma isn't necessarily that though, it's true application is in our moment to moment interaction with the unfolding of experience. The engrained habits which force us to relate to ourselves and the world in a certain way, and the positing of a self and world in general.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:47 AM
Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The only reason it was illegal in the first place is because William Randolph Hearst ran a smear campaign against hemp. Hemp was a growing industry which was going to be problematic for his cotton and paper businesses. Marijuana is actually a weed which grows in Mexico which is completely unrelated to hemp, they stole the name and labeled hemp 'marijuana' in order to make it sound foreign and potentially dangerous. Cannabis has never killed anyone, while alcohol and tobacco kill countless people every year. The whole thing is political. Big pharma doesn't want to see cannabis legalized because it can treat various ailments they claim to treat by peddling their garbage pharmaceuticals.

conebeckham said:

Well....I think Hemp is Cannabis. There are two basic varieties, Indica and Sativa. Whether it's a weed that grows wild, or a cultivated crop for fiber, or for psychoactive uses, doesn't matter.

Grass may not directly kill anyone...but definitely it has impaired the judgement of folks who have committed crimes as a result. Like driving while intoxicated--and yes, I'd rather folks drive stoned than drunk, I'd much rather they didn't drive at all when intoxicated.

Whether or not it's legal is not really an issue for me, frankly. The "morality" of intoxicants isn't even an issue. It's the effects, for me. The stuff these days is so unbalanced compared to the stuff that was around 25 years ago....with all the manipulation to boost THC content and the other psychoactive compounds involved no longer matter. It makes me anxious, heart rate goes up, mind appears to be racing, and in general it's not pleasant at all. The only positive thing I continue to maintain about it is that I do believe music can be "heard" and "felt" differently.....it gives you a different perspective. But I think it's the antithesis of a meditation aid. for me.

Effects on others apparently are widely divergent!

krodha wrote:
Right I wasn't implying hemp was different than cannabis. And you're right anything can be abused and misused, but the dangers of alcohol and tobacco are far more prevalent. I'm just saying the logic doesn't add up. If marijuana is illegal, alcohol and tobacco should be illegal, but of course that would never happen, there's big business behind alcohol and tobacco. And big business behind 'the war on drugs'.

I don't smoke weed or tobacco (or anything at all) and I don't drink, but in my opinion marijuana is far less dangerous and actually has potential health benefits. The whole thing just reeks of economic and political b.s.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The only reason it was illegal in the first place is because William Randolph Hearst ran a smear campaign against hemp. Hemp was a growing industry which was going to be problematic for his cotton and paper businesses. Marijuana is actually a weed which grows in Mexico which is completely unrelated to hemp, they stole the name and labeled hemp 'marijuana' in order to make it sound foreign and potentially dangerous. Cannabis has never killed anyone, while alcohol and tobacco kill countless people every year. The whole thing is political. Big pharma doesn't want to see cannabis legalized because it can treat various ailments they claim to treat by peddling their garbage pharmaceuticals.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: labelling of GMO foods
Content:
krodha wrote:
Another issue with growing your own food is that Monsanto has their own patented seeds, which are genetically modified to be resistant to their own pesticide 'round-up'. They also have genetically modified certain seeds to contain a killswitch that triggers after a season or two and renders the seed unable to germinate. So farmers are forced to buy new seeds every season instead of storing seeds. These corporations are insane.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Isn't Karma extrapolation?
Content:
Alfredo said:
Karma is just another pan-Indic supernatural belief for which no good evidence exists. ("Like comes from like" is quite vague, and unfortunately representative of the quality of Buddhist argument in favor of an afterlife.) It is only an "inference" in the sense that "fairies make the flowers grow" is an inference.

krodha wrote:
You don't seem to understand what karma is.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:47 AM
Title: Re: Isn't Karma extrapolation?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Your karma is simply your habitual tendencies and propensities which cause a dualistic interaction with experience to arise.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:28 AM
Title: Re: labelling of GMO foods
Content:
krodha wrote:
What's also wild is Fox News actually aired a critical piece on GMOs and their dangers this past week.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:13 AM
Title: Re: labelling of GMO foods
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
By the way, Monsanto and co. is not even capitalism, it's corporatocracy (well we could call it crony-capitalism or monopoly-capitalism, but I think corporatocracy is more accurate; and that's another topic though).

krodha wrote:
Agreed, it's corporatism, straight up!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: labelling of GMO foods
Content:
krodha wrote:
Unbelievable that they've been able to defeat this yet again.

http://www.infowars.com/monsanto-22-mil-propaganda-defeats-monumental-gmo-labeling-bill/

http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/11/06/washington-state-voters-reject-gmo-labeing/3450705/

Monsanto’s massive campaign to defeat your very right to know what’s in your food has been backed by over $22 million in corporate funding from sources like DuPont and Bayer, but the reality is that these corrupt corporate monopolies are fighting just to survive within the world’s food supply.
Perhaps most amazing to me is the fact that just $550 of the $22 million donated to fighting the GMO labeling initiative actually came from Washington citizens. To put that into perspective, that’s around .0025% of the total finances. The rest, actually came from the Grocery Manufacturers Association, Monsanto, DuPont Pioneer, Dow AgroSciences and Bayer CropScience — the same corporations who are actively dominating the food supply with all forms of genetically modified varieties.
Monsanto right now is backed against a corner like a stray animal, fighting with mass amounts of the almighty dollar in order to survive for just a few moments longer. Even the mainstream media now has been forced to reveal Monsanto’s ugly head in light of the Washington voting initiative.
Overall, it is not time to lose morale in the fight for the reclamation of our food, but instead to voice another rallying cry as the beast that is Monsanto begins to truly show how desperate it really is.
—-
Anthony Gucciardi is the acting Editor and Founder of alternative news website Storyleak.com, as well as the Founder of the third largest natural health website in the world, NaturalSociety.com. He is also a news media personality and analyst who has

been featured on top news, radio, and television organizations including Drudge Report, Michael Savage's Savage Nation, Coast to Coast AM, and RT.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 28th, 2013 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Scary movies and exorcism discussion...
Content:
padma norbu said:
It would be interesting to see a movie about a Buddhist exorcism. Are there any?

krodha wrote:
There's a documentary about the Dalai Lama's oracle, seems like that would be the closest you'd get to a Buddhist possession or exorcism type film.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nechung_Oracle

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 28th, 2013 at 2:18 AM
Title: Re: Scary movies and exorcism discussion...
Content:
krodha wrote:
Last night I watched the 'Ghost Adventures' 100th episode which took place in the house the film 'The Exorcist' was based on... it was pretty good. Made me wonder the same thing though, what class of being would these 'demons' be?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 7:18 AM
Title: Re: i need a girlfriend/wife
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's no necessity to be a monk.

But if you are interested in being part of a structured community which is akin to being a monk, there are tantric [vajrayāna] practitioners called ngakpas [sngags pa], which do marry and are even encouraged to have a sang yum. Ngakpas will even grow their hair long to express a difference between themselves and the traditional monastic lifestyle and requirements. So there are options.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 24th, 2013 at 8:47 AM
Title: Re: Path of Gods and Men
Content:
philji said:

My understanding is that the path of gods and men is the first turning of the wheel. The Hinayana path as taught by the Buddha leading to freedom from suffering.

krodha wrote:
Hinayāna is the teaching of the Buddha, so it isn't part of the vehicle of gods and man. The vehicle of gods and man is a designation which is used to classify any path which isn't the buddhadharma. Traditions such as Christianity, Hinduism, Islam etc. are examples of worldly paths, they cannot lead one out of samsara, and are therefore part of the vehicle of gods and man.

As for other relative, non-religious pursuits being classified under the vehicle of gods and man, I'm not sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 12:55 PM
Title: Re: What sort of practice are laypeople capable of accomplis
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
and i could imagine that shamatha is useful accomplishment in dzogchen also. the natural state will remain only as a glimpse, glimpse , glimpse , glimpse since the mind is restless and thus not able to concentrate.

krodha wrote:
Very true, Malcolm shared this some time ago:

Whether you are following Dzogchen or Mahamudra, and regardless of your intellectual understanding, your meditation should have, at base, the following characteristics:

Prthvi -- physical ease
Sukha -- mental joy
Ekagraha -- one-pointedness
Vitarka -- initial engagement
Vicara -- sustained engagement

If any of these is missing, you have not even achieved perfect śamatha regardless of whether or not you are using an external object, the breath or even the nature of the mind.
...
Even in Dzogchen the five mental factors I mentioned are key without which you are really not going to make any progress.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: NATURAL MIND RIGPA VASTNESS
Content:

Karma Tashi G. said:
When I was a young boy, I remember looking up at the sky from a hillside and my eyes trying to bore through the sky like a drill! Later I learned this was an official practice! Maybe most official practice teachings is based on young boy experiences?

I'm just really guessing!

KTG

krodha wrote:
A forceful śamatha practice of that nature is a common aspect of the A'Tri (sometimes spelled A-Khrid) system in Bönpo Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 1:16 AM
Title: Re: The Six Realms
Content:
flowerbudh said:
Above humans are the devas... I was under the impression that Buddhists don't believe in gods. Help?

krodha wrote:
The six realms are quite multifaceted in meaning and application. In the dharma there is always an exoteric or outward appearance and meaning, and an esoteric or inner meaning, some even add a third 'secret' meaning to certain concepts. At any rate though, one way to look at the realms, is as states of mind. So for instance; the god realm would be one of happiness or sheer elation, ease, luxury, etc. what most people would consider the high end of the spectrum as far as life experiences and circumstances go. The dharma is saying that even those who live in the lap of luxury, and have no worries, immense fortune or fame etc. are still caught in samsara.

In contrast you have the realm of the pretas or hungry ghosts. They represent greed. Their small mouths and insatiable appetites mean that they're never satisfied, and always want more and more. So this describes a state of mind that we can fall victim to. Likewise the asura realm represents extreme anger and wrath, sometimes jealousy. The animal realm represents torpor or ignorance. The human realm represents a state of equanimity or indifference, sometimes desire. The hell realm represents states of immense suffering.

So these are all ways to describe our condition as sentient beings, or in our case; the human condition.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 1:04 PM
Title: Re: My parents against my beliefs

Content:
krodha wrote:
The Tibetan Yungdrung Bön Institute is in Miami:

353 W 47th St.
Miami Beach, FL 33140

I'm sure they have programs where you can learn a great deal about these systems and traditions.

I believe Lama Khemsar Rinpoche presides over that institute though, his demeanor is quite austere (i.e. he doesn't f#@k around) so that is a possible avenue, but only if you're serious about the teachings.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:34 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Sherab said:
Okay, let's try this then:

"Emptiness means nothing exists inherently."

Therefore:

Any thing that exists must exist because of dependencies.

What does liberation means than?

If liberation means to be free from dependencies, then liberation is non-existence since any form of existence requires dependencies.

If liberation does not mean to be free from dependencies, then the state of liberation will always be depending on 'something else'. Therefore if that 'something else' change, then the state of liberation will change. This means that there is no guarantee that the state of liberation is stable. If there can be no guarantee that the state of liberation is stable, how can that state be called a state of liberation?

This is just to illustrate my point that all debates issue using terms such as existent and non-existent that have mutually exclusive meaning, can never come to a resolution because when you push the argument to its logical conclusion, you will end up with one extreme or another. To say that emptiness means nothing exists inherently does not provide an escape from this problem of using words with mutually exclusive meaning.

krodha wrote:
Nothing exists because of dependencies. Dependent origination is not origination.

Conventional existence is merely a convention. Therefore liberation is freedom from all four extremes.

"Those who perceive existents, non-existents,
inherent existence or dependent existence
do not see the truth of the Buddha's teaching."
- Nāgārjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 4:24 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Sherab said:
Nothing exists inherently.
Nothing exists inherently. Nothing exists in and of itself. Nothing exists by its own power. (They all have the same meaning.)

Therefore:

Any thing that exists must exist in dependence on something other than itself.

krodha wrote:
There is no 'itself' in dependent origination. There is nothing apart from, created by, or underlying the assumed dependencies. On top of that, the dependencies themselves are only such because the deluded mind draws associations and decides there is allegiance between the characteristics in question. The supposed 'thing' is a conventional designation which is inferred onto a certain collection of appearances which are deemed objective due to falling victim to the notion of a subject in the first place. The entire house of cards is a fallacy.

Sherab said:
What does liberation means than?

If liberation means to be free from existence, then liberation = non-existence.

krodha wrote:
Not at all. You aren't understanding how this works and are assuming that there is indeed inherent existence. There is nothing which inherently exists, therefore there is no non-existence, both or neither.

Sherab said:
If liberation does not mean to be free from existence, then the state of liberation will always be a state that depends on something else. Therefore if that something else change, then the state of liberation will change. This means that there is no guarantee that the state of liberation is stable. If there can be no guarantee that the state of liberation is stable, how can that state be called a state of liberation?

krodha wrote:
Liberation means a freedom from ignorance [avidyā] and the various implications of ignorance; such as deluded notions of existence, non-existence, both and neither. Buddhahood is an innate quality, it only becomes obscured by affliction. Why is it an innate quality? Because there is nothing which isn't empty. Empty things are empty by nature, therefore emptiness is always already implied, we simply don't see it due to being caught up in ignorance.

Your line of reasoning is faulty because it's predicated on a false premise.

Sherab said:
This is just to illustrate my point that all debates issue using mutually exclusive terms such as existent and non-existent, whether directly or indirectly, can never come to a resolution because when you push the argument to its logical conclusion, you will end up with one extreme or another. To come to a resolution intellectually, you will need to think using an approach that does not need to use such mutually exclusive terms. The other approach for resolution is to have direct realization.

krodha wrote:
Really this just illustrates that you don't understand dependent origination or emptiness. There is no establishment of mutual exclusivity, existence and non-existence are figments of delusion, and so there's no way they obstruct a resolution. As for direct realization being a resolution, that is a redundant point.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:40 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
A truly existent thing is unintelligible. Doesn't even make sense, and so non-existence doesn't make sense either. This is freedom from eternalism and nihilism.

jeeprs said:
I'm almost on board with you. No individual thing is truly existent - it doesn't exist in and of itself. But it doesn't therefore follow that nothing is real. But 'what is real' is also beyond designation as this or that thing.

Nirvana, in the positive sense, I understand as waking up to reality, seeing the way things truly are. But in addition to the negative descriptions of Nirvana, there are also positive descriptions. That is why I am interested in studying 'In Praise of Dharmadhatu'. You might say that is not 'the same Nagarjuna', but according to the chapter I have been reading it is ascribed to Nagarjuna. In that, the Dharmadhatu is described in positive terms . Brunnholzl notes in his commentary, that there are quite a few expressions in such texts which are at variance with what the strictly Madhyamika interpretation is supposed to be.

krodha wrote:
Where are the negative descriptions of Nirvana though? I don't see this apparent dichotomy of the negative a positive... again, it's only 'negative' if we are trying to establish inherency somewhere. There is no inherency, if there were, there would be no movement, no fluctuation, no growth, no dynamism, nothing at all.

asunthatneversets said:
But a svabhāva is by definition unconditioned, not dependent on other entities, and not caused. Thus the existence of a svabhāva is impossible.

jeeprs said:
The way I interpret this is that, 'existence' is phenomenal realm, the manifest realm, the realm of existing things, you and I, self and other. Svabhāva, as it says, is not in this realm, being unconditioned. There is not also some other realm 'over there', because ultimately there is only one reality, but from the point of view of 'the wayfarer', they are different realms.

But I don't think I have any issue with any of those texts you have quoted.

krodha wrote:
No, no... there is no manifest realm of 'existent things' and then some other realm (you clarified that this isn't what you meant though so nevermind). That isn't what this is saying at all. Svabhāva, means something which exists inherently on its own, completely free from causes and conditions. Nāgārjuna is saying such a thing is impossible. There are no conditioned things, and therefore there's nothing which is unconditioned.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:32 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:

hop.pala said:
When you read Nagarjuna and feel yourself good then probably are is on you on the right understanding,when feel yourself bad or feel nothing then probably not understand because only use the analytic side of your mind.The negation is always only for the analytic.The diverse buddhist logic is not for debate,it is only for the nonconceptual understanding.Attachment to "exist" or not exist" is not middle way.Middle way is nonconceptual,so is the attachment to emptiness is the same problem or to true self.

krodha wrote:
The point isn't an understanding in the mind which makes you feel good, nor an understanding which doesn't make you feel good. If either is the case, then the understanding is merely intellectual. The point is to experientially actualize the truth he

is pointing to in your own condition, beyond the intellect.

The negation is not always for the analytic. If you have seen emptiness, then it is plain as day that whatever it is you think exists, has never ever ever inherently (truly) existed.

There is no attachment to exist or non-existence going on in this discussion. Inherent existence is always negated, conventional existence (while a product of ignorance) is a useful tool and so it is tolerated because we of course have no other choice. That doesn't mean the conventional has any true reality, conventional things are merely conventions.

Emptiness is the middle way, a freedom from extremes.

Attachment to emptiness is only an issue when emptiness is turned into a view. Since emptiness is the pacification of views, turning emptiness into a view itself negates the entire premise of emptiness. The point is, as you said; non-conceptual realization.

Only the mind clings, clinging to emptiness means the deluded mind hasn't been pacified, and the understanding is only intellectual. Of course interacting here on a forum online, we have to use language to communicate and function within the conventional, these discussions don't constitute 'clinging to emptiness' though.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:09 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
In other words, the two truths only really become truly Buddhist when one views them as two aspects of the same "thing". Otherwise we simply have a dualistic theory no different to other religions.

hop.pala said:
Right.This can be an explanation,why can i accept the true self and the view of Nagarjuna in the same time.The understanding is nonconceptual.

krodha wrote:
And futerko is right, even though you have me accidentally cited instead, the two truths are like two aspects.

"The two truths are not different like two horns; in the conventionally real phase, when one sees the reflection of the moon in the water, insofar as there is the reflection, this is the conventionally real; insofar as this reflection is not the moon, this is the absolutely real. The fact that both represent one fact insofar as there is the presence of the moon in the water of the well without existing there, is the indivisibility of the two truths. About

the intellect that understands it in this way, it is said that it understands the two truths."
- Longchenpa

and

"Like mistakenly seeing a rope as a snake,
with these varied appearances
we perceive them as what they are not,
giving rise to the duality of externality and internality,
i.e. the material environments and life forms therein.
However, upon scrutiny only the rope itself is found -
These environments and life forms are primordially empty,
as the ultimate only seems to have such concrete form
within the dissimulating process of the conventional.
The perception of a snake is phenomenologically true in terms of our seeing it as so,
but seeing the rope instead is authentically true;
analogically, it is like the appearance of a bird on a promontory:
The nature of these two truths is that
this transitory world is merely conventional dissimulation,
which the authentic reality has no relationship to -
In the expanse of emptiness
everything is free within it's essence."
- Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 11:55 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
In other words, the two truths only really become truly Buddhist when one views them as two aspects of the same "thing". Otherwise we simply have a dualistic theory no different to other religions.

hop.pala said:
Right.This can be an explanation,why can i accept the true self and the view of Nagarjuna in the same time.The understanding is nonconceptual.

krodha wrote:
There's no way... Nāgārjuna adamately negates a true self, such a thing is impossible.

"Svabhāva is by definition the subject of contradictory ascriptions. If it exists, it must belong to an existent entity, which means that it must be conditioned, dependent on other entities, and possessed of causes. But a svabhāva is by definition unconditioned, not dependent on other entities, and not caused. Thus the existence of a svabhāva is

impossible."
- Nāgārjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 11:45 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Since there is nothing that exists unconditionally there is nothing that inherently exists. Dependent existence is not existence.

jeeprs said:
And, as I say, it tends directly towards nihilism, because the logical implication is, nothing whatever exists.

@futerko - I love the turtle.

krodha wrote:
Nothing exists inherently. But that also means that there is nothing that is inherently non-existent either, so nihilism is impossible. This is like seeing a rope as a snake, when you recognize that it's actually a rope, the snake is realized to be non-arisen. However in this case the rope represents the non-arising nature of the snake; its emptiness.

Things have a conventional nature, we can relatively say that they're existent conventionally, but that doesn't leave the realm of conventionality. The conventional designation is only inferred, the convention doesn't refer, there's nothing findable for it to refer to. This is the joyful irony.

A truly existent thing is unintelligible. Doesn't even make sense, and so non-existence doesn't make sense either. Therefore there is freedom from both eternalism and nihilism.

The only way you can perceive it as nihilistic, is if you believe that things exist inherently. Then yes this will appear as if your inherent things are being negated, because they are. Truly though, this reveals that there was nothing to negate in the first place. Inherent things are the delusion of the grasping mind, and do this is simply freedom from ignorance. Freedom from taking mirages, illusions, dream images, etc. as truly real.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 11:09 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
jeeprs said:
Eternalism means a view that there is something which is truly established or existent. I take it to mean that there is something that is eternal and existent, by virtue of which

'some ascetics' believe that they will be reborn in perpetuity.
The self and the world are eternal, barren, steadfast as a mountain peak, set firmly as a post. And though these beings rush around, circulate, pass away and re-arise, but this remains eternally.
Brahmajāla Sutta

Here, ‘this’ is that which ‘the eternalist’ believes is something durable, within which ‘beings rush around, circulate and re-arise’. This arises from the Vedic idea of sat as being ‘what really exists’, which is to be distinguished from asat, that which is illusory or unreal. Hence in this formulation, sat is what is ‘eternal, unchangeable, set firmly as a post’, and thus distinguishable from samsara or maya. It is conceived as ‘the essence of things’, both in general terms as Brahman and particular beings as ātman.

The Alagaddūpama Sutta criticizes those who think: This is the self, this is the world; after death I shall be permanent, everlasting, not subject to change; I shall endure as long as eternity’ - this too he [i.e. ‘the eternalist’] regards thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self’
That is an accurate view of what is criticized as 'eternalism', is it not?

Contrast that with the udanna which says:
There is, monks, an unborn — unbecome — unmade — unfabricated. If there were not that unborn — unbecome — unmade — unfabricated, there would not be the case that escape from the born — become — made — fabricated would be discerned. But precisely because there is an unborn — unbecome — unmade — unfabricated, escape from the born — become — made — fabricated is discerned.
"Nibbāna Sutta: Unbinding (3)" (Ud 8.3),

I take it that this 'unborn' is not something which is permanent, in the sense of existing continuously, in the way that 'the barren mountain peak' is conceived. It is not, properly, an object of thought or perception. But it is also not something non-existent. And I think that is because, what is 'eternal' is a different idea to 'something that exists by itself forever'.

Is that how you understand it?

krodha wrote:
A view of 'existence' is eternalism. For something to truly exist (inherently) it must exist outright, independent of causes and conditions. Since there is nothing that exists unconditionally there is nothing that inherently exists. Dependent existence is not existence.

There is no 'unborn' as a separate entity. The unborn is the non-arising (emptiness) of the imputed projections of mind mistaken as inherent reality. Unborn means non-arisen i.e. emptiness. Non-existence isn't a possibility because existence hasn't been posited in the first place. Only the deluded mind perceives extremes of existence, non-existence, both and/or neither. Emptiness is free of these. The unborn is dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:23 AM
Title: Re: Are these prophecies from Buddha?
Content:
krodha wrote:
The Kali Yuga!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 7:09 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
ASunThatNeverSets said:
Madhyamaka only results in nihilism in those who don't understand it, if it's understood what Madhyamaka is pointing to then nihilism is impossible

jeeprs said:
It still seems to me that Buddhism attracts many people with nihilist tendencies, whether they know that or not, and that it is very easy to rationalize that outlook in Zen and Madhyamika.

I don't agree that what Son of Buddha is advocating in this thread, is 'eternalism'. 'Eternalism' is the view that 'the self and the world will be reborn in perpetuity', as explained in Bikkhu Bodhi's commentary on the Brahmajala Sutta. But 'true nature' or 'Buddha nature' is not mere absence, nothingness, or non-being, and nirvana is not simply annihilation. However it is also inconceivable, beyond the samsaric mind, and beyond categories of existence and non-existence.

But I am not going to repeat multiple pages of argumentation about it.

krodha wrote:
Eternalism means a view that there is something which is truly established or existent. Meaning it's unconditioned, such a quality, capacity or thing is impossible in the eyes of the buddhadharma.

No one has said that one's nature is absence, nothingness or non-being. Also no one has ever suggested that nirvana is annihilation. This is what I mean by not understanding emptiness.

When you say one's nature is inconceivable, free of samsaric mind and free of the categories of existence or non-existence (both and neither), then this is emptiness.

So you've disparaged (your misunderstanding of) emptiness, and then proceeded to advocate for emptiness (thinking you were advocating for a contrasting view).

asunthatneversets said:
The Nāgārjuna who wrote 'In Praise of the Dharmadhātu' is not the same as the original Indian Nāgārjuna.

jeeprs said:
Karl Brunnholzl does not agree and provides extensive citations in support. He also says '..as much as some people might like to do so, it is impossible to restrict [Nagarjuna's] approach to negative or deconstructive rhetoric' (p25}. As he is a senior teacher at Nitartha Institute, I think his arguments ought to be heeded.

krodha wrote:
No one suggested Nāgārjuna's approach was negative or deconstructive. Only that those who grasp at their conditioning perceive it as such.

And unless Nāgārjuna lived for centuries, they aren't the same person.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:27 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Xabir said:
You don't have to take my word for it... just keep an open mind that the traditions could actually be speaking of different realizations (rather than merely 'sectarian polemics'), and that there might actually be people who have gone through these different realizations and are able to differentiate them.

jeeprs said:
I agree with that. I too have been through a lot of different phases, I'm sure that happens a lot with modern urban people, we are surrounded by books and information and resources, far more that you would have had in a traditional environment. (BTW I've seen Greg Goode speak, and also his collaborator and student Tomas Sander, on 'Emptiness and Post-Modernism' at one of the two Science and Non-Duality conferences I have been to, where the majority of the speakers were from a neo-Advaita type of background.)

I was very moved by my initial encounter with Ramana Maharishi's book, but then around the same time also got Zen Mind Beginner's Mind, (this is a long time ago now) and I thought that it was a more feasible and real teaching for me. So I embarked on reading Buddhism, took refuge and maintain a meditation practice.

But in the context of this debate, I tend to support the point of view being put forward by Son of Buddha, but I won't repeat all the arguments again. Suffice to say, it is very easy for Madhyamika to tend towards nihilism or to support nihilistic interpretations. I think the teaching of 'emptiness' is easily misrepresented as a kind of intellectual formula. I understand it in terms of paravritti, transformation of consciousness. As Tomas Sander

said in his talk, in the Buddhist perspective, this is not necessarily understood as being like a dramatic mountain-top awakening, but in terms of 'joyful irony', of seeing how things are (and have always been), day to day. So I relate to that, but *not* to Stephen Bachelor's Buddhist Atheism and his 'interpretation' of emptiness. (Tomas Sander's new blog in support of his book is http://awakeningclarity.blogspot.com.au/2013/09/first-chapter-preview-emptiness-and.html.)

The key thing for me has to be compassion. Whatever practice you're doing, whatever path you're on, if it doesn't actually generate the energy of compassion, like a power-station turns out electricity, then it's not working. Early on in my path I had the good fortune to go to a talk by the renowned Lama Yeshe and that talk really turned on a light-bulb for me (not that I knew it at the time. His lecture was similar to http://fpmt.org/education/teachings/lama-thubten-yeshe/bodhicitta-the-perfection-of-dharma/.)

I have just ordered Karl Brunnholzl's translation of and commentary on In Praise of Dharmadhatu. That is a very different side of Nagarjuna - devotional, rather than dialectical.

krodha wrote:
Madhyamaka only results in nihilism in those who don't understand it, if it's understood what Madhyamaka is pointing to then nihilism is impossible. Most label it nihilistic because they see it deconstructing the delusions of mind we've been conditioned to think are inherent aspects of experience and so they find it uncomfortable. Those who conceive of a True Self are the ones promoting nihilism, there is no being without non-being, no eternalism without nihilism, no true self without a false one (or an absence of that True Self); these are all delusions of mind.

No one's suggesting that emptiness is an intellectual endeavor, nor are I or xabir mistaking it as such.

If you lean towards Son of Buddha's view then you champion an eternalistic doctrine, which there's nothing wrong with, but I would say that is why you see nihilism elsewhere.

The Nāgārjuna who wrote 'In Praise of the Dharmadhātu' is not the same as the original Indian Nāgārjuna.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 3:01 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm sorry I had a typo in this Longchenpa quote (I posted earlier) above, which potentially obfuscated the meaning of the quote... Instead of 'no similarity', I had accidentally typed 'to similarity'. Here's the fixed quotation:

Third turning (Vajrayāna) does not teach that there is a 'True Self', as Longchenpa states here:

"The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears no similarity to the Self of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'Self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 1:11 PM
Title: Re: Is disability a result of karma?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I read today that resting in vidyā [rig pa] for three seconds purifies a kalpa of negative karma.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 8:25 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
krodha wrote:
Still, this doesn't mean third turning asserts the existence of a True Self. My Kagyu lama, who is a Mahāmudrā master, rejects this notion outright. He states that the 'vajra' in Vajrayāna means emptiness, and those who claim Vajrayāna states something other than the other two yānas in regards to selfhood, are sadly misinformed.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 7:51 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
And then you get teachings like this... clearly denigrating notions of a self of any kind, including your alleged Universal Self.

The Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra:

"Moreover, these sentient beings must have also discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conceptions of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self (True Self), because if they had not, their minds would inevitably grasp after such relative ideas. Further, these sentient beings must have already discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conception of the non-existence of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self. If they had not, their minds would still be grasping after such ideas. Therefore, every disciple who is seeking Anuttara-samyak-

sambodhi should discard, not only conceptions of one's own selfhood, other selves, living beings and a Universal Selfhood, but should discard, also, all ideas about such conceptions and all ideas about the non-existence of such conceptions."

and

"Such a person will be able to awaken pure faith because they have ceased to cherish any arbitrary notions of their own selfhood, other selves, living beings, or a universal self. Why? Because if they continue to hold onto arbitrary conceptions as to their own selfhood, they will be holding onto something that is non-existent. It is the same with all arbitrary conceptions of other selves, living beings, or a universal self. These are all expressions of non-existent things. Buddhas are Buddhas because they have been able to discard all arbitrary conceptions of form and phenomena, they have transcended all perceptions, and have penetrated the illusion of all forms."

and

"If a disciple cherishes the idea of a self, a person, a living being or a universal self, then that person is not an authentic disciple. Why? Because in fact there is no independently existing object of mind called the highest, most fulfilled, and awakened mind."

and

"A true disciple knows that there is no such thing as a self, a person, a living being, or a universal self. A true disciple knows that all things are devoid of selfhood"

Son of Buddha said:
your post has nothing to do with what is actually taught in the Third Turning Sutras or Tantra's.
This is from the second Turning not the 3rd turning.
as I said the Third Turning teaches True Self.

(also the Samdhi-nirmochana Sutra places your quote in the provisional Dharma while stating the Third Turning to be definite)

krodha wrote:
And Dzogchen, for example, states that the third turning is provisional while itself is definitive. It all depends on the teaching. Dzogpa Chenpo upholds a freedom from extremes, thoroughly negating a True Self, and when referencing the yānas and other systems; considers early Indian Prasangika Madhyamaka to be a definitive view (because it likewise upholds a freedom from extremes).

So your 'definitive' is provisional as well. Context is everything.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
Lastly ill add this
The Buddhas teach that emptiness
Removes, without fail, all clinging to views,
But those who cling to the view of emptiness
Are said to be incorrigible.

krodha wrote:
Also, this quote is irrelevant to this discussion. It is stating that emptiness is the pacification of views, because it is the pacification of the ignorance which grasps and clings. Ergo; grasping and clinging to the means or principle (emptiness) which removes views, is turning the means into a view itself, thereby negating emptiness. This isn't saying that emptiness is wrong, it's saying that objectifying emptiness in the relative mind is not the meaning of emptiness. Emptiness pacifies views, if you make emptiness into a view then you've failed to pacify views.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 7:14 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
krodha wrote:
And then you get teachings like this... clearly denigrating notions of a self of any kind, including your alleged Universal Self.

The Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra:

"Moreover, these sentient beings must have also discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conceptions of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self (True Self), because if they had not, their minds would inevitably grasp after such relative ideas. Further, these sentient beings must have already discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conception of the non-existence of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self. If they had not, their minds would still be grasping after such ideas. Therefore, every disciple who is seeking Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi should discard, not only conceptions of one's own selfhood, other selves, living beings and a Universal Selfhood, but should discard, also, all ideas about such conceptions and all ideas about the non-existence of such conceptions."

and

"Such a person will be able to awaken pure faith because they have ceased to cherish any arbitrary notions of their own selfhood, other selves, living beings, or a universal self. Why? Because if they continue to hold onto arbitrary conceptions as to their own selfhood, they will be holding onto something that is non-existent. It is the same with all arbitrary conceptions of other selves, living beings, or a universal self. These are all

expressions of non-existent things. Buddhas are Buddhas because they have been able to discard all arbitrary conceptions of form and phenomena, they have transcended all perceptions, and have penetrated the illusion of all forms."

and

"If a disciple cherishes the idea of a self, a person, a living being or a universal self, then that person is not an authentic disciple. Why? Because in fact there is no independently existing object of mind called the highest, most fulfilled, and awakened mind."

and

"A true disciple knows that there is no such thing as a self, a person, a living being, or a universal self. A true disciple knows that all things are devoid of selfhood"

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist parenting
Content:
disjointed said:
Just my ideas. It might be better to raise children as Buddhists.

krodha wrote:
Important to tread lightly (and wisely) though; my mentor is a perfect example of this. His son is now in his late 20's, but when he was a child, my mentor made sure that he created a fun environment around the dharma. He never pushed it on his son, but made it enjoyable. For instance; he would place his son on his shoulders and let him ring the bell and wave the vajra around and they would clap and dance and sing Vajra Guru Mantra... his son remembers it to this day.

When his son got older, and there were teachings to attend, my mentor would set up a fun outing around the event, and let his son bring a video game he could play quietly during the teaching. Before hand they would go and get lunch wherever his son wanted to, and afterwards they would go see a movie and get ice cream. So his son learned that going to the teachings wasn't all that bad. During empowerments and important transmissions (meaning in the moments the teacher was giving the wang or lung) he would have his son sit on his lap and pay attention, but the rest of the time he was allowed to play quietly. He never pushed it on his son though, and now that his son is older, he's an avid Chödpa and is very passionate about the Dharma. He's also a happy and well balanced guy, so my mentor did good raising him.

I do the same with my son, who's 4. He knows about buddhas, and says they're like magical ninjas, he'll have his toy ninjas pretend to meditate etc. I let him ring the bell and pretend he's shooting lighting out of the vajra. We hung prayer flags in his room, and he's visited my Kagyu lama here in SF who gave him a small wooden prayer wheel and a pouch for his toys. I've taken him to group practice (ganapuja) and let him take a brief

look at webcasts from Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche (when I'm watching) until he loses interest. He knows about the Dzogchen guardians (I have a large thangka with the three of them on it he looks at) and says they're the guys who kick butt. He has a positive perception of the Dharma and that's all that's important I think. Whether he chooses to be involved with it when he's older, that will be up to him, I'll never push it on him. The last thing I'd want is to try and condition him like that. That is when you get resistance and can ruin the experience for them. It's just good to create a positive and light environment with the teachings, have the Dharma present and accessible but don't ever indoctrinate or insist upon it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 6:34 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
you do realise the Samdhinirmocana sutra states that the 1st and 2nd turnings are provisional and only the 3rd turning is definite right?
so those 3rd turning True Self teaching are considered the definite teaching by this sutra you mention.

krodha wrote:
Third turning (Vajrayāna) does not teach that there is a 'True Self', as Longchenpa states here:

"The final [turning] for the sake of those who had reached fulfillment and who were of sharpest capacity taught the nature of all that is knowable, as it really is. As such, it bears to similarity to the Self of the Hindu heretics because these people in their ignorance speak of a 'Self' that does not actually exist, being a mere imputation superimposed on reality."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 1:34 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
futerko said:
Sorry, I should've been more specific. On the "Emptiness and the two truths" thread you wrote,
"The view of Buddha nature I personally champion is the gzhi of Ati Dzogpa Chenpo; the inseparable three kāyas and their respective wisdoms. Primordial wisdom free from extremes."

So it seems you've used the term "gzhi" in two different senses here. I take it that it is the ālaya that falls away and not the kāyas. I'm far more familiar with the second usage. Thanks for the references, that gives me plenty to go on.

asunthatneversets said:
Yeah there's the basis [gzhi] which is the three kāyas, and then the all-basis [kun gzhi] which is the result of not recognizing the gzhi.

futerko said:
Ahh, I see, thanks.

krodha wrote:
Also, sometimes Bönpo Dzogchen doesn't differentiate between the basis [gzhi] and all-basis [kun gzhi], they'll just refer to the basis as 'kun zhi', I've also attended a teaching by Keith Dowman, for example, and he didn't differentiate the bases either. So that's something to watch out for because it can make things potentially confusing. Bönpo masters like Lopon Tenzin Namdak will differentiate the basis and all-basis, and Nyingma Dzogchen does as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 12:37 AM
Title: Re: Beautiful Dhamma songs/Chantings
Content:
krodha wrote:
Palden Rangjung: Homage to Ekajati

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 10:52 AM
Title: Re: Deadbeat parents
Content:
krodha wrote:
My teacher has said sometimes compassion must be expressed in the form of 'tough love', meaning that if the circumstances call for it, the best course of action may not appear to be (what we would conventionally consider to be) compassionate. If we simply give aid to someone and allow their abusive behavior or habits to continue, then this isn't being compassionate, because all we are doing is enabling them. Compassion doesn't mean rolling over and letting people get away with murder, or becoming a doormat and letting people walk all over us (or others). It's important to find a strong balance and be able to give peaceful and wrathful compassion in accordance with whatever circumstances we are faced with.

In my opinion; 'giving without limit' means precisely that. Being able to adapt and give the proper aid the situation calls for. Not limiting ourselves to associating compassionate activity with being a 'nice person' who simply enables people to do

whatever they want, that's being stupid, not compassionate.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 7:53 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Sherab said:
Given the above, there are those that resort solely to dependent arising, arguing that everything is dependent on something else and this goes on ad infinitum. For those who believe that everything has a cause, then they have to posit an endless chain of causation. For those who are familiar with logic, such arguments can never be a complete argument and therefore not intellectually satisfying.

krodha wrote:
You're failing to understand how dependent origination works. Things depending upon other things is not what is being pointed to in dependent origination, perhaps a notion of that nature can be used in a very crude and coarse way, but it is unskillful and will not alleviate suffering or the ignorance which causes it. The cause is ignorance; delusion about the nature of experience and reality. The entire charade of samsara is built and predicated upon that ignorance. 'Causes and conditions' isn't speaking of coarse causes, such as the 'endless chain of causality' you referenced, nothing of the sort. Delusion and the propensities which come from that delusion, are the causes and conditions which birth and sustain conditioned existence.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I never mentioned existence or non-existence, but yes a freedom from extremes would imply all four extremes.

Sherab said:
Freedom from extremes is just a short cut for freedom from the extreme of existent, non-existent, both existent and non-existent, and neither existent nor non-existent.

krodha wrote:
Right, as I said; 'freedom from extremes would imply all four extremes'.

asunthatneversets said:
Liberation isn't about being free from dependent origination,

Sherab said:
Then we are talking pass one another.

Thanks for the discussion.

krodha wrote:
A buddha's freedom from dependent origination is due to seeing dependent origination for what it is. The root of dependent origination is ignorance, see ignorance for what it is, and it no longer has power over your condition. When that knowledge increases to it's full measure, there is buddhahood.

As Nāgārjuna says:
"Neither samsara nor nirvana exist;
instead, nirvana is the thorough knowledge of samsara"

Dependent origination and emptiness [śūnyatā] are synonymous in most traditions. The chain of dependent origination [12 nidānas] arises due to ignorance [avidyā], which is the first 'link' in the chain. Once ignorance arises the chain of causation then perpetually builds upon itself. The idea is that the chain of dependent origination doesn't actually create anything at all, but we mistakenly perceive it as valid, and so we are beguiled into taking our own ignorance as inherent aspects of experience. The theory of dependent origination is a tool which can help 'undo' or 'see through' the chain (though there's nothing to truly 'undo', it's simply a matter of understanding the nature of our habitual tendencies and propensities which reify these aspects of experience).

"The wonder of it! This marvelous, astounding event/reality (Dharma):
From that which involves no origination, everything originates;
and in that very origination, there is no origination!
The wonder of it!
In it's very enduring, there is no enduring!
The wonder of it!
In it's very cessation, there is no cessation!"
- Guhyagarbha Tantra

Vimalamitra states [per Malcolm]:
"Everything arose from non-arising;
even arising itself never arose."

When we are ignorant of emptiness and dependent origination, conceptual imputation and conventional language are mistaken as pointing towards authentic persons, places, things, etc. When ignorance is undone, there is freedom to use conventional language, however it no longer creates confusion because wisdom directly knows ignorance for what it is.

In the buddhadharma, conventionality is allowed to be a tool implemented for communication, so there's freedom to be John Doe or Mary Smith, and trees, rocks, cars etc., are allowed to be the useful conceptual designations they are. Conventionality is treated as a useful tool which doesn't point to anything outside of itself. The conventional truth is relative... words, concepts, ideas, persons, places, things etc., and is contrasted by ultimate truth, which is the emptiness of those

conventions. As Dilgo Khyenste Rinpoche shares: "By examining relative truth, establish absolute truth; Within absolute truth, see how relative truth arises. Where the two truths are inseparable, beyond intellect, is the state of simplicity."

Here the Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra discusses how conventional imputation gives rise to misconceptions when governed by delusion:
"Like mistakenly seeing a rope as a snake,
with these varied appearances
we perceive them as what they are not,
giving rise to the duality of externality and internality,
i.e. the material environments and life forms therein.
However, upon scrutiny only the rope itself is found -
These environments and life forms are primordially empty,
as the ultimate only seems to have such concrete form
within the dissimulating process of the conventional.
The perception of a snake is phenomenologically true in terms of our seeing it as so,
but seeing the rope instead is authentically true;
analogically, it is like the appearance of a bird on a promontory:
The nature of these two truths is that
this transitory world is merely conventional dissimulation,
which the authentic reality has no relationship to -
In the expanse of emptiness
everything is free within it's essence."

All apparent phenomena which fall under the category of 'conditioned' - meaning they seemingly accord with one or more of the four extremes [existence, nonexistence, both, neither] - originate dependently. We know this is so because there is no such thing as phenomena which is independent of causes and conditions, per Nāgārjuna:

"Whatever is dependently co-arisen
That is explained to be emptiness.
That, being a dependent designation
Is itself the middle way.
Something that is not dependently arisen,
Such a thing does not exist.
Therefore a non-empty thing
Does not exist."

If we look at the very first link in the chain of dependent origination, we find ignorance [avidyā], and as Nāgārjuna states:

"When the perfect vidyā [discerning wisdom knowledge] sees,
That things come from ignorance as condition,
Nothing will then be objectified,
Either in terms of arising or destruction."

So 'things' arise due to confusion and ignorance, once emptiness is realized, confusion

and ignorance are undone, and 'things' are understood to be non-arisen. Non-arising isn't suggesting non-existence, because for the non-arisen, existence hasn't been suggested to begin with. Just as when you mistakenly view a rope to be a snake; the snake is a misconception, it's delusion, ignorance. Recognize the snake for what it is (a rope) and the snake falls, the snake is understood to have always been delusion, therefore the snake is non-arisen. Likewise, the aggregates (constituent aspects of experience) are a misconception, delusion, ignorance. Recognize the aggregates for what they are (the empty display of primordial wisdom) and the aggregates fall. The aggregates are understood to have always been delusion, therefore the aggregates are empty and non-arisen.

Phenomena which appear to be conditioned (and appear to accord with one or more of the four extremes), are in truth dependently originated and are therefore empty, unborn, non-arisen, free from extremes etc. When we mistakenly perceive something which we attribute substantiality (or insubstantiality) to (meaning it has originated and/or ceased), all that is occurring is a misapprehension within the confines of ignorance. Ignorance itself isn't an entity which is anymore established or valid than the apparent structuring it gives rise to... however ignorance is precisely the proclivity to habitually relate to experience in a way that reifies a subject-object dichotomy and all the subsequent arisings which depend on that dichotomy. It is that tendency to objectify phenomena and grasp which is one of the main issues.

Dependent origination is not truly origination, which is pointed out by Nāgārjuna in his 60 Stanzas:
"The supreme knower of reality, said that dependent production is not production."

Once ignorance falls, wisdom [prajñā] remains. Unafflicted dependent origination can unfold in wisdom (though it's usually called lhun grub; 'self-origination', 'natural formation' etc.), but wisdom is no longer fooled. So those projections aren't being reified. In wisdom, unafflicted dependent origination becomes freedom of expression, in delusion, afflicted dependent origination becomes the cause for delusion's own self-perpetuation.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Being empty of itself isn't equivalent to nihilism. Emptiness is a freedom from extremes and so is neither nihilistic or eternalistic.

Sherab said:
Since you hold that emptiness is freedom from the extremes of existence and non-existence (note: there is no need to consider the other two extremes), then all that is left for you to claim would be that emptiness is dependent arising. But since the ultimate is emptiness, then the ultimate is also dependent arising. If everything is

dependent arising then there is no need to talk about an ultimate. But if everything is dependent arising, then there is no possibility of being liberated since liberation is about being able to be free from being a dependent arising.

krodha wrote:
I never mentioned existence or non-existence, but yes a freedom from extremes would imply all four extremes. Emptiness is synonymous with dependent origination in Madhyamaka. The ultimate is the emptiness of the relative. If everything is dependently arisen then it makes perfect sense to say that the ultimate nature of X is that it is empty. Liberation isn't about being free from dependent origination, but seeing that dependent origination is non-origination, and therefore there is liberation from the ignorance which perceives that phenomena accord with any extreme.

asunthatneversets said:
Liberation being a convention doesn't mean liberation isn't possible or an arbitrary notion, quite the opposite. If liberation was anything more than conventional it would indeed be impossible.

Sherab said:
You misunderstood. I did not say nor imply that liberation is a convention. What I did try to say is that if the conventional is all there is, then liberation is not possible. See my argument above.

krodha wrote:
The 'ultimate' is nothing more than the emptiness of the relative i.e. conventional. There is nothing which isn't conventional.

asunthatneversets said:
The middle position is emptiness; the freedom from extreme views.

Sherab said:
Does this mean that emptiness is dependent arising? If not, then how is emptiness a freedom from extreme views?

krodha wrote:
Dependent origination accords with a freedom from extremes. If emptiness isn't dependent origination then we border on the view of Dzogpa Chenpo which sees emptiness and dependent origination as antonymous, but only because they are used differently, the same principles still stand.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:47 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen vs Tantra
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The account of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa? Yes it is apparently an authoritative account.

Jikan said:
Of course. I should have been clearer--I was asking about the first-person voice of the author of the awakening to reality blog, who is the one I know nothing about.

krodha wrote:
Ah the author is AEN who posts here as xabir, though he writes quite often he didn't write anything himself in that piece. Just referenced Malcolm's statements and some from the Kunzang Dechen Lingpa article (along with some insight from his own mentor).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:29 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen vs Tantra
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Rainbow body may not be what you think it is:
https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2013/03/rainbow-body-and-thusnesss-advise.html?m=1

Jikan said:
I don't know of the author of this item. Is this an authoritative or accurate account?

krodha wrote:
The account of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa? Yes it is apparently an authoritative account.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There's the whole aspect too where there really isn't an actual rang stong, but that rang stong is simply a straw man created by gzhan stong pas. Gzhan stong adopted a certain view and then said 'we're gzhan stong, all the rest of you are rang stong'. In all actuality those who are labeled rang stong pas are just those who follow the traditional view of emptiness, and would never refer to themselves as rang stong pas.

Sherab said:
Both rang stong and gzhan stong are straw men.

If the ultimate is empty of itself, you are forced into two possible extreme positions. One is that the ultimate is really nothing and that would be nihilism. The other extreme position is that the conventional is all there is and that would imply that liberation is not possible.

If the ultimate is not empty of itself but empty of other, you are forced into saying that

the ultimate has inherent existence. If so, it would be permanent. If it is permanent, it cannot produce anything. If it cannot produce anything, there can be no phenomena. All you will get is a static world.

That is why such debates using mutually exclusive pairs of words such as existent and non-existent etc. is futile because it is not possible to come to the "middle" position as taught in the suttas/sutras.

krodha wrote:
Being empty of itself isn't equivalent to nihilism. Emptiness is a freedom from extremes and so is neither nihilistic or eternalistic.

Liberation being a convention doesn't mean liberation isn't possible or an arbitrary notion, quite the opposite. If liberation was anything more than conventional it would indeed be impossible.

The middle position is emptiness; the freedom from extreme views.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:16 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
And Shentongpas are only following the traditional views of emptiness found in the Buddha Nature Sutras.

asunthatneversets said:
That's debatable. I'm going to respond to your last post, I read it while I was at my Kagyu lama's center. Drubpon Yeshi Rinpoche (who is visiting) was telling his life story tonight and he added randomly that we should be practicing and not debating and constructing intellectual models. I'm sure he knew, my teacher here is clairvoyant as well :\

Son of Buddha said:
its actually not debatable.....seeing as I have already proven that the Shentong view is literally copied and pasted from the Buddha Nature Sutras.
I could post 20 more quotes where it says Enlightenment is empty of all defilements but it is not empty of its own inherently pure Nature and you would still deny what is clearly written in front of you.

P.S. Its actually a practice to debate in the vajrayana tradition.many traditions set aside time to debate everyday.

krodha wrote:
Of course it's debatable, anything and everything is. I could also post various quotes which state that enlightenment is empty of all defilements and its also empty of its own nature. You'd deny what's in front of you as well.

Yes I know about the debate and debate often, the Drikung Kagyu is just very practice oriented, and Yeshi Rinpoche is very traditional to his lineage.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:06 PM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi] essentially represents non-recognition of our nature, and so is naturally implied if we aren't in recognition of our nature. Differentiating mind and vidyā, or the all-basis and vidyā, mind and the nature of mind, ālaya and dharmakāya, etc., is a common theme in Dzogchen.

futerko said:
Sorry, I should've been more specific. On the "Emptiness and the two truths" thread you wrote,
"The view of Buddha nature I personally champion is the gzhi of Ati Dzogpa Chenpo; the inseparable three kāyas and their respective wisdoms. Primordial wisdom free from extremes."

So it seems you've used the term "gzhi" in two different senses here. I take it that it is the ālaya that falls away and not the kāyas. I'm far more familiar with the second usage. Thanks for the references, that gives me plenty to go on.

krodha wrote:
Yeah there's the basis [gzhi] which is the three kāyas, and then the all-basis [kun gzhi] which is the result of not recognizing the gzhi.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 1:48 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen vs Tantra
Content:
krodha wrote:
Depends who you ask I'm sure, Dzogchen is held to produce a buddhahood which is superior even to other dharma vehicles, as Malcolm has shared before: "this is why the Dzogchen doctrine of two different kinds of Buddhahood is critical -- the first, the buddhahood that reverts the basis is the buddhahood asserted by all lower vehicles. The buddhahood that does not revert to the basis is the preserve of only Dzogchen".

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 1:28 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
There's the whole aspect too where there really isn't an actual rang stong, but that rang stong is simply a straw man created by gzhan stong pas. Gzhan stong adopted a certain view and then said 'we're gzhan stong, all the rest of you are rang stong'. In all actuality those who are labeled rang stong pas are just those who follow the traditional view of emptiness, and would never refer to themselves as rang stong pas.

Son of Buddha said:
And Shentongpas are only following the traditional views of emptiness found in the Buddha Nature Sutras.

krodha wrote:
That's debatable. I'm going to respond to your last post, I read it while I was at my Kagyu lama's center. Drubpon Yeshi Rinpoche (who is visiting) was telling his life story tonight and he added randomly that we should be practicing and not debating and constructing intellectual models. I'm sure he knew, my teacher here is clairvoyant as well :\

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 12:35 PM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's the whole aspect too where there really isn't an actual rang stong, but that rang stong is simply a straw man created by gzhan stong pas. Gzhan stong adopted a certain view and then said 'we're gzhan stong, all the rest of you are rang stong'. In all actuality those who are labeled rang stong pas are just those who follow the traditional view of emptiness, and would never refer to themselves as rang stong pas.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 11:04 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
krodha wrote:
The ālaya's aspects are defined as fourfold...

'The four in detal are:

The primordial ālaya: the attendance of nescience upon wisdom - that aspect [of nescience] that from the beginning arises simultaneously with gnosis, like tarnish on gold; it serves as the initial basis for all samsaric phenomena.

[ii] The linking-up ālaya: the basis of karmic activity, the neutral basic support that links up and impels through one's individual karma to samsara and nirvana.

[iii] The ālaya of various imprints: the neutral [basis] of diverse latent karma that

generates the samsaric cycle of mind and mental factors.

[iv] The ālaya of the body of imprints: nescience as a basis, a ground for the manifestation of three different bodies [a] a gross body that manifests as parts, whose limbs and organs are [composed of] minute particles, radiant body of light, and [c] a body that manifests out of contemplation.'

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 10:41 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The all-basis is what falls away when we recognize our nature.

futerko said:
Could you elaborate on this, or provide a reference please?

krodha wrote:
The nature of mind is 'non-dual emptiness and clarity', so either (i) clarity (cognizance) must be recognized as empty, or (ii) emptiness must be recognized as non-dual with clarity.

The all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi] essentially represents non-recognition of our nature, and so is naturally implied if we aren't in recognition of our nature. Differentiating mind and vidyā, or the all-basis and vidyā, mind and the nature of mind, ālaya and dharmakāya, etc., is a common theme in Dzogchen.

Clarity (cognizance) alone implies a subtle reference point and a subtle grasping, but when clarity is sealed with emptiness that reference point is freed up and the grasping is cut. cl
Clarity alone (divorced of the recognition of its emptiness) is merely the neutral indeterminate cognizance of the ālaya. All sentient beings function from the standpoint of the ālaya.

There's (i) non-fixation which is resting in the clarity of mind (as a reference point), and then there's (ii) non-fixation resting in the nature of mind (free of a reference point). Confusing the former for the latter causes a lot of issues.

Dudjom Rinpoche points out the difference between the ālaya and vidyā [rig pa]:

"When the mind starts to rest, a slight diminishment of movement and thoughts constitutes a false semblance of stillness. When deep certainty arises that stillness is unborn and movement unceasing, and that stillness and movement are an equal taste, you have begun to meditate correctly."

The ālaya is the deluded reference point of mind which abides as the 'stillness' behind

the movement of thought. This is also the clarity of mind. The deep certainty he's alluding to is the recognition of the mind's nature, where that clarity (i.e. stillness) is recognized as empty (or unborn as he puts it). Instead of the background stillness or clarity, it's recognized that the stillness was only ever precisely the movement of thought and phenomena, and that 'cognizance' is precisely the 'forms' of experience, at that point 'stillness and movement are an equal taste' as Dudjom Rinpoche put it, and that is knowledge of the mind's nature, which is vidyā [rig pa]. 'Meditating correctly' in this context means authentic vipaśyanā i.e. resting in the natural state.

The Reverberation of Sound Tantra explains the etymology of 'all-basis':
"The etymology of 'kun' [all] lies in it's subsuming everything.
The etymology of 'gzhi' [basis] lies in it's accumulation and hoarding (of karmic traces and propensities)."

The same text continues:
"Here I will explain the all-basis to start off:
It is the ground of all phenomena and non-phenomena."

The Tantra of the Self-Arisen Vidyā states:
"The all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi] is adulterated by diverse cognitive processes
By force of it's sustaining neurotic conceptuality;
The all-basis is the real ignorance [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa]."

Jigme Lingpa in 'Distinguishing The Three Essential Points of Dzogchen' states:
"The ālaya is the basis of all samsara and nirvana;
It is not unlike muddy water.
[In it], because of confusion led by latent ignorance,
The brightness of wisdom and gnosis has become hidden."

Elsewhere he states:

"Those who, not understanding this, mistake the ālaya for the dharmakāya, are like blind men wandering in the desert without a guide. Because of their confusion about the vital points of the basis and result, they have come to a standstill on the path that accomplishes buddhahood in one lifetime."

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 9:32 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Thanks, that was very interesting. I know next to nothing about Dzogchen really, I need to read up.

krodha wrote:
It's good stuff. The info above spans Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna and Dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 9:21 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
We can cherry pick quotes all day which support our positions

Son of Buddha said:
,

I can cheery pick quotes all day from the Many Buddha Nature Sutras to support my position.
you however can only cherry pick ONE quote from the Buddha Nature Sutras to support your position (its literally the ONLY quote you guys have)

krodha wrote:
These are your interpretations, you see what you want to see and find reference material which you believe supports your confirmation biases. The authority you find and provide is that which you give power to via belief and opinion. The same goes for any point of view I have. The difference is that I am not claiming a definitive view and willing it onto the entire spectrum of Buddha nature teachings so I can validate my opinion.

I can provide other citations. However I have no interest in persuading you out of your view, I'm only interested in placing some moderation on your claim that gzhan stong is definitive, by showing that such a notion doesn't leave the realm of opinion.

Son of Buddha said:
the problem with your statement is the information I provided is not my opinion at all, it is what the Queen Srimala Sutra clearly states.
the position of Shentong(other-Emptiness) is taught in the Queen Srimala Sutra (its literally word for word.....and its word for word cause Dolpopa quoted it)

krodha wrote:
And there are various views which refute such a position. I never said the information itself is an opinion, the part that is an opinion, is your assertion that your position on the matter is an authoritative interpretation.

Son of Buddha said:
Nonsense Dolpopa wrote an extensive Book on Shentong its called Mountain Doctrine..... in his book he literally quotes the Buddha Nature Sutras and lets them speak for themselves, then afterwards he give a small commentary on the passage itself.so Dolpopas views are entirely based on Buddha Nature Sutras .

matter of FACT what are your views of Buddha Nature based on????????

can you quote from the Buddha Nature Sutras to support your position??
(surely you have more than just one quote right?)

krodha wrote:
Dolpopa didn't write a book on gzhan stong, he invented gzhan stong. He gives his own interpretation, an interpretation of the Buddha Nature sutras.

What is my view of Buddha nature? In the context of the Buddha nature sutras; it is a notion (more accurately a skillful means i.e. upāya) to instill confidence and show that buddhahood is a latent possibility; the curd in milk, which can be actualized given the proper causes and conditions.

The view of Buddha nature I personally champion is the gzhi of Ati Dzogpa Chenpo; the inseparable three kāyas and their respective wisdoms. Primordial wisdom free from extremes. The Buddha nature sutras, while valuable, are unnecessary (in the context of Atiyoga) and do not support that position.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 8:46 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen vs Tantra
Content:
krodha wrote:
Relevant threads...

Atomic and Rainbow bodies:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=9748

Females who achieved Rainbow body:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=9945

Rainbow body may not be what you think it is:
https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2013/03/rainbow-body-and-thusnesss-advise.html?m=1

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 8:17 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
The correct view on Emptiness in relation to the Buddha Nature is Shentong (literally)

asunthatneversets said:
In your opinion (literally).

Son of Buddha said:
You must not of read my passage I posted
"O Lord, there are two kinds of wisdom of emptiness with reference to the tathāgatagarbha. The tathāgatagarbha that is empty is separate from, free from, and different from the stores of all defile ments. And the tathāgatagarbha that is not empty is not separate from, not free from, and not different from the inconceivable Buddha-Dharmas more numerous than the sands of the Ganges River. “O Lord, the various great disciples can believe in the Tathā gata with reference to the two wisdoms of emptiness. All arhats and pratyekabuddhas revolve in the realm of the four contrary views"

its not my opinion the Queen Srimala Sutras position on emptiness is LITERALLY Shentong.

(Dolpopas teachings on Shentong(other-emptiness) was simply copied from the Buddha Nature Sutras....he didnt create anything new)

krodha wrote:
We can cherry pick quotes all day which support our positions, that still doesn't discount the fact that it is your own opinion that these selected quotes are authoritative and represent the full spectrum of views regarding buddha nature. It's quite obvious they do not, because that is impossible. So the principle still stands that it is your own opinion the correct view regarding emptiness and buddha nature is gzhan stong.

Dolpopa's gzhan stong is Advaita Vedanta dressed in Buddhist drag, so you're right he didn't create anything new; he simply adopted an eternalistic tīrthika view and paraded it as buddhadharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 8:04 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
krodha wrote:
In the Dröltig Gongpa Rangdröl it states that even up until the path of no more learning (which is equivalent to aspect of non-meditation in Mahāmudrā and accords with the fourth vision of thögal) there is remnants of delusion in sleep:

"With the exhaustion of striving for mindfulness, meditation and post-meditation are completely mixed. Though subtle stains of delusion remain during sleep; this is called the lesser yoga of no more learning [lesser non-meditation]."

Then the next degree:

"Throughout the day and night, you become entirely at one with the luminosity; the subtle luminosity of sleep arises as experiences; this is called the medium yoga of no more learning [medium non-meditation]."

And the last:

"The subtle stains of the object of cognition, dualistic appearances, are exhausted, and the luminosities of ground and path are mixed into one; this is called the great yoga of no more learning [greater non-meditation]."

Great yoga of no more learning and great non-meditation are also called 'crossing over, without any difference in day or night, to the state of the inseparable three kāyas'. In Dzogpa Chenpo sem sde this stage is referred to as 'the experience of spontaneous presence transcending the boundaries of ordinary contemplation'. These three sections span stages [skt. bhūmi, tib. byang chub sems dpa'i sa] 8 to 16.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 7:30 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
i would like to continue this thread by asking that how does Buddha-nature teach the correct view of emptiness? and what separates it from the extreme of eternalism?

Son of Buddha said:
The correct view on Emptiness in relation to the Buddha Nature is Shentong (literally)

krodha wrote:
In your opinion (literally).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 6:14 AM
Title: Re: dream yoga and supplements, pills, some questions
Content:
krodha wrote:
Some people are of course more naturally predisposed to lucid dreaming etc., but for the most part I think the lucidity in sleep eventually flowers as a direct result of one's stability in the natural state. If you read some of the gradualist texts in Vajrayāna for example - which discuss the stages of realization - at a certain point the waking and dream states begin to intermingle on their own.

A friend of mine who is a good practitioner also said that after a certain point his ability to be lucid in dream and deeper sleep simply occurred naturally. That isn't to say we shouldn't attempt dream yoga as beginners, I think there's great value in it. And there are cetainly good habits which promote lucidity along with herbal supplements and activities that coordinate energy. But I think some of these issues with dream practice begin to naturally resolve themselves with time well spent in practice.

Part of the issue is that the all-basis [skt. ālaya, tib. kun gzhi], expresses itself as the deep unknowing states which occur in sleep, fainting etc. The all-basis is what falls away when we recognize our nature. It's sustained by karmic propensities and dualistic habitual tendencies, so some traces still remain latent even after recognition, but there is an increase in lucidity as those propensities fall away due to resting in vidyā.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 5:52 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
to Asunthatneversets
That looks like a quote from the Lankavatara.

First off that text never says Tathagatagrabha is skillfull means.

Second “Mahamati, my teaching of Tathāgatagarbha is not equivalent with the assertion of the Self of the non-Buddhists. Mahamati, the Tathāgata

The quote is seperating the idea of a substastial Self such as "the size of a thumb size of a mustard seed non buddhist idea of self from the tathagtagrabha(true self)

Third the rest of the quote is in reference to newly converted Buddhists,who still had wrong views of what the self was so Tathagatagarbha is redefined as to not confuse those new converts.

Fourth your translation from about half way down looks entirely mistranslated and doesn"t even make since nor does it compare or line up with Suzuki or Red pines translations.

As far as Buddha Nature being a definite teaching read the Dharma Drum Sutra and Nirvana Sutra.

krodha wrote:
It is a skillful means:

Thus spoke Samantabhadra: "The ālaya is a state that is like the vast general ground of all samsara and nirvana having fallen asleep and not being awake to the sense objects. However, even during the five unconscious states, mind itself and mind, which have the nature of support and supported, remain latently present. In the lower vehicles this [ālaya] is taught as the buddha nature for the sake of temporarily guiding the immature ones who are eaten by doubts regarding the stainless true condition."
- Jigme Lingpa

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 5:41 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
These schools are entirely inline with the sutras they uphold (third turning)

asunthatneversets said:
They tend to either (i) err into eternalism, or (ii) hold conditioned dharmas (mind i.e. consciousness) to be unconditioned. I don't doubt that they are entirely in line with certain individual's interpretations of the sūtras they allegedly uphold, but for the reasons given I would have to disagree that those interpretations are accurate.

Son of Buddha said:
sigh.....Start your own thread on the subject
with that said im positive your individual interpretations of the sutras is not in line with what is actually taught in the sutras on the subject matter themselves,which is why you cannot accept that these schools are inline with the respective sutras they uphold.

Peace and Love

krodha wrote:
Yes we will have to agree to disagree. Peace and Love.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 5:26 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
asunthatneversets
Those who have perverted the Tathāgatagarbha into a 'True Self'
The Tathagatagarbha is the True Self,I havent perverted anything I just quoted what the sutra says it is.

[Nirvana sutra] CHAPTER TWELVE: ON THE TATHAGATA-DHATU “Kasyapa said to the Buddha: "O World-Honoured One! Is there Self in the 25 existences or not?" The Buddha said: "O good man! "Self" means "Tathagatagarbha" [Buddha-Womb, Buddha-Embryo, Buddha-Nature]. Every being has Buddha-Nature. This is the Self. Such Self has, from the very beginning, been under cover of innumerable defilements. That is why man cannot see it. O good man!

krodha wrote:
The Tathāgatagarbha in and of itself is an example of upāya and is a provisional pointer for those who lack confidence in their nature. The Tathāgatagarbha being presented as a

Self is yet another example of upāya, this is stated specifically by the Buddha.

"Similarly, that Tathāgatagarbha taught in the sutras spoken by the Bhagavan, since the completely pure luminous clear nature is completely pure from the beginning, possessing the thirty two marks, the Bhagavan said it exists inside of the bodies of sentient beings.

When the Bhagavan described that– like an extremely valuable jewel thoroughly wrapped in a soiled cloth, is thoroughly wrapped by cloth of the aggregates, ayatanas and elements, becoming impure by the conceptuality of the thorough conceptuality suppressed by the passion, anger and ignorance – as permanent, stable and eternal, how is the Bhagavan's teaching this as the Tathāgatagarbha is not similar with as the assertion of self of the non-Buddhists?

Bhagavan, the non-Buddhists make assertion a Self as "A permanent creator, without qualities, pervasive and imperishable".

The Bhagavan replied:

"Mahamati, my teaching of Tathāgatagarbha is not equivalent with the assertion of the Self of the non-Buddhists.

Mahamati, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyak Sambuddhas, having demonstrated the meaning of the words "emptiness, reality limit, nirvana, non-arisen, signless", etc. as Tathāgatagarbha for the purpose of the immature complete forsaking the perishable abodes, demonstrate the expertiential range of the non-appearing abode of complete non-conceptuality by demonstrating the door of Tathāgatagarbha.

Mahamati, a self should not be perceived as real by Bodhisattva Mahasattvas enlightened in the future or presently.

Mahamati, for example, a potter, makes one mass of atoms of clay into various kinds containers from his hands, craft, a stick, thread and effort.

Mahamati, similarly, although Tathāgatas avoid the nature of conceptual selflessness in dharmas, they also appropriately demonstrate Tathāgatagarbha or demonstrate emptiness by various kinds [of demonstrations] possessing prajñā and skillful means; like a potter, they demonstrate with various enumerations of words and letters. As such, because of that,

Mahamati, the demonstration of Tathāgatagarbha is not similar with the Self demonstrated by the non-Buddhists.

Mahamati, the Tathāgatas as such, in order to guide those grasping to assertions of the Self of the Non-Buddhists, will demonstrate Tathāgatagarbha with the demonstration of Tathāgatagharbha. How else will the sentient beings who have fallen into a conceptual view of a True Self, possess the thought to abide in the three liberations and quickly

attain the complete manifestation of Buddha in unsurpassed perfect, complete enlightenment?"

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 4:56 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
asunthatneversets
All three turnings. The only traditions or views which stray close to eternalism are Yogācāra and gzhan stong.
These schools are entirely inline with the sutras they uphold (third turning)

krodha wrote:
They tend to either (i) err into eternalism, or (ii) hold conditioned dharmas (mind i.e. consciousness) to be unconditioned. I don't doubt that they are entirely in line with certain individual's interpretations of the sūtras they allegedly uphold, but for the reasons given I would have to disagree that those interpretations are accurate.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 4:37 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
smcj said:
All three turnings. The only traditions or views which stray close to eternalism are Yogācāra and gzhan stong...
...which happen to be the basis for the Nyingma and Kagyu schools, as well as some Chinese schools.
You, Son of Buddha, are the resident eternalistic dogmatist, this is common knowledge to anyone who regularly frequents this forum.
Hey, what about me? Don't I count too?

krodha wrote:
The heart dharma of the Nyingma is Dzogpa Chenpo, which outright refutes Yogācāra and considers gzhan stong to be a post-meditative embellishment at best. The key Nyingmapa adepts of the past all considered early Indian Prasangika Madhyamaka to be their definitive view of choice.

As for the Kagyu, the teachings I'm familiar with (Drikung), do not fall into extreme views.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 4:13 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
agreed the conventional self ceases to exist and was just a mirage, but the Mirror/Buddha Nature/True Self is still there untouched and pure.

asunthatneversets said:
Not at all. The dharma explicitly rejects a self of any kind. Including a True Self. Such notions are nothing but fabricated eternalistic dogma.

Son of Buddha said:
The third Turning Sutras teach True Self...(I actually quted from them in this thread if you need proof)

What would you say if I told you the 1st turning(Pali canon) and the 3rd turning rejected No Self and considered No Self to lead to suffering?

Would you consider all the proof I posted from the pali canon and third turning sutras to be fabricated eternalist dogma?

Since this is really not the place for this discussion/topic I will send you a PM if you wish.

krodha wrote:
Those who have perverted the Tathāgatagarbha into a 'True Self' will attest that it is thus and so. And I'm sure will be able to produce what they consider proof i.e. anything which allegedly supports their confirmation biases. You, Son of Buddha, are the resident eternalistic dogmatist, this is common knowledge to anyone who regularly frequents this forum.

What would I say if you told me that the first and third turnings reject 'no self'? I would say this is common knowledge. 'No self' is rejected just the same as 'self' and 'Self' are rejected, only a self would believe in 'no self'. This is why the accurate dharma is emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 3:28 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
smcj said:
Not at all. The dharma explicitly rejects a self of any kind. Including a True Self. Such notions are nothing but fabricated eternalistic dogma.
Which Dharma? The 1st turning of the wheel of dharma, with the 4 noble truths? The 2nd turning, with the prajnaparamita sutras? Or the 3rd turning of the wheel of Dharma, which includes the teachings on buddha nature, the alaya 'all base consciousness', and the 'empty of other' schools of buddhist thought?

There is a gamut of views on this subject. You can pick and choose whichever you like. They are all validated through their own texts.

krodha wrote:
All three turnings. The only traditions or views which stray close to eternalism are Yogācāra and gzhan stong.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 2:54 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"At no time throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes has there ever been an actual birth. There has only been the appearance of birth. There has never been actual death, only the transformation of appearances like the shift from the dream state to the waking state... throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes there has never been any actual experience of transition or going from one state to another, or any actual experience of being located in some other place. This is analogous to the images in a dream."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 2:52 PM
Title: Re: What connects us all when there is no self?
Content:
Son of Buddha said:
agreed the conventional self ceases to exist and was just a mirage, but the Mirror/Buddha Nature/True Self is still there untouched and pure.

krodha wrote:
Not at all. The dharma explicitly rejects a self of any kind. Including a True Self. Such notions are nothing but fabricated eternalistic dogma.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 7:45 AM
Title: Re: Experiencing Annica
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
But in Vajrayana one gets into the Buddha nature and the internal reality of the kayas. So meditation on anicca gets demoted big time.

krodha wrote:
Vajrayāna, Buddha nature and the kāyas do not contradict anitya or impermanence. So it's impossible that anitya is demoted. The three marks; anitya, anātman and duhkha, are an integral aspect of Vajrayāna and the other yānas.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 3:31 AM
Title: Re: Pure Awareness
Content:
rachmiel said:
Most of what you say makes sense to me. Especially the part about pure awareness being a way to experience emptiness firsthand. Thanks.

A teacher of mine once said that emptiness is the absence of concepts. So this "intelligence" thing I'm positing that works with awareness (yin-yang-ishly) to enable us to fathom/navigate the world ... can it do its thing without conceptualizing? I think it can. Which means that awareness+intelligence (rather than pure awareness) is also a way to experience emptiness. Just thinkin' out loud here ...

dimeo said:
Pure awareness results in utterly releasing.

rachmiel said:
Utterly releasing what?

krodha wrote:
An absence of concepts (non-conceptual awareness) is the 'experience of emptiness' but it isn't the realization of emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 1:11 PM
Title: Re: Coincidences freaking me out
Content:
krodha wrote:
I agree that looking into 'meaning' is doing too much. They just occur. It's important not to attach to them and give them too much significance, if any at all. If experiences like that occur, they occur, if they don't, they don't, it doesn't matter either way.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 11:13 AM
Title: Re: Coincidences freaking me out
Content:
krodha wrote:
Another stand out was singing the song of the vajra while driving and getting to the last part which goes RA RA RA, and a truck pulled in front of me with 'RA RA' printed huge on the back of it.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 11:00 AM
Title: Re: Coincidences freaking me out
Content:
Konchog1 said:
Thank you. Yes, everyone please post more about Nyams and Makyo.

krodha wrote:
Konchog, my mentor calls this 'everyday magic' and says that the more one rests in their nature, or meditates close to their nature, these coincidences will arise. Every now and then I have large spurts of these occurrences, very bizarre and intriguing. I've had coincidences that make my heart jump because they're so fantastical. So it happens... and more frequently with honed practice.

For example, the last major coincidence was joking around with friends in a group text and quoting the line from the first Predator film where the girl Anna says:

"When I was little, we found a man. He looked like - like, butchered. The old woman in the village crossed themselves... and whispered crazy things, strange things. 'El Diablo cazador de hombres.' Only in the hottest years this happens. And this year, it grows hot. We begin finding our men. We found them sometimes without their skins... and sometimes much, much worse. 'El cazador trofeo de los hombres' means the demon who makes trophies of men."
I quoted the Spanish and 'demon who makes trophies of men' and then went on google and found a screen shot of that scene.

The very next day when I got home from whatever I was doing I turned the TV on and the first thing that appeared was that exact image from the screen shot and the character Anna was doing that monologue.

It was shocking to say the least.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 10:32 AM
Title: Re: Why is Dzogchen the Path beyond Cause and Effect?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
This doesn't make DC causal.

M.G. said:
At least from a conventional perspective the result seems to have a cause.

krodha wrote:
It's all conventional. Anything delineated conceptually is a convention.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 12:37 AM
Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
hi, i currently suffer from cigarette addiction, i just bought herbal ayurvedic cigarettes to help me quit smoking.

my question is that does even the ayurvedic cigarettes render phowa ineffective or close the crown chakra.

i read from chatral rinpoche's - compassionate action that indeed smoking cigarettes closes the crown chakra.

any information would be appreciated.

krodha wrote:
You should try some of those electronic cigarettes, maybe you can ween off your addiction that way. They have nicotine but are essentially water vapor I believe. Definitely the lesser of two evils when compared to cigarettes.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Integration
Content:
krodha wrote:
Jean-Luc Achard on integration:

"Oh yes there are plenty of things to do. Rushen for instance in order to clearly deepen this knowledge and have a direct experience that is not produced by our discursiveness. Then, the training of the 3 doors. Then specific techniques such as the Four Natural Accesses to properly access the state of Trekcho. You seem to imply that there is nothing to do: there are things to do to enter this state, and once you're in it you just cultivate it by integrating other things (after having become familiarized with it). This appears to be not understood at all in this discussion. When you are in this state, you just have to stabilize it. This takes the whole path to do so! (Don't bypass it because you don't like it, it's precisely like this, one has to practice, period). You may state otherwise but this is not Dzogchen anymore. This is Chan. We don't accept Chan as having a definitive perspective on the natural state in Dzogchen. This is a sutra-based approach which is at best dualistic (the 2 truths) or at worst nihilistic (don't do nothing). Then, what is happening in the meditation? Nothing, nothing at all. No integration. Once you are stable in the experience of the natural, you realize that this experience is uncompounded, unaltered, etc., and you don't have to do anything to correct it. But in general everybody (including our masters at a stage in their life) regresses from it. So one has to become familiar with it, through contemplation practice. But this contemplation practice is aimless if it just mean sitting and doing nothing. That means

that each time you quit your sitting meditation, you are regressing from that state because ordinary life is particularly good at putting you back into an ego-centered life. But, if you want to integrate the natural state in a non-regressive way, you have to do something (otherwise it does not do it by itselt just for you). And integration is the very purpose of Trekcho otherwise your Thogel is not going to go very far. So again, i'm sorry to repeat it, but in while in the Trekcho state, you have to integrate 4 things (please Jax learn this by heart, I wrote it several times but you by-pass it constantly whereas it is the core of Trekcho practice and of all Dzogchen practices):

1. integration of the activities of the 3 doors (there are specific things to integrate here, very precise),

2. integration of the six sense consciousnesses (also specific things here too),

3. integration of thoughts (same as above), and

4. integration of various things (this larger in scope but precise too).

I'm not enumerating this list out of my imagination. This is precisely what one has TO DO in Trekcho practice. If your Trekcho and experience of the natural state consists in doing nothing, then your result is nothing. If you try to integrate the 4 modalities listed above (and you have a lot of specific practices in there), then you integrate your whole being to the natural state and that is real Trekcho."
- Jean-Luc Achard

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: blocking realization
Content:
krodha wrote:
One potential block is damage to samaya, and when you're a teacher you apparently take on the samaya of your students. ChNN has said before that because he has so many students, it would be somewhat difficult for him to attain rainbow body.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 1st, 2013 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya the source?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Dharmakāya is emptiness, definitely not a source. The five lights are originally pure, which means they're primordially unborn and free from extremes.

Duffster, regarding your question; 'spirituality' is a fairly broad term and could represent various systems, religions and traditions, all having different ideas of a source. In Vedanta for example, the source of phenomena is called Brahman. Dzogchen however

doesn't posit a 'source' of phenomena per se... It's said that the way we usually perceive phenomena is incorrect, and that is the reason we suffer. So the system of dzogchen is predicated on recognizing the true condition (or nature) of phenomena. The dharmakāya signifies the empty nature of phenomena, which means that in truth phenomena are non-arisen and do not accord with any of the four possible extremes, which are: existence, non-existence, both and neither. When we realize that phenomena are truly unborn and non-arisen then that is called dharmakāya. That realization liberates us from our ignorant misconceptions that phenomena can exist, not exist, etc. which means we are free from the causes and conditions which sustain delusion and suffering.

duffster1 said:
u said 'when we realize that phenomena are truly unborn' so could the dharmakaya be called the unmanifested?

krodha wrote:
In the conventional context of referring to allegedly 'manifested' phenomena it (dharmakāya) could be called 'the unmanifest', but truthfully it's a false dichotomy because dharmakāya implies the realization that there's never truly been manifestation to begin with.

For dharmakāya to be the unmanifested it would require something 'manifest' to contrast that 'unmanifest' designation, but since manifestation is a misnomer, unmanifestation is an equally invalid notion (in the ultimate sense). We of course loosely refer to dharmakāya as 'unborn', 'non-arisen' etc. but these terms are referencing emptiness, so they're actually implying a freedom from extremes. A lack of extremes means that (ultimately) manifest and unmanifest are both equally inapplicable because whatever it is we could refer to as manifest or unmanifest is essentially nothing more than a false thought.

As long as 'unmanifested' is understood in that context then it's a suitable title. But if we interpret unmanifested as implying non-existence, or an absence (as a negative) which is contrasted and defined by an existing or affirmed (positive) designation, then we've fallen into extremes and have deviated from the meaning of dharmakāya.

Dharmakāya is free from (i) existence, (ii) non-existence, (iii) both existence and non-existence, and (iv) neither existence or non-existence. So that is to say; non-existence is an impossibility because existence hasn't been suggested to begin with, and vice versa. That freedom from extremes is the accurate view of non-manifestation. Like recognizing a snake in a dark room to actually be a rope, that realization implies that the snake is primordially unborn and non-arisen. The snake was a misunderstanding from the beginning, so it's recognized that there is no snake to exist, not exist, both or neither. We can tentatively say the snake doesn't exist, but such an assertion would need to be understood correctly otherwise it can easily become nihilism. I've even seen Longchenpa refer to emptiness as the 'true face of non-existence', because it realizes the unreality of X, but doesn't negate the mere appearance of X. Why non-existence? Because we wouldn't say that a mirage is truly 'real' or substantiated, but at the same

time a mirage isn't utterly non-existent either. Dharmakāya implies the the same type of recognition, that things are apparent yet unreal. Illusory and ungraspable like a mirage.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 4:11 PM
Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya the source?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Jigme Lingpa defines dharmakāya as: "The wisdom that is aware that the manifesting objects - form, feelings, perceptions, and so on - are empty of self."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 11:45 AM
Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya the source?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Dharmakāya is emptiness, definitely not a source. The five lights are originally pure, which means they're primordially unborn and free from extremes.

Duffster, regarding your question; 'spirituality' is a fairly broad term and could represent various systems, religions and traditions, all having different ideas of a source. In Vedanta for example, the source of phenomena is called Brahman. Dzogchen however doesn't posit a 'source' of phenomena per se... It's said that the way we usually perceive phenomena is incorrect, and that is the reason we suffer. So the system of dzogchen is predicated on recognizing the true condition (or nature) of phenomena. The dharmakāya signifies the empty nature of phenomena, which means that in truth phenomena are non-arisen and do not accord with any of the four possible extremes, which are: existence, non-existence, both and neither. When we realize that phenomena are truly unborn and non-arisen then that is called dharmakāya. That realization liberates us from our ignorant misconceptions that phenomena can exist, not exist, etc. which means we are free from the causes and conditions which sustain delusion and suffering.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 6:01 AM
Title: Re: Longde Teachings
Content:
Norwegian said:
oldbob,
"For me [...]"

It's not up to you however.

It's up to ChNN, who has specifically stated time and time again, that to do Longde

practice, you need to receive Longde transmission and teachings. In other words participate in person at the retreat site, or via closed webcast when that happens, on Longde.

oldbob said:
Sorry I did not make myself clear. I was referring to what I believe is required to listen / view the Longde DVD, not to do the practice

You are exactly correct about practice, which is why I wrote,

"Of course, you should also do - exactly - whatever your teacher tells you to do."

I also wrote, "If you want to be official, you can request a lung of the teachings, and a short wang permission, in a vision or a dream, or in present reality," again referring to permission to view the DVD. Of course to do the practice, you need to receive Longde transmission and teachings, in person, or via a closed webcast.

I learned the Longde from ChNNR, in person, in several retreats, and have practiced the Longde in retreats. I pray that everyone who wants to receive the transmission in person, to be able to practice these wonderful teachings, can do so. Perhaps making the DVD available to those who are members and have had pointing out instruction, will lead those who buy the DVD to seek out and attend a Longde teaching, in person, or in a closed webcast. Perhaps this was the SSI thinking in making the DVD generally available in the "restricted" section.

ob

invisiblediamond said:
You know Old Bob, for somebody so experienced I wonder why you are still so full of bla bla bla. Maybe leave talking aside for a while.

krodha wrote:
Wait what'd Bob do? Pretty sure he's just trying to be helpful.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 9th, 2013 at 11:46 AM
Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind
Content:

Karma Dorje said:
While your point about renunciation and compassion is well-taken, I can't help but think that many practitioners enfeeble themselves thinking that they are not capable of practicing the view of Dzogchen when it is far less complicated than Vajrayana praxis, for example. This seems to be particularly a problem with practitioners that convince themselves that only after long retreats and elaborate contrived practices will they ever

meet with that which they most intimately are.

krodha wrote:
Depends on the individual, but most have a great deal of conditioning which obfuscates their nature. The long retreats and practices (in the context of Dzogchen) aren't contrived or causal endeavors, but are implemented for the purpose of integrating body, speech and mind with wisdom. Retreat is a beneficial environment because it allows for the practitioner to relax in their nature without the distractions of daily life. After a certain amount of familiarity with vidyā comes about, then the individual doesn't really have to worry about becoming distracted, and daily life becomes an ornament of one's nature. This isn't the case for beginners though. Karmic propensities and habitual tendencies are the factors which obstruct our nature, and because they're habitual it's not so easy to cut through them without some time away from the in's and out's of daily life and our respective relative conditions. Even masters take time for retreat.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 10:07 AM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?
Content:
Barney Fife said:
Not sure if this is what Malcolm is hinting at, but I have heard that "mind nature" can be used in Sutra, Tantra, and Dzogchen to refer to "seeing the empty essence of the mind", like experiencing emptiness free of thoughts.

krodha wrote:
The nature of mind is the inseparability of emptiness and clarity. A state free of thought is simply resting in clarity. Clarity must be recognized as empty for recognition of the mind's nature to occur. Otherwise clarity alone is merely the neutral indeterminate cognizance of the ālaya.

Barney Fife said:
And that in Dzogchen, awareness/rigpa refers to the awareness to be recognized within that experience of seeing the empty essence.

krodha wrote:
Rigpa i.e. vidyā, is knowledge of primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes], which is the three kāyas.

Barney Fife said:
So maybe, when that is recognized, one experiences the primordial state, which is taught to be the base of primordial purity,

krodha wrote:
Primordial purity is ka dag, which is one of the three wisdoms of primordial wisdom.

Barney Fife said:

meaning that one recognizes one's primordial state as the inseparability of the empty expanse of space/ying/dhatu and awareness/rigpa/vidya? Inseparable expanse and awareness?

krodha wrote:
You're sort of associating a lot of terms that aren't necessarily related or relevant. But 'space' is a term used in various ways depending on context. Space is sometimes used as a metaphor for awakened wisdom or emptiness. It's also sometimes used to translate the Tibetan word 'klong' i.e. long, as in 'longde' [klong sde]. Long is really a term that doesn't translate all to well... it's meant to relate to vidyā. 'Space of vidyā', 'expanse of vidyā'. Longchen Rabjam for example means something like 'All encompassing vast expanse [of vidyā]'.

At any rate though many of those terms have different meanings.

Barney Fife said:
It seems like Tantra Mahamudra has a primordial state teaching when they refer to the innate mind or the co-emergent mind that first arises spontaneously through completion stage yogas, but it seems like Dzogchen maybe has some special unique insights into that primordial state.
Probably have not understood this properly or thoroughly, though, in case anyone wants to clarify.

Thanks,

b.f.

krodha wrote:
The different systems are just different paths. Generation/completion stage Mahāmudrā, formless Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen only differ in praxis and methodology.

Some may argue that only Dzogchen allows for a result that is nondual ka dag and lhun grub, but I'm sure that's going to depend on who you ask.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 12:32 PM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
On top of that, most dharmic traditions (including Dzogchen), see consciousness as an afflicted product of delusory fabrication.

In most Buddhist traditions consciousness isn't held to be absolute, but is considerd samsaric in nature (meaning it arises from ignorance). Consciousness is usually attributed to the collection of 'consciousnesses' which correlate with each sensory modality. In the conventional model, consciousness and the organ cannot function

without each other i.e. they are dependently originated.

In some traditions there are 6 consciousnesses: [eye-consciousness, ear-consciousness, nose-consciousness, tongue-consciousness, body-consciousness, intellect-consciousness]

and in others there are 8 [eye-consciousness, ear-consciousness, nose-consciousness, tongue-consciousness, body-consciousness, intellect-consciousness, emotional distortion consciousness, all-basis consciousness]

Consciousness itself is the fifth aggregate i.e. skandha which serves to constitute a sentient being (which is the opposite of a buddha), and are recognized as empty in wisdom. Consciousness is defiled by nature and represents a dualistic condition (as opposed to the defect-free condition of a buddha), though more precisely it is attributed to the various capacities of mind such as the sensory modalities, in addition to the other cognitive capacities (of mind) such as the intellect and memory. Therefore in the context of the dharma, consciousness signifies the faculties which apprehend and apperceive the various objects of experience which are perceived to be external from the organism. The afflictive sensory and cognitive consciousnesses which dualistically fixate and grasp at projected objects must be divested of the ignorance which dominates their perceptual functioning if they are to be expressions of primordial wisdom.

David Germano on consciousness:
"'Consciousness' (rnam shes; shes pa; vijñāna): rnam shes literally reads 'aspect-know', with 'aspect' generally signifying the various facets of objects which we can perceive (ther 'blueness', etc.); it often signifies something along the lines of 'consciousness'.... but in other contexts would perhaps be more precisely rendered as 'cognition', or even 'perceptual process'. In Great Perfection thought, the term rnam shes only applies to the neurotic psychic activity of ordinary living beings, and is understood in contrast to the ye shes (literally 'primordial knowing', and translated herein as 'primordial gnosis') which exclusively characterizes the psychic activity an Enlightened One (this is another way of expressing the distinction between 'ordinary mind' (sems) and primordial gnosis (ye shes)... In ordinary exoteric Buddhism, 'consciousness' is identified as the fifth of the five psychophysical components constituting human existence, and these 'modes of consciousness' or 'perceptual cognitive processes' are further classified into eight types: the five sensory modes (visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, tactile); the sixth 'psychic' or 'intellectual' mode (yid shes; mano-vijñāna) which synthesizes that sensory data, conceptualizes it, and deals with abstract images/concepts; the seventh 'emotionally distorted psychic' mode (nyon yid; kliṣṭa-manas) which involves our web of emotional reactions, cathexis, and ego-logical tendencies; and the 'universal ground consciousness' (kun-gzhi rnam-shes; ālaya-vijñāna), which is the 'unconscious' that constitutes a substratum that serves both as a type of psychic memory extending over many lifetimes, as well as ongoing source of all the other psychic modes' operations, which are like 'streams' of psychic energy trickling out from it. ...Longchenpa characterizes the five sensory modes of consciousness as 'cognizing (shes pa) aspects (rnam pa) of objects', which are thus 'cognitive energy' (shes pa) which develop

resembling those (aspects), accounting for the term 'perceptual consciousness' (rnam shes, literally 'aspect-cognize').
In the Great Perfection (dzogchen), this 'universal ground consciousness' is understood as deriving from the 'brightness' (dangs) of the luminous channels, and is viewed as 'clouds' which obscure the heart's pristine awareness [Skt. vidyā, Tib. rig pa], which thus must be cleared away via contemplation in order to attain enlightenment. In addition, the Great Perfection tradition usually distinguishes between the terms 'universal ground' (kun gzhi; ālaya) and the 'universal ground consciousness' (kun-gzhi rnam-shes; ālaya-vijñāna)... It should be noted that this distinction between the 'universal ground' and the 'universal ground consciousness' has its precedents in Indian Buddhist literature on the subject, such as the Bodhisattvabhūmi passage which relates the 'universal ground' to 'non-conceptuality uninvolved with objects' (i.e. a total non-differentiation of any distinct objects), and the 'universal ground consciousness' to 'non-conceptuality involved with objects' (i.e. that which clearly sees presences, but doesn't conceptualize them); also see Sthiramati's commentary to the Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra... where he characterizes the 'universal ground' as the overall support or basis for the accumulation of karma (and thus resembling their 'house'), while the 'universal ground consciousness' is that which 'opens up the space' for these karmic energies (which Longchenpa explains as 'for the increase, amassing, decline, and so on of these karmic forces')."

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:57 AM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?
Content:
Barney Fife said:
Thank you everyone for the diverse and interesting contributions. Read several times over and contemplated all the posts from the early part of page 4 up to this point in the thread. Really helpful info, especially when read all together. Fascinating details about how Dzogchen understands those deepest questions of existence. Dzogchen is so unique.

Also, a consensus appears to emerge. Don't want to put words in anybody's mouth, in case I missed something (or missed everything). If I have understood properly after putting together what everyone said in the last three pages, it sounds like the consensus is:

What Jes Bertelsen calls "Unity Consciousness", and what Dzogchen calls "ignorance" are the same thing.

Yes? No? Maybe?

Magnus wrote: In Dzogchen ignorance is an active state that we continuously create, not something we are born in to.
Pero wrote: Hmmmmm, yet is ignorance why we are born at all...
Magnus wrote: True, ignorance is a continuous activity creating birth/death and all kind

of experiences.
Quotation from "Essence of Mind: An Approach to Dzogchen" by Jes Bertelsen: Perhaps the meaning of life is to discover that everything has emerged from unity consciousness? Perhaps the physical universe is a windfall event, a celebration sprung from divine cosmic creativity? Perhaps from a certain perspective in consciousness everything is continuously, in every moment, being created anew? Perhaps every tree and every leaf really is a song of praise?"
(Kindle Locations 895-903; p.68)
thanks,

b.f.

krodha wrote:
Depends on what he means by 'unity consciousness', I would assume he's speaking of a unified consciousness, as a source, that everything emerges from, or something of the like. If that's the case then 'unity consciousness' and the ignorance Dzogchen speaks of would not be the same. Dzogchen doesn't posit a unified source-consciousness that creates everything, for Dzogchen, 'everything' is a product of delusion and arises out of confusion. When that delusion is resolved, phenomena are resolved and realized to be non-arisen. Bertelsen appears to be conceiving of an unafflicted divine-like source (like the Brahman of Vedanta) which gives rise to phenomena (like a physical universe) as an expression of its creativity... this isn't the view that Dzogchen employs.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 8:36 AM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?
Content:
LhodroeRapsal said:
In one of his much later book from 2008 Jes Bertelsen shares how the first meeting with Tulku Urgyen was
Otsal translated a part of this book in a previous posting, here it says: This unbroken apperceptive unity with Tulku Urgyen’s enlightened consciousness lasted between 20 minutes and half an hour.
So according to this the natural state was stable in Jes Bertelsen between 20 minutes and 30 minutes at their first meeting. Of course you can doubt the validity of this statement, which I do fully understand - because I would do that if someone told this about a teacher I don't know, and esspecially if this socalled teacher also seems to modify the teachings.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps his direct recognition of the natural state was stable for a period of 20 minutes, but that wouldn't constitute a complete stability. Those who are irreversibly stable in the natural state upon first recognition of vidyā are called chikcharwas [cig-car-ba], there hasn't been a chikcharwa for centuries though, supposedly.

I don't know anything about Jes Bertelsen, but if his recognition experience is true, it

sounds like he was simply ripe for that insight. That doesn't mean he was stable in the natural state though (as in able to maintain a continuity at all times), for most it takes a considerable amount of practice to fully integrate the three doors (body, speech and mind).

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Sanskrit for nonmeditation
Content:
Huifeng said:
Hmmm..., but "sahaja samadhi" (or derivatives) simply does not mean "non-meditation". It could be translated as something like "together-born meditation" (in an overly literal sense), or maybe even "inborn meditation" or "innate meditation" (a closer cognate) in certain contexts. But that doesn't sound much like "non-meditation" at all, at least to me.

~~ Huifeng

krodha wrote:
Sahaja would be 'natural', 'spontaneous', 'innate' or 'inborn' as you suggested, all of which correlates with non-meditation. Non-meditation is stable, natural and effortless absorption i.e. contemplation [skt. samadhi, tib. ting dzin].

Sahaja wouldn't be a literal translation, but would be an accurate translation as far as context and meaning goes. The literal translation of 'non-meditation' would most likely result in a term which negates meditation, however 'non-meditation' isn't a term which is negating meditation, it is a way to convey that meditation has become 'natural', 'spontaneous', 'innate' or 'inborn'.

If a literal translation is sought, it seems the true meaning/context of 'non-meditation' would be lost, so while 'sahaja' isn't an exact, literal translation, it does represent what 'non-meditation' is intended to communicate.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 12:27 PM
Title: Re: Sanskrit for nonmeditation
Content:
krodha wrote:
Non-meditation in sanskrit would be sahaja samadhi, which is spontaneous and effortless abiding in the natural state.

Non-meditation is a specific level of non-regressive abiding (in absorption) which transcends sessions and breaks between meditation sessions. So it's more than simply the opposite of meditation, which is what the negative sanskrit prefixes of 'a', 'ni', 'na' etc., would represent. Instead of a lack of meditation (or the absence of meditation),

non-meditation is effortless meditation. Sahaja samadhi represents that state and is a fitting term in my opinion. But I'm no expert!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 6:01 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness and Nothingness
Content:
krodha wrote:
"The two truths are not different like two horns; in the conventionally (relatively) real phase, when one sees the reflection of the moon in the water, insofar as there is the reflection, this is the conventionally real; insofar as this reflection is not the moon, this is the absolutely (ultimately) real. The fact that both represent one fact insofar as there is the presence of the moon in the water of the well without existing there, is the indivisibility of the two truths. About the intellect that understands it in this way, it is said that it understands the two truths."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 30th, 2013 at 2:59 AM
Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?
Content:
krodha wrote:
There was a recent thread somewhere else where the same type of question was posed; which was the reality or validity of the deities/yidams etc. To me it seems like this is missing a fundamental point of the dharma, that everything is equally apparent yet unreal. So when it comes down to it, labels of real vs. unreal, existent vs. nonexistent etc. don't really apply beyond a conventional level, and with that being the case, Vajrasattva is just as real as anything else is.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 29th, 2013 at 6:31 AM
Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Emptiness is the natural state of mind.
It is the non-conceptual refuge, and the absolute bodhicitta.
It is the Vajrasattva who absolves evils.
It is the mandala of perfecting accumulations.
Emptiness is the guru yoga of dharmakāya."
- Nyoshul Khenpo Jamyang Dorje

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 29th, 2013 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Vajrasattva represents realizing emptiness I'm pretty sure. When you realize emptiness you behold Vajrasattva. So the deity is primordially established, I'm fairly sure that's what he's getting at.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 26th, 2013 at 2:26 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Silent Illumination/Shikantaza
Content:
krodha wrote:
There are a few commonly held misconceptions about Zen and Chán in Tibet it seems. Hashang Mahāyāna is often used as an example for Zen/Chán, and the view of Hashang's teaching is generally implemented as a cautionary tale to warn against attachment to formless states. I believe there were certain debates which took place which resulted in Hashang's teaching being perceived as advocating for a blanked out formless absorption, and then Zen and Chán were subsequently lumped in with that idea as well. But that isn't really the case, even for Hashang's Mahāyāna, I think some key figures such as Jigme Lingpa noticed this and even expressed doubt about that commonly held perception of Zen, Chán and Hashang Mahāyāna. Longchenpa also did a fairly in depth comparison between Dzogchen and Hashang's teaching (which can be found in Tulku Thondup's 'The Practice Of Dzogchen'), he made it clear that he wasn't speaking of Zen or Chán, and even referenced Jigme Lingpa's doubt about the Tibetan idea of these schools. Also, Dzogchen master Vairotsana (disciple of Padmasambhava and Shri Singha) spent some time in China receiving teachings from Hashang. So no way to know where the commonly held views came from exactly.

The general view of Hashang's exposition and teaching is taught to prevent attachment to the experience of emptiness (meaning the space between thoughts and not the realization of emptiness). It's taught that attachment to that capacity causes the practitioner to delve into deep unclear states of absorption (referencing deep samadhi states) which can last for lengthy amounts of time. Stories are even told of yogis who have come upon caves where practitioners are found frozen in these mindless states of absorption to the point that their respective lifeforces have been rendered dormant for years on end, and they need to be revived. It's unfortunate that Hashang is mistakenly associated with that, and that Zen gets wrapped up in the mix. I'm not saying Zen and Dzogchen are the same by any means, but the perception of Zen, Chán and Hashang is inaccurate it seems.

The Great Perfection and the Chinese Monk: Nyingmapa Defenses of Hashang Mahāyāna:

http://earlytibet.com/about/hashang-mahayana/

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 20th, 2013 at 6:53 AM
Title: Re: Thigle
Content:
Stewart said:
Thanks Dronma.... I've emailed ChNN as it seems to resurface now and then... Obviously he's busy right now, so I'll just bide my time until he replies, and post his answer.

To be clear I asked about the precise order for Ati Guru Yoga. I'm actually in the process of commissioning an 'A in Thigle' calligraphy/painting from an artist friend of mine, so I'll follow ChNN's definitive advice.

krodha wrote:
Please share Rinpoche's response when you hear back. And post a photo of that art when it's finished, would love to see it!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 19th, 2013 at 1:49 PM
Title: Re: Thigle
Content:
Snowid said:
https://2.bp.blogspot.com/_e51bfU2D1ps/R118pQCVwEI/AAAAAAAAABM/B2UmiGHmBls/s1600-h/a_thigles_copia2.jpg

http://www.dzogchen.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/AH_THIGLE_wp.jpg

Why does the color white is in different places?

krodha wrote:
So apparently that last image is not representative of any system, since there are no systems which have water [white] positioned last.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 19th, 2013 at 1:44 PM
Title: Re: Thigle
Content:
Snowid said:
https://2.bp.blogspot.com/_e51bfU2D1ps/R118pQCVwEI/AAAAAAAAABM/B2UmiGHmBls/s1600-h/a_thigles_copia2.jpg

http://www.dzogchen.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/AH_THIGLE_wp.jpg

Why does the color white is in different places?

krodha wrote:
From a series of posts on the 'Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu' thread in the 'Dzogchen' forum:

Dronma wrote:
...the order of the colors of the 5 elements depends on the practice.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, you are correct: there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam) [blue, green, white, red, yellow]

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam). [blue, green, red, white, yellow]

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

---

heart wrote:

Thanks, but the tigle in dronmas post is space, air, fire, earth, water is that correct or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as it should be IN THE THUN SYSTEM.

LONGSAL is different.

M

Mr. G wrote:
If we're doing an Anuyoga practice, we would use the one in the thun?

Malcolm wrote:
It depends: if you are doing an Anuyoga practice like Jnanadakini you use the Longsal system. If you are doing something not connected with Longsal, you use Thun system. The system used in the Thun book comes from lower tantras.

Finney wrote:

Malcolm,
Here [referencing Malcolm's response to heart's post] you seem to be agreeing that the proper Thun order is: space, air, fire, earth, water.

But earlier you wrote:
[Malcolm wrote:
The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)]

so, I'm a little confused. Can you help clarify it for me?

Malcolm wrote:
Oh I see... I was not paying careful attention. Also Thun [practice book] cover is out of order. There is no system where water is last. That is just for aesthetics. It has been like that for 30 years. Since Crystal [and the Way of Light]. My bad.

Pero wrote:
There are two different things. One is the order of mantras in the purification of the 5 elements. This is different in Tun and Longsal. The other is the order of colors of the thigle when doing GY. As far as I know, these two aren't related. I'm pretty sure Rinpoche talked about it himself and I'd give you a reference but after 14 hours of work I don't really feel like going through a 1000 pages right now to find it (or it could have been during a webcast in which case I'll never find it haha).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 18th, 2013 at 4:35 PM
Title: Re: Manifest Phenomena?
Content:
Dust said:
Maybe- Awareness simply exists in a state of emptiness.

Thank you asunthatneversets, for the reminder that all words are lacking when trying to describe the Indescribable, I often get too caught up in philosophy, when I should be meditating.

krodha wrote:
Awareness is empty, meaning free of extremes just as everything is. When you read 'awareness' in those quotes, for example, what's being discussed is vidyā i.e. rig pa, which is knowledge of one's nature. 'Awareness' is sort of a translational trend gone awry in Dzogchen books.

Given the climate of 'spiritual paths' which are co-existing with Dzogchen, 'awareness' is a bit of a misleading term due to the fact that it draws certain associations with those other traditions, be it neo-advaita or something of the like which champions 'awareness',

etc. So many become misled into perceiving Dzogchen as having the same characteristics and aspects of those paths when it's actually nothing like them. So it's good to find a qualified teacher who can relay an accurate account of vidyā/rigpa through direct introduction and proper guidance, otherwise we're liable to misconstrue the meaning of Dzogchen. Not to imply you have, just saying.

At any rate though, yes everything is completely and utterly empty including awareness, vidyā/rigpa, the base, path, result, chickens, cows and emptiness itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 18th, 2013 at 10:22 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
YogaDude11 said:
If I have already received skatipat initiation is it ok to watch this transmission? Is there anything I should know prior to watching?

krodha wrote:
Starts in 40 mins, just log on and the webcast will be roughly an hour. Most likely will be no explanation but just be attentive and listen/watch Rinpoche with the intention of receiving the transmission and you will. The webcast today will be primarily done in mantra so there's nothing to intellectually comprehend, just be present and attentive with the intention to receive the transmission.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 18th, 2013 at 7:09 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Transmission webcast in 4 hours!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 17th, 2013 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Manifest Phenomena?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Smcj, this is a clear exposition on the differences;

"In it [Dzogpa Chenpo] the essence [ngo-bo] of vidyā, the realization of the non-existence of the apprehended and apprehender, is called spontaneously arisen primordial wisdom. But Dzogpa Chenpo doesn't assert it as self-awareness and self-clarity [rang-rig rang-gsal] as Yogācāra, the Mind Only School, does. Because (according to Dzogpa Chenpo), as there is no existence of internal and external, it (vidyā) is not established as internal mind. As there is no self and others, it isn't established as self-

awareness. As the apprehended and apprehender have never existed, freedom from the two is not established. As it is not an object of experiences and awareness, the experience is not established as non-dual.

As there is no mind and mental events, it does not exist as self-mind. As it does not exist as clarity or non-clarity, it is not established as self-clarity. As it transcends awareness and non-awareness, there are not even the imputations of awareness. This is called the Dzogpa Chenpo, free from extremes. Although it is designated as self-arisen primordial wisdom, enlightened mind, ultimate body, the great spontaneously accomplished ultimate sphere, and the naked self-clarity vidyā, these ascriptions are merely in order to signify it. It should be realized that the self-essence (of Dzogpa Chenpo) is inexpressible. Otherwise, if you take the meaning of the words literally, you will never find (in Dzogpa Chenpo) any difference from the cognition of self-awareness, self-clarity, and non-duality of apprehender and apprehended of the Mind Only School."
- Longchen Rabjam

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 17th, 2013 at 1:30 AM
Title: Re: Manifest Phenomena?
Content:
smcj said:
I could be mistaken, but this sounds like the Yogacara, a.k.a. Cittamatra, a.k.a. "Mind Only" perspective on emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Yogācāra says that consciousness [mind] is the ultimate nature of phenomena. Dzogchen, Mahāmudrā, Madhyamaka etc., say that 'phenomena' as phenomenal existents are products of mind, because they arise from grasping, however consciousness/mind are afflicted and are therefore manifestations of ignorance [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa]. When ignorance is resolved, consciousness and mind are recognized to be non-arisen, and therefore phenomena are recognized to be non-arisen and free from extremes [empty].

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 3:49 AM
Title: Re: Only way to realise Lhundrub is longde or thogal?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Per Malcolm, with tregchö etc., you can realize ka dag, but with thögal it's possible to realize ka dag chen po, which is non-dual ka dag and lhun grub.

alpha said:
How about longde?
There were lots of practitioners in the past who achieved the rainbow body by practicing longde alone.And that means perfecting lhundrup.

krodha wrote:
Seems to be the case, ChNN has said quite a few times that achieving rainbow body via Longde is possible. The eradication of 'coarse obscurations' however is something which has been mentioned before, that in practicing tregchö alone (without thögal etc.) there are coarse obscurations which will not have been resolved prior to realizing emptiness [ka dag]. So the realization isn't as 'pure' as the ka dag chen po realized with the tregchö-thögal combination. Not sure if Longde is or isn't able to purify those obscurations to the degree that thögal can, but I'm speculating at this point.

alpha said:
Q: then the Third Vision of Thogal realization of emptiness is not superior to the two-fold emptiness realized upon realization of Kadag at trekchod?

Malcolm wrote:
The answer to your question is no, it is not superior. The third vision is basically the equivalent of the first bhumi in the sutra system.

However, in tregchö one does not eradicated the coarse obscurations prior to realization of emptiness.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: Only way to realise Lhundrub is longde or thogal?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Per Malcolm, with tregchö etc., you can realize ka dag, but with thögal it's possible to realize ka dag chen po, which is non-dual ka dag and lhun grub.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 2:19 PM
Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
It's said that Gampopa most likely received semde teachings from Milarepa and put his own spin on them, though I'm sure that is open to debate...

Malcolm said:
No, Gampopa started out as a Nyingmapa, then became a Kadampa monk, then met MIlarepa towards the end of the latter's life.

The four naljors are:

(i) shi-nè (zhi gNas)
(ii) lhatong (lhag mThong)
(iii) nyi-mèd (nyis med)
(iv) lhundrüp (lhun grub)

It is the the four ting 'dzins (samadhis) and the first two are actully gnas pa (calm state) and mi gyo ba (non-movment); the others are fine. This is the system of Khams lugs sems sde.

M

krodha wrote:
Thanks for clarifying about Gampopa.

So the 'four naljors' is an incorrect title, and 'four ting 'dzins' is the correct title? Or the four listed above are the ting 'dzins and the naljors are something different?

I had always been under the impression that semde had the naljors, longde the da's and mennagde the chozhags.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 4:41 AM
Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen
Content:
flavio81 said:
#2. "Mahamudra is Dzogchen semde in drag" - Namdrol/Malcolm Smith. I don't know if it is correct, but it is a really easy to understand reply for me!

krodha wrote:
The four yogas implemented in formless/essence mahāmudrā are essentially identical to the four naljors of dzogchen semde:

Mahāmudrā is sometimes divided into four distinct phases known as the four yogas of mahāmudrā (skt. catvāri mahāmudrā yoga, Wylie: phyag rgya chen po'i rnal 'byor bzhi).

They are as follows:

(i) one-pointedness (skt. ekāgra, tib. rtse gcig)
(ii) simplicity (skt. niṣprapāncha, tib. spros bral) "free from complexity" or "not elaborate."
(iii) one taste (skt. samarasa, tib. ro gcig)
(iv) non-meditation (skt. abhāvanā, tib. sgom med) The state of not holding to either an object of meditation nor to a meditator. Nothing further needs to be 'meditated upon' or 'cultivated at this stage.

It's said that Gampopa most likely received semde teachings from Milarepa and put his

own spin on them, though I'm sure that is open to debate...

The four naljors are:

(i) shi-nè (zhi gNas)
(ii) lhatong (lhag mThong)
(iii) nyi-mèd (nyis med)
(iv) lhundrüp (lhun grub)

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 8:13 AM
Title: Re: Forceful Zhine
Content:
krodha wrote:
Shiné is a fairly universal practice and the instructions shouldn't differ too much at all lineage to lineage. The goal is calm-abiding, as was mentioned. Shiné with support, without support and then released shiné which is essentially the natural state. Shiné is the first of the four naljors of dzogchen sem sde. In shiné the aspirant identifies stillness and familiarization with that aspect is the foundation for the other three naljors.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: Guardians in Dzogczen
Content:
Snowid said:
If the task of the guards is to protect the teachings and practicing followers
so why allow this what is happening in Tibet?
Why they not protect teachings, people and country?

krodha wrote:
It's interesting to look at the tragedy which has occurred in Tibet from the standpoint of what it has done for the teachings. Prior to the invasion, Tibet was very solitary and cut-off from the rest of the world and the teachings and their customs were largely unknown. The Chinese attempted to step in and stamp their culture out, and unfortunately they have indeed caused much strife, but really they also succeeded in being the catalyst for the teachings to spill out into the rest of the world. The Tibetan culture was forced to become refugees in the world and lamas spread across the globe, becoming more accessible and teaching the very systems which remained cut-off for centuries. So although the genocide which has gone on there is an unspeakable horror, there is a silver lining which is that the systems of Tibet are now found everywhere.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 3:33 PM
Title: Re: Forceful Zhine

Content:
krodha wrote:
Check out "Stilling The Mind: Shamatha Teachings From Dudjom Lingpa's Vajra Essence", good book with a lot of info on zhine and other practices; benefits, methods, advice etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 3:28 PM
Title: Re: Forceful Zhine
Content:
Mikeliegler said:
asunthatneversets

I was not sure about the blurriness affecting my practice. I seem to have gotten to that point where I can sustain my awareness on the A and keep from letting thought's carry me off with them. I feel good and comfortable in this state but I still can't visualize without some support. I'm going to try Lhasa's suggestion and use the blink method.

Thank You Kindly

Mike

krodha wrote:
Yeah the blurriness is no issue, in fact space can be used as a support for your zhine. If you gaze two palm widths from the tip of your nose, your eyes are crossed anyways and everything is blurry, visions begin to manifest that way. Hold your hands up side by side right at the tip of your nose and then look to the far side of the outer hand, locate that spot and then drop your hands and keep the gaze there... extremely blurry! But good stuff.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 2:22 AM
Title: Re: Forceful Zhine
Content:
Mikeliegler said:
I'm having trouble keeping focused on the tibetan "A" symbol. I can keep my mind on the "A" and when thought's pop up I can keep from following them. My problem is The letter A starts to get blurry on me after a minute or so. Is it OK to let the A get blurry so long as a thought's are not not given attention?

krodha wrote:
If you're looking at the image of an A and it gets blurry after awhile that's ok, I actually like to slightly cross my eyes on purpose and rest with that blurred vision. Better to start

with the visual support before jumping to no support. If you get distracted just bring your attention back to the A. As soon as you notice you're distracted just drop the train of thought at focus on the A. In time you'll find you'll become less distracted. Eventually you'll be able to hold your attention on the A with no distraction, that is a good time to start zhiné without support where you just focus on space.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 15th, 2013 at 4:12 AM
Title: Re: The Highest Maha Ati Teachings - Rigdzin Shikpo (Hookham
Content:
smcj said:
I clicked on the link you provided, and he does have quite an impressive beard however.

krodha wrote:
However it is utterly eclipsed by the magnificence of this fine specimen:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 2:54 AM
Title: Re: Tara Mandala Chogyal Namkhai Norbu & Lama Tsultrim Allio
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's unfortunate there was no webcast for this retreat...

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 7:48 AM
Title: Re: Liberation Unleashed in the POV of Dzogchen
Content:
gentle_monster said:
Certainly not.

Although they obviously lack clarity when it comes to discern various insights, realizations etc...

But they are not mistaking their passing thorugh gate as final liberation and are opened to further refinement and practice...

They posted good article that clarifies their situation on their main page:

Integrating View and Experience

http://liberationunleashed.com/Article_Integrating-View-And-Experience.html

krodha wrote:
I think they've come to realize that what they call 'passing through the gate' isn't equivalent to liberation, a year ago however they might have, and many of those who went through their process did have that impression. They're very active on FB forums so I've interacted with them quite a bit in passing. To their defense, their founding members and 'key figures' are actually very passionate about the dharma. From what I've seen with their interactions online they're very open minded to receiving constructive criticism and seeking an evolution of their views, plus they're very friendly people... I know one of their founding members used to practice Buddhism and was part of a sangha which fell apart due to scandal. I think that caused him to lose confidence in organized systems somewhat, probably was part of what inspired the approach they attempt to implement. At any rate though, doesn't compare to dzogchen. If people have found benefit through their process that's great, but it's a distant and far cry from the Great Perfection teachings. Even Madhyamaka logic is more refined in my opinion, but to each their own!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 2:50 AM
Title: Re: Liberation Unleashed in the POV of Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Moreover, these sentient beings must have also discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conceptions of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self, because if they had not, their minds would inevitably grasp after such relative ideas. Further, these sentient beings must have already discarded all arbitrary ideas relating to the conception of the non-existence of a personal self, other personalities, living beings and a Universal Self. If they had not, their minds would still be grasping after such ideas. Therefore, every disciple who is seeking Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi should discard, not only conceptions of one's own selfhood, other selves, living beings and a Universal Selfhood, but should discard, also, all ideas about such conceptions and all ideas about the non-existence of such conceptions."
- Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra [The Diamond Sutra]

They usually fall victim to this very principle, they promote 'no-self', however 'no-self' becomes an objectified truth and therefore the idea of 'no-self' is grasped at by the mind, which ends up reifying and reaffirming the very notion they initially set out to negate. So all you have is a bunch of selves (afflicted processes of grasping and clinging) believing there isn't a self.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 2:37 AM
Title: Re: Liberation Unleashed in the POV of Dzogchen

Content:
krodha wrote:
Tenpa, Liberation Unleashed is nothing like Dzogchen, and in my opinion their 'pointing out' is quite unskilled, they tend to fall into various extremes. Better to find a qualified teacher!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Today's retreat info:

Chögyal Namkhai Norbu will teach from what is considered to be the most important of all Dzogchen texts. Dra Thalgyur (sgra thal ‘gyur) is the abbreviated title of the Dzogchen Upadesha Tantra named rin po che 'byung bar byed pa sgra thal 'gyur chen po'i rgyud. Guru Garab Dorje re-transmitted this tantra about 300 years before Jesus was born.

The Dra Thalgyur has 6 chapters with a total of 168 questions & answers in about 200 folios. These questions include everything we always wanted to know about Dzogchen but did not know how to ask. It is the most important Dzogchen text but it is very difficult and condensed. During a period of about 3 years, Chögyal Namkhai Norbu edited 2 editions of Vimalamitra's commentary on the Dra Thalgyur. Korde Randrol ('khor 'das rang grol) means the self-liberation of samsara and nirvana. We are very fortunate that Chögyal Namkhai Norbu will transmit these profound teachings in this "open to everyone" webcast !!!
- Jim Valby

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 3rd, 2013 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: Question on a line from a Tibetan passage regarding Tant
Content:
wisdom said:
On some level non-abiding, or non-recognition is a "sin" in Dzogchen, confession is recognizing that this has happened, and repentance is returning to your natural state.

krodha wrote:
Read this somewhere and can't confirm whether it's true or not, but the root meaning of the word 'sin' is actually 'to forget'... to err or become distracted, interesting correlation if that is true!

From wikipedia:
"The word [sin] derives from “Old English syn(n), for original *sunjō,... The stem may be related to that of Latin sons, sont-is guilty. In Old English there are examples of the original general sense, ‘offence, wrong-doing, misdeed'”. The Biblical terms that have

been translated from Greek and Hebrew literally refer to missing a target, i.e. error."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 1st, 2013 at 6:03 AM
Title: Re: Questions about Buddhism?
Content:
CMP said:
Thanks for these replies, but I'm really not finding these answers satisfactory and many of them don't make sense.

Lots of the answers are seeming to imply that I'm just "thinking too much"....this is where I start believe this philosophy just really isn't for me. Perhaps it's not a good thing, but I have a very strong preference for logic and reason, which comes from the intellect. Any philosophy that tells me to basically just lobotomize myself and turn my brain off seems really dangerous. I shudder to think what kind of world we would live in if people never used their brains and just accepted whatever situation was present. No one would've invented electricity, the wheel, computers, toilets, etc. All of these came about because someone recognized and inconvenience, suffered from it, and rather than sitting on a couch and meditating it away, they decided use their intellect and do something about it.

krodha wrote:
'Thinking too much' is not the issue, thinking, assessing, reasoning etc., are all wonderful tools which help us to navigate our experiences and should not be rejected. When the dharma suggests that you 'still the mind' (which isn't even a necessary requirement), the reason for doing so is because a lot of the time, the tool we call 'thought', can begin to overwhelm our experience and get out of control. The philosophy isn't to reject the intellect, not at all, honestly if you inquire into the rejection of the intellect, it is only the intellect rejecting itself, so that is not the point. If you have a strong preference for logic and reasoning, then there is no reason to create an aversion to that. Again, that point is to inquire into your experience. Stopping thoughts is not the point of meditation, half of meditation is to discover that we are not our thoughts, and then the other half is to discover that we (as "I") are nothing but a thought, whereby we can discover that the cognizant capacity which is functioning in every instance of our experience, is precisely what we mistake to be an objective universe (more or less).

CMP said:
And that's what I meant when I said that meditation made me feel as if I was wasting time. I relaxed a bit, sure. But if there's some magic button to turn my brain off, I'd love to hear about it. Because you can never completely stop thinking. The point of meditation is supposed to be to "let go" of your attachments to things.

krodha wrote:
Half of attempting to stop thought, is discovering that it is impossible. The 'entity' which wants to stop thought, is thought itself. So it is 'a futility married to an illusion' as Alan Watts put it. The point of meditation is to discover your authentic nature, and

attachment obfuscates that discovery. Recognition of our nature requires skillful means, because if it is 'the self' that is in the way, how can the self get rid of the self? Part of meditation is inquiry into these things, analysis of oneself and our experience, because it is not what we take it to be.

CMP said:
Well let's say I'm behind on bills and about to lose my house. The bank does not "let go", the landlord does not "let go", the insurance company does not "let go".....but if I'm doing this philosophy the right way, then apparently I shouldn't care....I shouldn't suffer because according to Buddhism, suffering is a choice.

krodha wrote:
By all means handle your relative circumstances, ignoring our life circumstances and what is happening in our daily lives doesn't solve anything and accomplishes nothing. It's not that you shouldn't care, but that you (if you apply the teachings) will find that your life is easier, your own experience will be easier to deal with. It won't magically resolve your relative issues, but how you relate to those issues will be drastically improved. So it's not that you shouldn't care and that suffering is a choice, but that how you relate to your experience is something which is manageable and subject to improvement/change for the better.

CMP said:
And that's where I think this is pure BS. Can ask a question? If suffering is truly a choice, then can I drive a nail through your skull? Will someone volunteer? You might feel pain physically, but you're telling me you won't suffer. What in the hell is the difference? If your squirming and screaming in pain, I believe that qualifies as suffering. This philosophy seems to blame the victim for things.

krodha wrote:
The philosophy doesn't blame the victim for anything, but is a way to empower yourself. Truly it isn't a philosophy at all, because it's not a collection of intellectual notions one adopts and hangs onto like other dogmatic traditions or religions. The point is to apply the teachings to your direct experience, and actually improve your experience. Not in the sense of an opiate, like everything is ok because Jesus loves me, that doesn't solve anything apart from making someone feel better about things on a small scale. The point of Buddhism is to experientially change your life, actually discover a decrease in suffering, on the large scale even become liberated. This 'philosophy' puts you behind the drivers seat, and says you yourself can improve your experience. The Buddha left teachings for you to follow for experiential application, not dogma for you to believe. It may take some time for the teachings to be actualized, I know for myself it took some time. In the beginning I did have doubt, but I remained earnest and was fortunate to have some realizations which showed that the dharma is real, and that liberation is real.

CMP said:
For example, I was raped as a child. You're basically saying that the reason I suffered

was because I was too attached to not being raped?? Maybe that's not what's being said here, but I find that to be ludicrous and remarkably illogical and insensitive. After discovering Buddhism, I actually felt a sense of guilt for my own suffering, which in turn made me feel worse.

Anything else to add or is this philosophy just not for me?

krodha wrote:
No one (nor the Dharma) is saying that you suffered because you were too attached to not being raped. Not at all. There's no reason to feel guilt for your suffering. The dharma will only ask that you inquire into your experience. The past cannot be changed, but you have the power to change today, for a better tomorrow. The point isn't to become insensitive or detached via suppression or rejection, all that will do is bury those patterns which reify suffering in your present experience. The dharma may however ask that you evaluate your experience, look at yourself, discover what patterns, habitual tendencies etc., cause these events of the past to plague your current experience. Not in the sense that it's anything you're doing, or anything you should feel guilty of, that isn't the point, nor is it helpful. This is part of the message that 'being present' is attempting to help with, if we can be present, we can notice how residual traces of the past may creep up on us through certain proclivities and habits in thinking, behavior etc. No one is saying you are at fault, nor is anyone suggesting you deny the trauma you suffered, but to inquire into how that trauma is replaying, resurfacing, thriving in your condition, so that you can eventually be free of that stigma. You are not at fault in any way and should not feel guilty, these things are what Buddhism calls karmic propensities, traces etc., which act out subconsciously and plague your experience. There's nothing you are doing that you should feel guilty for, but Buddhism can help to bring these subconscious tendencies to the surface so that they are no longer playing out behind the scenes. So don't feel responsible for these things, but look at the dharma as a possibility, to now bring an end to the processes which are creating this vicious loop you are caught in.

May you find peace and happiness.
For the benefit and liberation of all sentient beings.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 1st, 2013 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Questions about Buddhism?
Content:
CMP said:
Also about attachment....I don't think people really choose to become attached to things. I think it's a natural phenomenon that human beings experience. I have a dog, and I know he's impermanent, but I'm still attached. And I didn't actively CHOOSE to become attached to him, it just sort of happened over time. Humans are evolutionarily inclined to show favor to their own pets, or spouses, or kids, or even possessions. So

how do you just "let go" of attachment?? It seems to be somewhat of an impossible task and I feel that even the people who claim they are not attached to something are just lying to themselves.

krodha wrote:
The idea is to eventually understand that we are nothing but attachments and aversions. You as the psychosomatic individual you are, are a collection of attachments, 'I like this', 'I don't like that', 'this is good', 'that is bad' etc., the Dharma is suggesting that you inquire into the nature of "I", or "me", what are you, who are you. Not who are you in the everyday conventional sense, but what is it that constitutes 'you'? Is there anything behind the habits? Or is there just habits, if you say there is something more than habits, where is it? The illusion of an individual entity arises out of attachment and aversion, if you can resolve attachment and aversion, which is to say resolve the illusion of 'selfhood', then that is liberation.

CMP said:
Also, how is suffering merely a product of the mind? Buddhists claim you must be in the "wrong mindset" or "too attached" to something if you suffer because of it....but I think that's absurd. If I drive a spike through someone's head and they start screaming and crying and SUFFERING because of the pain, does that mean it's their fault because they are too attached...?? How can any rational person say such a thing? Are the starving children in Africa suffering just because they are too attached to eating?

krodha wrote:
The suffering is more so the reactionary, or emotional torment that arises in relation to events and experience. Physical pain isn't exactly what is being referenced in the case of 'suffering'. Suffering is the throes of mental and emotional torment, negative mind states etc. In the most basic sense, we do suffer out of resistance to life, we resist 'what is' and when that occurs we suffer mentally or emotionally. That doesn't mean to throw out resistance altogether, conventional resistance is a useful tool in life. But be aware of that process, what is going on, what is occurring. On the coarse level, don't allow yourself to be a slave to spontaneous subconscious reactions, be mindful of the implications of your reactions, how it makes you feel when you reject something, and if you didn't would you still feel the same way?

On a more subtle level, yes suffering is indeed also addressing physicality, but those realizations only come through increased realization. As Dudjom Lingpa discusses here:

"Still, you might protest that it is unreasonable to hold that the body and the rest of the world have never existed as anything other than mere sensory appearances, since those who understand the empty nature of their bodies still feel pain when touched by fire or water or when struck by arrows, spears, clubs and so forth. The answer to this is the fact that as long as you have not arrived at the state of basic space [space being a metaphor for awakened wisdom] in which phenomena resolve within their true nature, dualistic appearances do not subside, and as long as they have not subsided, beneficial and harmful appearances occur without interruption. In actuality though, even the fires of hell do not burn."

CMP said:
Also the concept of "living in the moment" made no sense to me. I mean, if we really lived in the moment, would we even bother putting clothes on every day? or going to the bathroom when we poop? Because if we lived in the moment, we would just take it one second at a time and not worry about the future and who might ridicule us. And even if they did ridicule us we would just put it in the past. So does anybody REALLY live "in the moment" or is that just a bunch of clap-trap?

krodha wrote:
Living in the moment, is more so a matter of being aware of what is going on presently. Not being caught up in thought, thinking about the past, regretting, resentment, longing etc., not thinking about the future, what might come to be, what will happen if such and such does or doesn't occur etc (essentially addressing fear). The idea is to see that the past and the future are merely presently arising thoughts, you cannot access the past nor the future, you are only here now. So dwelling in thought, is essentially dreaming more or less, being distracted in possibilities, potentialities etc.

This individual [Atmananda] wasn't a Buddhist, but his insight is essentially the same as that which we would find in questioning 'time' through being present:

"Time is believed to be composed of the past, present and future. Of these three, the past is past only in reference to the present and the present is present only in relation to the past, future is future only in reference to the present. So all three being interdependent, even for their very existence, it has to be admitted by sheer force of logic that none of them are real. Therefore, time is not.

Experience is the only criterion by which the reality of anything can be decided. Of the three categories of time, past and future are not experienced by any, except when they appear in the present. Then it can be considered only as present. Even this present - when minutely examined - reduces itself into a moment which slips into the past before you begin to perceive it, just like a geometrical point. It is nobody's experience. It is only a compromise between past and future as a meeting point. Thus the present itself being only imaginary, past and future are equally so. Therefore, time is not."

So your present wakefulness is always in this immediacy, everything happens 'right now'... wherever you are or whatever you do, it is always 'right now'. Time, comes into being when thoughts (which seem to be recalling a previous happening) arise in this present moment and this thought (called memory) is then said to be commenting on 'the past'. However, all that is occurring, is an image arising 'right now' which seems to be representing another time. Likewise, thoughts which seem to be projecting events which have not yet come to pass, arise in this present moment and this thought (called an aspiration, hope or fear) is then said to be about 'the future'. However, all that is occurring, is an image arising 'right now' which seems to be representing another time. Lastly, this present moment, is only the present moment in relation to the past and future, the past and future only being presently arising thoughts are never experienced as actual 'times' so therefore the present cannot be the present and time is seen as

empty.

If you delve deeply into being present, it can be apperceived that every "moment" is the first moment that has ever been. However a 'first moment' would imply second and third, it's not the first, or the last, nor anywhere in between. It's an utterly timeless immediacy (And even 'the immediate' only exists in reference to the non-immediate, and is therefore negated as anything inherent).

CMP said:
I tried meditating, but it honestly didn't do much for me. I didn't gain any great experience from it, in fact, I seemed to have a feeling of wasting my time when I could've been actually fixing problems. Where did I go wrong?

krodha wrote:
It takes time to gain experience from meditation, however experience isn't exactly the point. Here are some good meditation instructions from Dudjom Rinpoche...

Instruction on Meditation By Dudjom Rinpoche:

Since everything originates in the mind, this being the root cause of all experience, whether “good” or “bad”, it is first of all necessary to work with your own mind, not to let it stray and lose yourself in its wandering. Cut the unnecessary build-up of complexity and fabrications which invite confusion in the mind. Nip the problem in the bud, so to speak.

Allow yourself to relax and feel some spaciousness, letting mind be to settle naturally. Your body should be still, speech silent, and breathing as it is, freely flowing. Here, there is a sense of letting go, unfolding, letting be.

What does this state of relaxation feel like? You should be like someone after a really hard day’s work, exhausted and peacefully satisfied, mind contented to rest. Something settles at gut level, and feeling it resting in your gut you begin to experience a lightness. It is as if you’re melting.

The mind is so unpredictable – there’s no limit to the fantastic and subtle creation which arise, its moods, and where it will lead you. But you might also experience a muddy, semi-conscious drifting state, like having a hood over your head – a kind of dreamy dullness.

This is a manner of stillness, namely stagnation, a blurred, mindless blindness. And how do you get out of this state? Alert yourself, straighten your back, breathe the stale air out of your lungs, and direct your awareness into clear space in order to bring about freshness. If you remain in this stagnant state you will not evolve, so when this setback arises clear it again and again. It is important to develop watchfulness, to stay sensitively alert.

So, the lucid awareness of meditation is the recognition of both stillness and change,

and the quiet clarity of peacefully remaining in our basic intelligence. Practice this, for only by actually doing it does one experience the fruition or begin to change.

View in Action

During meditation one's mind, being evenly settled in its own natural way, is like still water, unruffled by ripple or breeze, and as any thought or change arises in that stillness it forms, like a wave in the ocean, and disappears back into it again. Left naturally, it dissolves; naturally.

Whatever turbulence of mind erupts- if you let it be – it will of its own course play itself out, liberate itself; and thus the view arrived at through meditation is that whatever appears is none other than the self display or projection of the mind.

In continuing the perspective of this view into the activities and events of everyday life, the grasp of dualistic perception of the world as solid, fixed and tangible reality (which is the root cause of our problems) begins to loosen and dissolves. Mind is like the wind. It comes and goes; and through increasing certainty in this view one begins to appreciate the humor of the situation.

Things start to feel somewhat unreal, and the attachment and importance which one signifies to events begin to seem ridiculous, or at any rate lighthearted.

Thus one develops the ability to dissolve perception by continuing the flowing awareness of meditation into everyday life, seeing everything as the self-manifest play of the mind. And immediately after sitting meditation, the continuation of this awareness is helped by doing what

you have to do calmly and quietly, with simplicity and without agitation. So in a sense everything is like a dream, illusory, but even so humorously one goes on doing things. If you are walking, for instance, without unnecessary solemnity or self-consciousness, but lightheartedly walk towards the open space of suchness, truth. When you eat, be the stronghold of truth, what is. As you eat, feed the negativities and illusions into the belly of emptiness, dissolving them into space; and when you are pissing consider all your obscurations and blockages are being cleansed and washed away.

So far I have told you the essence of the practice in a nutshell, but you must realize that as long as we continue to see the world in a dualistic way, until we are really free of attachment and negativity, and have dissolved all our outer perceptions into the purity of the empty nature of mind, we are still stuck in the relative world of "good" and "bad", "positive" and "negative"actions, and we must respect these laws and be mindful and responsible for our actions.

Post Meditation

After formal sitting meditation, in everyday activities continue this light spacious awareness throughout and gradually awareness will be strengthened and inner

confidence will grow.

Rise calmly from meditation; don’t immediately jump up or rush about, but whatever your activity, preserve a light sense of dignity and poise and do what you have to do with ease and relaxation of mind and body. Keep your awareness lightly centered and don’t allow your attention to be distracted. Maintain this find thread of mindfulness and awareness, just flow.

Whether walking, sitting, eating or going to sleep, have a sense of ease and presence of mind. With respect to other people, be honest, gentle and straightforward; generally be pleasant in your manner, and avoid getting carried away with talk and gossip. Whatever you do, in fact, do it according to the Dharma which is the way of quieting the mind and subjugating negativities.

CMP said:
And lastly…the philosophy itself seems to point to suicide as the logical conclusion. This is what led me to nearly killing myself listening to people like Mooji and Eckhart Tolle. If life is suffering, and we become attached to impermanent things, then why cling to our own life? If I'm going to spend 70 or 80 years basically trying to find the white space in my head where there's no desire, what's the point? Why not just kill myself now and get the long tedious process over with? It only seems logical.

Thanks for anyone who can answer.

krodha wrote:
'The white space in your head where there's no desire' is not the point, nor is it even anything which is an aspect of these teachings. We aren't trying to create detached robots in the dharma, but happy people! Early in my path, I too spent some time with Eckhart Tolle and Mooji, however I didn't interpret their teachings in the way you seem to be. If their teachings aren't resonating with you, then perhaps some other teachers would be better.

Suicide is never, ever, ever the answer. It is a permanent solution to a temporary hardship. My younger brother suffered from debilitating suicidal depression some years ago, and he made it through and is doing wonderful now. While he was sick, he could not see beyond that fog of depression, he had to be hospitalized on numerous occasions because we feared that he would harm himself. So while I do not know your own experience, I have some semblance of an idea of what you are going through, from an objective perspective of course. These teachings are helpful, and they are wonderful, they have improved my life vastly and though I personally haven't struggled with depression, I have been able to sever negative and afflictive emotions through meditation and inquiry, and I am very content with life. The same is available to you, there is no difference between you or I, or you and anyone else. When we strip away our life circumstances and life situations, we are all sentient beings which function in the same way, so application of these teachings, and meditation for you can bring results if you want them to. It may take some time of course, and there must be the desire to be earnest and apply yourself, but it can pay off if you allow it to. I know you don't know me,

and I am not a teacher, but if you ever need someone to talk to you can send me a message anytime. Please hang in there, and please try and get some help!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 1st, 2013 at 4:14 AM
Title: Re: Questions about Buddhism?
Content:
CMP said:
...I even agree that suffering comes from desire. But how is it possible to stop desiring things? Even the desire to eradicate desire is a desire itself...

krodha wrote:
Very clever of you! That is the point, to realize that. Alan Watts discusses it here:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 1:06 PM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
For Dzogchen subjective experience only appears out of ignorance, so it does appear, but that doesn't mean it's not an adulteration or a mere byproduct of imputation (it is).

undefineable said:
Again, not everyone here will be familiar with this "Buddhist minimal-awareness" view (Gelug prasangika-madhyamika??) -assuming you're talking about all subjective awareness and not just a narrower object-consciousness- or have the capacity to understand ideas such as imputation generating the subjective experience that its own generation depends on by definition

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what you mean by "Buddhist minimal-awareness" view... it's not a view which is indicative of any particular school or teaching as far as Buddhism goes, so it isn't anything that is particularly Gelug etc. You'll have to define 'all subjective awareness' and 'narrower object-consciousness' for me I'm not sure what you mean by those two terms. 'Imputation generating the subjective experience that its own generation depends on', is assuming that imputation depends upon a subjective experience for its validity and functionality.

asunthatneversets said:
There is no awareness as a container (or field of potentiality) that things arise in.

undefineable said:
Maybe so, but that's how it might look from a broad-brush perspective, particularly on a certain level.

krodha wrote:
Yes that would be a multi-faceted notion if explored in its entirety.

asunthatneversets said:
You also have to be careful with the whole neither existent nor nonexistent thing as well, because some individuals will interpret that vague border as a license to promulgate an awareness-anchored view.

Awareness isn't an autonomous and free standing quality and therefore it isn't something which can be found apart from that which it relies on... it's only a viable designation when it's in relation to a wide array of other co-emergent designations. This is the type of thing you'd have to do some investigative work with though. By going through the process of discovering all the ways in which awareness is dependent, all the qualities, characteristics, aspects, things etc. that it depends on. Both in the sense of other qualities and also constituent characteristics that would define 'awareness' as what you take it to be. And when you've exhausted that search you will wind up not being able to locate awareness but will only find what it depends on. From there you'll then have to turn the investigation to whatever seems to remain (whatever awareness was dependent on) and find the emptiness of those qualities as well.

undefineable said:
It's turtles all the way down!

krodha wrote:
Although I can't pin down what it would be, the suggestion that what I wrote is creating a circular argument must be governed by a certain presupposition, I don't see an issue, you'll have to elaborate and clarify for me what you're getting at.

undefineable said:
In the case that there's no aspects of mind apart from ordinary objects, then why do Buddhist teachings promise an enlightenment that's supposedly unqualified, uncharacterised, non-emergent, non-dependent, and -most importantly- a [/i]liberation[/i] of the mind (i.e. an enlightenment that's necessarily incompatible with mind if indeed it can't operate on that level)? Further, why was the Buddha unable to answer the question of whether he'd exist after death if (by his insight) he'd been liberated from all things mind-(and body-)related? And, if everything in reality is without any reality apart from references to other things - which themselves are also without any reality whatsoever, then in what way is such a 'heavy' emptiness still empty of itself?

krodha wrote:

This presupposes 'mind' and 'ordinary objects' as viable qualities. Primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes] is unqualified, non-emergent, non-dependent etc., however it is still completely and utterly empty and not established in any way. The mind cannot be liberated, but through recognition that the mind is unborn, liberation is achieved. For the Buddha (or any Buddha for that matter), he had passed beyond the notions of birth and death, as all contamination (ignorance) had been exhausted. The Buddha's condition is dharmakāya [tib. chos sku], which is emptiness free of the four extremes [existence, non-existence, both and neither]. It's not that everything in reality is without reality apart from references to other things, that would be a guise for svabhāva. Everything in reality is in truth unborn, only our ignorance mistakes that origination or cessation occurs in relation to any 'thing'.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 9:37 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
undefineable said:
I don't get the impression that the idea of object-consciousness springing into existence without prior conditions (of a similar nature) -rather than from a potential for sentient experience (prior to its specific contents) that you might label awareness- is a particularly Buddhist idea, so I suspect there's some context here - Perhaps Greg is talking exclusively about the more referential (fifth-skandha?) forms of consciousness, or perhaps he's just trying to fit views on reality into a concrete intellectual framework. Either way, without context, this quote implies -via an easily-locatable awareness- an easily-locatable mind, albeit in infinite numbers even within a single lifetime.

krodha wrote:
Not my quote, but he was differentiating between the 'brahmanesque' source-type awareness which subsumes phenomena, and the view that a freedom from extremes would take on this issue, it was for the benefit of someone coming from (what I suppose was) a neo-advaita background.

undefineable said:
Inherently existent awareness sounds pretty indigestible on its own (since our minds would then trap us in existential bubbles), but a broader awareness might prove to be a fact of life in other ways. PadmaVonSamba often gives his take on awareness (as a kind of context?), and the fact remains that the contrasted philosophy of Advaita apparently proposes a mysterious substance -Brahman/God- as a necessary support to awareness/consciousness, rather than simply asserting awareness/consciousness as bare facts. It's easy to find out and grasp that the concept of Inherent Existence in Indian philosophy refers to something more than the everyday idea of 'this exists', even though we do tend to imagine existence in those more-substantial terms. {The whole concept of Substance seems to amount to the idea that object 'x' is so real that no mind could ever penetrate its mysteries, and although I've not even practiced enough to see that this is a myth, there's a mass of scientific findings that strongly suggest that it is - and that theism is wrong.}

krodha wrote:
The 'inherent' was referencing the Brahman of Vedanta, as opposed to emptiness (as presented in Buddhism).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 3:46 AM
Title: Re: The throat chakra
Content:
Tirthan said:
Thanks, so obviously it is not the same for all traditions - Lama Thubten Yeshe was a Gelugpa -Master.
I am actually mainly Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche ´s student - I mostly do practices that He transmits. (You may know that Tenzin Wangyal was for sime period of His life closely co-operating with Namkhai Norbu ´s Dzogchen Community.)

krodha wrote:
I'm also a student of Norbu Rinpoche and for his visualizations (I'm of course no authority, but) I would say the general area is fine, just the throat in general. For example; for the OM AH HUNG visualization, the AH in the throat should actually be radiant with light and can be as big or small as you'd like, so if you feel unsure about where to place it, you can have it encompass the entire throat area if that helps. It's really whatever is best for you and what you feel resonates with your practice.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 2:45 AM
Title: Re: The throat chakra
Content:
Tirthan said:
Hello,
I have read in some text of Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche that the throat chakra is not situated in the center of the throat but rather lower, in the base of throat, where throat meets the body (don't remember the text but the information I know for sure).
But Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche is a teacher from Bonpo -tradition. So I am not sure if it is the same also for Buddhist tantra?
(Because some things differ very much - e.g. where Buddhists have OM Ah HUM, Bonpos have A OM HUM; the way Bonpos do 9 purification breathings differs too ...)

krodha wrote:
I know some traditions hold the throat chakra to be directly at the adam's apple, for instance in Lama Thubten Yeshe's Bliss of Inner Fire book he explicitly states "The throat chakra is located directly behind the Adam's apple". But you should go with whatever your teacher says, if Tenzin Wangyal is your teacher and says the throat chakra is in the base of the throat then that is right, it's more about the connection to the transmission and the lineage than anything.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
rachmiel said:
I know dis guy from my studies of Advaita Vedanta and Neo-Advaitan Non-Duality.

krodha wrote:
Yeah same guy, he's recently been doing a lot of work with the emptiness teachings though. Both emptiness and the Atmananda's direct path [advaita] are his main teachings he focuses on. I think he's more well known for his nonduality, awareness based teachings but he's been focusing more on emptiness lately, and does a great job, doesn't conflate the advaita view with the Buddhist emptiness at all. Here's his emptiness site: http://www.emptiness.co/

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Greg Goode had some good insight on this too:

monktastic said:
It may be useful to note, for rachmiel's sake, that Greg is not a Mahamudra teacher. Although I consider his amazing work to be of tremendous value to my own practice, he freely admits that he does not teach from a Mahamudra perspective. From a personal communication:

Greg Goode said:
I have just finished a book on the emptiness teachings, and my co-author is one of Dogchen Ponlop's students. Even so, we are taking the Gelug Prasangika approach to Madhyamika, not the Kagyu Mahamudra approach.

krodha wrote:
True, and even though Greg focuses more on the Gelug Prasaṅgika view (mainly Tsongkhapa etc.), the early Indian Prasaṅgika view accords very closely with the Dzogchen view, and so most of the great Nyingma key figures; Longchenpa, Mipham, Jigme Lingpa etc., all consider the early Prasaṅgika Madhyamaka expounded by Nāgārjuna to be a definitive view. Even though Greg isn't a Mahamudra teacher, some of the themes in the Prasaṅgika logic and reasoning can be very helpful in understanding Dzogchen. Both uphold a freedom from extremes as the correct view.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
Unknown said:
Being primordially pure of all constructs, the extreme of existence has been discarded. As the manifestation of awareness is spontaneously present, it is free from the extreme of nonexistence.--Mipham Rinpoche

krodha wrote:
Important to note that 'awareness' in the above quote is a perfect example of vidyā [rig pa] being translated as 'awareness'. Mipham is speaking of vidyā here, not awareness in the sense that we think of awareness. Mipham is talking about knowledge of primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes].

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
krodha wrote:
Greg Goode had some good insight on this too:

Greg wrote:
Matt, when you say

'can someone show me how it's [awareness] not an eternal, non-separate essence?'

and

'as soon as you point to a phenomenon upon which awareness would be dependent, awareness was already there,'

are you assuming that awareness is one, single unified thing that is already there before objects are? That awareness is present whether objects are present or not?

That is a particular model. It sounds very similar to Advaita. But there are other models.

The emptiness teachings have a different model. Instead of one big awareness they posit many mind-moments or separate awarenesses. Each one is individuated by its own object. There is no awareness between or before or beyond objects. No awareness that is inherent. In this emptiness model, awareness is dependent upon its object. And as you point out, the object is dependent upon the awareness that apprehends it. But there is no underlying awareness that illuminates the entire show.

That's how these teachings account for experience while keeping awareness from being inherently existent.

This isn't the philosophy that denies awareness. That was materialism. We had a few materialists in the fb emptiness group, but they left when they found out that emptiness doesn't utterly deny awareness. So you see, there are people who do deny it... In the emptiness teachings, things depend on awareness, cognitiion, conceptualization, yes. But it is the other way around as well. Awareness depends on objects too.

Greg wrote:
Speaking of *after* studying the emptiness teachings.... After beginning to study the emptiness teachings, the most dramatic and earth-shattering thing I realized the emptiness of was awareness, consciousness.

It came as an upside-down, inside-out BOOM, since I had been inquiring into this very point for a whole year. It happened while I was meditating on Nagarjuna's Treatise. Specifically verse IX:4, from “Examination of the Prior Entity.”

If it can abide
Without the seen, etc.,
Then, without a doubt,
They can abide without it.

I saw that a certain parity and bilateral symmetry is involved. If awareness can exist without its objects, then without a doubt, they can exist without awareness. True enough. Then there is a hidden line or two:

BUT - the objects CAN'T exist without awareness. Therefore, awareness can't exist without them. This was big for me.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 29th, 2013 at 1:31 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
monktastic said:
As they say in Dzogchen texts, it [subjective experience] is not nonexistent, because it clearly appears. Yet it is not existent, because it cannot be pinned down as this or that (i.e., assigning it physical characteristics leads to nonsense, as we see above).

rachmiel said:
Sweet. Resonates nicely.

So how about awareness, in its sense as a field of ... potential (?) in which mentation arises? (Not sure I got that quite right.) Is awareness similarly not nonexistent yet not existent?

krodha wrote:
For Dzogchen subjective experience only appears out of ignorance, so it does appear, but that doesn't mean it's not an adulteration or a mere byproduct of imputation (it is).

There is no awareness as a container (or field of potentiality) that things arise in. You also have to be careful with the whole neither existent nor nonexistent thing as well, because some individuals will interpret that vague border as a license to promulgate an awareness-anchored view.

Awareness isn't an autonomous and free standing quality and therefore it isn't something which can be found apart from that which it relies on... it's only a viable designation when it's in relation to a wide array of other co-emergent designations. This is the type of thing you'd have to do some investigative work with though. By going through the process of discovering all the ways in which awareness is dependent, all the qualities, characteristics, aspects, things etc. that it depends on. Both in the sense of other qualities and also constituent characteristics that would define 'awareness' as what you take it to be. And when you've exhausted that search you will wind up not being able to locate awareness but will only find what it depends on. From there you'll then have to turn the investigation to whatever seems to remain (whatever awareness was dependent on) and find the emptiness of those qualities as well.

In the end you might still uphold that 'things' depend upon awareness, but whatever it is you think depends upon awareness is merely a conventional notion, which doesn't withstand proper scrutiny. If you say time, space and thought depend on awareness, this is a presupposition, if you investigate that claim you'd see that it can go the other way around as well. There's no ontological hierarchy to these apparent designations apart from the one we insist upon. Awareness is only primary if we say so. If we skillfully investigate a claim of that nature we can discover that within these alleged structures nothing is truly produced.

The investigation is reconciling and resolving the presuppositions of inherency which allow other suppositions to be anchored in our experiences. So it's an endeavor which starts untying knots so to say. When we resolve the emptiness of one designation we find that another designation which depended on that-which-was-just-resolved starts to lose its footing as well. You're pulling cards out of the house of cards.. It's like the game jenga, pretty soon the whole thing topples. What's left is inexpressible because to capture it defines something and that definition directly results in another co-emergent designation which in turn spawns another... ad infinitum, so it's said to be ungraspable. There is nothing which did not arise due to clinging and grasping.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 25th, 2013 at 4:57 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
rachmiel said:
Please help me understand the Buddhist takes on these key terms. I'm hoping they can

be "defined" in just a few words, i.e. the essence sans ornamentation ... ?

mind: ...

consciousness: ...

awareness: ...

krodha wrote:
'Mind' usually refers to the experiencing continuum of a sentient being in its entirety. Which means deluded dualistic perception governed by ignorance [skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa]. Subjectivity which naturally implies objectivity and that dichotomy as a whole. A sentient being is the opposite of a Buddha, Buddhas are not deluded. Mind would be the sum of the consciousnesses. The term 'mind' may also (sometimes) be attributed solely to the stream of thought and memory, like it is traditionally in the west, though more often than not mind will simply signify the afflicted condition of a sentient being.

'Consciousness' is a term attributed to the different sensory modalities and their respective streams of experience. The collection of consciousnesses are set up in groups of 6 or 8 depending on the tradition, including the 5 traditional senses plus memory, emotional imprints etc. for the additional consciousnesses. Consciousness is also deluded and arises as a result of ignorance. The senses; sensory organs, sensory fields are likewise products of ignorance. A Buddha is divested of these faculties and recognizes them to be empty (meaning lacking inherent existence, dependently originated and/or free from extremes).

'Awareness' would be synonymous with consciousness, though it can perhaps be attributed to a subtle dualistic reference point as well. There has been a prominent trend to translate the term 'rig pa' [skt. vidyā] as 'awareness', and so you may often see rigpa translated as 'awareness' in dzogchen and mahamudra texts. Unfortunately this trend is misrepresentative of rigpa, which is more accurately a discerning knowledge of primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes]. 'Awareness' suggests (i) awareness of something, and (ii) also suggests a neutral indeterminate cognizance, both are misrepresentative of rigpa (which is best left untranslated).

Buddhism is more concerned with emptiness. Mind, consciousness and awareness are all empty, there is nothing which isn't empty.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 24th, 2013 at 4:38 AM
Title: Re: Question about "location of mind"
Content:
krodha wrote:
Honestly the entire 'brain based' model can be disregarded entirely when it comes to dharma inquiry and practice. The brain and body of course do have conventional relevance, however if one insists that the scientific theories are inherently and

ultimately true, all that is accomplished is the championing of a materialist/physicalist view. A view which is extremely defeating when it comes to the ways in which the dharma can liberate one from all of our misconceptions. The brain and it's supremacy is relatively valid when it comes to our physiological functioning, but always remember it is something you learned, and therefore it is a notion you hold onto and have to conjure up to explain away experience. It is nothing but a thought, and you do not experience thought, located in a brain, in your direct experience. The brain is never experienced in your direct experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 23rd, 2013 at 5:51 AM
Title: Re: The Purpose of Thogal Practice
Content:
krodha wrote:
Thögal is (using the term 'process' loosely) the process of reverting the five elements into their natural state as the five wisdom lights.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 23rd, 2013 at 4:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Mahamudra experiences
Content:
krodha wrote:
Some questions about Dzogchen and Mahamudra differences came up recently in a discussion with Malcolm:

Malcolm wrote:
While it is standard idea that buddhahood realized through sutrayāna is not complete, the realization of Mahamudra and the realization of Dzogchen are completely identical. The path however is very different and the way the term "rigpa" is used in various traditions varies. For example, what the term "rig pa" means in Mahamudra literature is a little different than what it means in Dzogchen because the explanation of the basis, path and result is completely different.

Q: Malcolm, it surprises me that you equate the realizations so downright. I've gotten the impression that there are actual differences between the two culminations. Nothing would satisfy my synthesizing brain more, and that's exactly why I'm weary of thinking that their fruit is equal. What about thogal? At the moment, Mahamudra resonates more with me.

Malcolm wrote:
The result of Mahamudra and Dzogchen are completely identical, only the path is different. But we do not talk about "rig pa" on the path of Mahamudra in the same way it is used in Dzogchen. The basic difference is the Mahamudra works from the outside in via the two stages. Dzogchen works from the inside out. Between the two, Dzogchen is less dependent on mind, and is therefore more rapid. Gampopa's Mahamudra

teachings are very influenced by Dzogchen Semsde.

Q: Two stages? And what kind of a difference in rapidness are we talking?

Malcolm wrote:
Mostly, it is a matter of effort, Dzogchen is easier than practicing deity yoga, doing tummo, etc. Dzogchen is for lazy people who are in a hurry.

Q: Mahamudra necessarily entails deity yoga, tummo, etc.? How come the realization of the teachings of the historical Buddha are considered not complete?

Malcolm wrote:
In general, Mahamudra entails deity yoga, etc. Mahamudra is the state of realizing one's state through a yidam such as Kalacakra or the other way to realize Mahamudra is through Guru Yoga. These are the two paths of Mahamudra. The teachings of the Agamas/NIkayas resuilts solely in the eradication of afflictions, not the attainment of omniscience. Mahayāna (Zen, etc.) also only takes one to the eleventh bhumi, and not total buddhahood (thirteenth bhumi).

Q: I don't see how the four yogas fit into the two steps/paths you mention. Is there something I'm missing?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the four yogas are practiced alongside the two stages/guru yoga by most practitioners. The four yogas technically are part of sutra mahamudra, actually, according to how it is presented by Kongtrul. They are presented as part of Mahamudra in the five fold system of Drikung and Drukpa, but this is integrated with creation stage and Guru Yoga.

Q: And they parallel the four naljors of Dzogchen Semde, yes? You mention "sutra mahamudra". I've heard the distinction before, but I don't understand what it distinguishes from mantra/tantra and essence mahamudra. Will you clarify? Also, if the path of mahamudra and dzogchen is dissimilar, why do we find the 4 yogas and the 4 naljors in parallel? It's not that I haven't studied this, but it induced confidence to get it confirmed.
Unknown said:
"The Sutrayana approach to Mahamudra is seen as a very profound method because it does not require any of the sophisticated and complex tantric rituals, deity yoga practices, or samayas. It is a very simple sutra approach, yet it conveys the direct transmission of the tantric essence of awakening."
- excerpt from 'Wild Awakening'

krodha wrote:
Malcolm wrote:
According to a personal communication to me from Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso, Sutra

Mahamudra was contrived by Gampopa for those who were not ready for Tantra. In sutra mahamudra there is no empowerment and no samayas, etc. Essence Mahamudra is based on a specific type of empowerment called the descent of the wisdom vajra (CF Jnanasiddhi by Indrabhuti), and the tantric mahamudra involves the practice of the two stages. The former is more a path of Guru Yoga, the latter, of course, the two stages. Sutra Tantra and Essence Mahamudra is a system of the Karma Kagyu, It does not exist in the other Kagyu schools. In Drukpa and Drikung, the four yogas are included as part of the Sahaja Mahamudra, but this also depends on a kind of introduction. Usually a Cakrasamvara or a Vajrayogini empowerment.

Q: When for example, the Mahamudra talks about the realization of one taste as "liberation from the duality of perceiver and perceived" and "by the power of the multiplicity of all phenomena appearing as one taste, the expansion of the great expression of wisdom, the realization of one taste itself manifesting as multiplicity" Would you say such description is related to the 13th bhumi apprehension of all phenomena as being the display of his own wisdom?

Malcolm wrote:
One taste is not total realization. The result of Mahamudra according to the four yogas is achieved only at greater non-meditation. Even first stage bodhisattvas are free from the duality of dualistic perception while in a state of equipoise.

Q: Malcolm Smith you said that the Mahamudra result is the same as Dzogchen, does that mean a Mahamudra practitioner will realize primordial state through their own empowerments? How about say, an 11th bhumi Zen practitioner? Does that practitioner realize primordial state?

Malcolm wrote:
The difference [in realization between 11th and 13th bhumis], as recounted in such tantras as the Samputa, etc, is that a buddha of the eleventh or twelfth bhumi does not apprehend all phenomena as being the display of his own wisdom. This is more or less the classical Indian presentation of Vajrayāna path structures generally followed in Sakya and Nyingma. The Kagyus on the other hand consider the eleventh and twelfth bhumis to be bodhisattva stages rather than stages of buddhahood. But in general the Kagyus, like the Gelupgas, are in many respects more influenced by Sutra than Sakya and Nyingma.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 23rd, 2013 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Mahamudra experiences
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Hello,

I have a question about the practice of Dzogchen and Mahamudra.

- What would be the real difference regarding the experience between a Mahasiddha and a Dzogchenpa ?
- Where do we have THAT certain difference and where does it start in the practice ?

I do know it on paper some differences but how does it look like in the practice?

Thanks at beforehand for your attention

Best wishes
KY

krodha wrote:
The end result is the same, but the paths are different. Mahamudra in general is generation stage [mahayoga] and completion stage [anuyoga], so it is quite different from Dzogchen in that respect. There is Essence (formless) Mahamudra, but apart from the four yogas, Essence Mahamudra is resting in the state of Mahamudra, which ends up being essentially equivalent to the practice of Tregchö in Dzogchen. The four yogas also being essentially Gampopa's rendition of the four naljors of Dzogchen semde.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 15th, 2013 at 1:51 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
If we maintain that dualistic mind is equivalent to primordial wisdom then what is the point of the dharma?

gregkavarnos said:
The text does not say it is equivalent, it says that the source of all reality is primordial wisdom. Like cheese comes from milk, but is not milk.

krodha wrote:
That works... so cheese arises from milk, yet forgets it's milk nature and suffers (even though it's delicious), cheese then discovers the dharma, recognizes it's milk nature, trains in it's milk nature and becomes milk again, voilà!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 15th, 2013 at 1:35 PM
Title: Re: The difference between causation and reflection
Content:
krodha wrote:
Malabeads here's a lot of blah, blah, blah conceptualization (or my blah, blah, blah conceptual interpretation I mean):

Causation would refer to the proliferation of the conditioned phenomena of dualistic

mind. The phenomena of dualistic mind and ignorance originate dependently and therefore depend upon causes and conditions to exist. The condition is ignorance [avidyā], and the causation is the interdependent origination which occurs due to attachment and aversion. The mind beguiled by avidyā perceives duality and therefore acts and reacts from within that delusion. Those actions (of attachment and aversion), along with the subtle habits which sustain the ignorance, are one's karma. To overcome karma (causation) the mind which is trapped in delusion must be recognized as empty so that the foundation for karma's proliferation is disarmed. The knowledge which results from recognizing the mind's nature is vidyā [rig pa]. Stabilization and familiarization with vidyā will make it so a) new karma isn't being generated and/or b) the influence of karma which is being generated is greatly diminished. Once vidyā is stable, the latent karma, which resides in the form of propensities, then has to exhaust itself, the fuel which kept the fire going is removed so karma just burns out.

In vidyā, the aspirant recognizes that ignorance and the deluded mind are causes and conditions for phenomena. This is because vidyā is knowledge of the basis [skt. sthāna, tib. gzhi] i.e. primordial wisdom [skt. jñāna, tib. ye shes]. The basis is incapable of ignorance, so it has never been involved in affliction at any time. The basis also doesn't depend upon causes and conditions, and so one could say the basis is uncaused, but usually the basis is termed as self-originated primordial wisdom. Self-origination can also be looked at as unafflicted dependent origination i.e. spontaneous natural formation which is completely unestablished in any way. Spontaneous natural formation is lhun grub, and because lhun grub is inseparable from ka dag (primordial purity); from the perspective of primordial wisdom there is no establishment nor unestablishment of anything at any time (freedom from the four extremes). That is why the analogy of reflection is often used, because a mirror's capacity to reflect is never adulterated or sullied by reflections, and in addition to being dynamic and able to appear as anything, the mirror's capacity to reflect is also inseparable from the reflections. Primordial wisdom is the same way: wisdom's capacity to manifest appearances is never adulterated or sullied by those appearances, and in addition to being dynamic and able to appear as anything, primordial wisdom is also inseparable from empty appearance (empty, meaning free from extremes i.e. illusory).

Something I wrote awhile ago...
"...The mirror-analogy is commonly used in attempting to describe the 'nature of mind' and there is a common misconception which tends to arise from this analogy because the implementation of a mirror seems to convey a substantiated background (or unchanging source). I was attempting to point out that the analogy isn't meant to explore the mirror in itself as an unchanging basis, but solely the mirror's capacity to reflect. So the capacity is the aspect the analogy is exploring. Equating the nature of mind to the mirror's reflective capacity (but not the mirror itself). That the reflections are inseparable from that capacity, just like AEN elucidated with the fire-to-heat and water-to-wetness examples. That capacity isn't a conceivable quality, it isn't something which can be 'known' as a substantiated suchness. The capacity (to reflect) cannot be rolled, thrown or bounced, it has no shape, color, location, weight or height. There is nothing there one can point to and declare 'there it is!'. Yet in it's elusiveness it is still fully apparent in the presence of the reflections themselves. The capacity is evident because

of the reflections and the reflections are evident because of the capacity, in truth they co-emergent and mutually interdependent qualities which are completely inseparable. Evident, clear and pure, yet unestablished, ungraspable and ephemeral."

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche used the capacity aspect as well in one of his Longde books....

"Our primordial potentiality is beyond form, but we have a symbol, and when we have a symbol then we can get in that knowledge. It is very easy to understand with an example. If you want to discover the potentiality of a mirror, how can you go about it? You can neither see or touch the nature or potentiality of a mirror, nor can you have contact with it in any ordinary way, the only way is to look in a mirror, and then the reflections will appear and through the reflections you can discover it. The reflections are not really the potentiality of the mirror but they are manifesting through that potentiality, so they are something visible for us. With this example we can get in the knowledge of the potentiality of the mirror...."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

"Why then do we have this symbol of primordial potentiality? Primordial potentiality in the Dzogchen teaching is explained with three principles: sound, light and rays. This does not mean that sound, light and rays are manifestations, but rather that these are the root of all manifestations. When you have this potentiality then there is always the possibility of manifestations. If we wonder, for example what the potentiality of a mirror looks like, we couldn't say very much, we could say for example that it is clear, pure, limpid and so forth, but we could not really have contact with it directly through our senses. In the same way sound, light and rays are the essence of potentiality. When we have this potentiality, if secondary causes arise, then anything can manifest.
What do we mean by secondary causes? For example, if in front of a mirror there is tree, or a flower or a person, the object instantly manifests. These are secondary causes. So if there is no secondary cause there is no manifestation. Thus in front of our primordial potentiality there are all the possibilities of manifestation of the secondary causes....."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 11th, 2013 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
You guys like to stroke each other that's all that's happening here.

krodha wrote:
Hmm yes we're talking dharma on a dharma forum...

Greg and I are having a friendly conversation I don't see the harm. What else would you have us do Holybla?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 11th, 2013 at 12:51 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Likewise dualistic mind and avidyā aren't primordial wisdom, but arise adventitiously as a result of primordial wisdom's dynamism.

gregkavarnos said:
That is like saying an apple tree is not an apple tree because it arose from an apple seed and not an apple tree.

krodha wrote:
It's like the rope and snake metaphor; dualistic mind and phenomena which appear to be conditioned are like the snake lying in the road, however if the apparent snake is properly scrutinized it's discovered to be merely a rope. Once the rope is apperceived it's understood that the snake was only ever confusion and ignorance, and therefore the snake is unborn, non-arisen etc. The rope never directly manifested the delusion of the snake, the rope was a rope, displaying itself as a rope the whole time. However through our confusion a snake apparently originated. The snake was an error, and likewise the misconceptions of dualistic mind are errors.

If we maintain that dualistic mind is equivalent to primordial wisdom then what is the point of the dharma? It's soteriological value and purpose would be rendered redundant and void. Dualistic mind and ignorance are rtsal at root, however they aren't wisdom display. It's all primordial wisdom all along, but it's recognition or non-recognition of that which is the point of dzogchen. If we recognize primordial wisdom, then that is vidyā [rig pa], which is one's foundation for practice to achieve liberation. If we don't recognize primordial wisdom then that is avidyā [ma rig pa], which is the foundation for delusion and suffering.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 11:43 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
The tantra itself does not seem to draw a distinction between mind and the natural state. It shows a seamless continuity, not two seperate entities. To "argue" that there is the mind and there is the natural state, cannot really be justified on the basis of the text.

krodha wrote:
Not two separate entities per se, but the two possible paths which result due to recognition or non-recognition.

gregkavarnos said:
To say that the text merely outlines deluded mind also does not seem to be warranted. The text seems to be outlining the process whereby appearances are generated out of the natural state. By this token it would be like saying that fuel, spark and fire are seperate.

krodha wrote:
I wasn't suggesting that it solely outlines dualistic mind, just noting that what may appear to be merely outlining the natural state is in truth also discussing the process of straying into duality as well (and the subsequent implications), even though that isn't overtly apparent. The natural state issues sound, light and rays however that phenomena is unborn, emptiness free from extremes. It's only when emptiness isn't recognized that appearance is mistaken as objective phenomena and the delusion of origination occurs. The five wisdom lights are adulterated into the five elements. The elements are the lights all along however our ignorance obscures recognition of that.

Rather than the fuel, spark, fire metaphor I think the sun to clouds one frames the relationship between primordial wisdom [ye shes] and mind well; that the sun simply displays its radiance and heat, and when that heat interacts with water vapor, clouds are formed which then obscure the sun. The sun is still shining all along, however by force of its own innate qualities certain causes and conditions arise which veil it. The clouds aren't a part of the sun, but arise adventitiously as an expression of it's dynamism. Likewise dualistic mind and avidyā aren't primordial wisdom, but arise adventitiously as a result of primordial wisdom's dynamism.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 9:59 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's definitely a topic which is a point of departure for people, I had a recent conversation with Jax where he vehemently opposed the kun byed rgyal po being the dualistic mind, Malcolm didn't write much but also maintained his position that it's the mind which is being referenced:

Jax wrote:
Kyle Dixon, so as you now see both you and Malcolm were wrong as per my quotes... And JL's comments had nothing to do with our conversation. Like I said: Boy, Kyle are you wrong:

From the Kunje Gyalpo Tantra: "Kunje Gyalpo declares: I am primordial self-perfection. I am the essence of of the state of self-perfection of all the Buddhas"

Namkhai Norbu writes: "The transmission of knowledge comes from the state of rigpa that has never been stained and has never been hindered. This is AdiBuddha, or the primordial Buddha, Kunje Gyalpo. The state of Kunje Gyalpo is knowledge (rigpa)..."

So admit you were wrong again Kyle along with your wrong concept about "emptiness being the result of the 4th vision of thogal, and your about face regarding Zhantong. You need to get out your books again and try to memorize this stuff... or just practice.

I wrote:
Jean-Luc's comments had everything to do with what we're discussing, he was addressing the very fact that the 'All-Creating King' is the mind.

As for Malcolm Smith being wrong, I would disagree and it's unfortunate you'd make such a claim.

I have no issue with making mistakes from time to time and admitting it, I don't allow for my confirmation biases to blind me from seeking the truth. When I recognize that I must admit wrong in my life, I do it with pride, because that is the only way I (and others) can grow.

Petty of me to do so but, may I point out that you weren't even aware that the realization of emptiness was associated with any of the visions (and you claim to teach that practice). I really have no position on Zhantong, it appears to be no different than Advaita Vedanta, but great masters such as Dudjom Rinpoche have proclaimed that it has useful application in practice so I remain open to it. I'm fairly unconcerned with that view, that is your own interest.

Jax wrote:
Of course Malcolm was wrong. Didn't you read the quotes from the KJG Tantra and Norbu? Hello???

Malcolm wrote:
Wrong about what?

I wrote:
According to Jax, the following two quotes from Norbu Rinpoche's kun byed rgyal po translation refute your statement that the mind is the all-creating king:

From the Kunje Gyalpo Tantra: "Kunje Gyalpo declares: I am primordial self-perfection. I am the essence of of the state of self-perfection of all the Buddhas"

Namkhai Norbu writes: "The transmission of knowledge comes from the state of rigpa

that has never been stained and has never been hindered. This is AdiBuddha, or the primordial Buddha, Kunje Gyalpo. The state of Kunje Gyalpo is knowledge (rigpa)..."

Malcolm wrote:
Oh, well jax just has to read more carefully and thoroughly.

Jax wrote:
Jax has to read "what" more thoroughly and carefully? The texts I posted were quite clear and carefully read before I posted them. The discussion was "What does the Kunje Gyalpo, "The All Creating Monarch" represent?

Kyle Dixon said "The all creating king indeed does represent ignorance since phenomena only arise from ignorance... The all creating king is the mind... not the gzhi, nor is it the dharmakaya, nor is it samantabhadra since those 3 are never involved in ignorance."

Jax: Now here are the correct facts: From the Kunje Gyalpo Tantra:

"Kunje Gyalpo declares: I am primordial self-perfection. I am the essence of of the state of self-perfection of all the Buddhas"

Namkhai Norbu writes: "The transmission of knowledge comes from the state of rigpa that has never been stained and has never been hindered. This is AdiBuddha, or the primordial Buddha, Kunje Gyalpo. The state of Kunje Gyalpo is knowledge (rigpa)..."

I rest my case and have no further reason to argue regarding what the Kunje Gyalpo means in Dzogchen. It does not mean as Kyle said it represents "ignorance". Rather it represents our primordial State as Rigpa or perfect Buddha Wisdom Mind.

Malcolm wrote:
Chnn has said more about this than is what in your citation.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 9:49 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
But for a) those who are caught in ignorance [avidyā], or b), are fluctuating in their integration [unripened vidyā]; the words are not dzogchen because they're being related to dualistically (they are wisdom essentially, but that's irrelevant because it's

recognition or non-recognition which is the deciding factor).

gregkavarnos said:
Hmmmmm... "Oh great bodhisattva, listen! Things are made in a perfect manner. This is so because I am the nature of perfection. I shall show you My own being. Because My own being is non-conceptual and uncreated, I have made [things] as to exist in the realm of Reality (chos dbyings). They do not rest on anything else but the mind of perfect purity. As My own being is immaculate and all-pervasive [the things] do not rest upon anything else but on the self-originated awareness itself in the mansion of awareness, i.e the lurid sky. As I am the central vigor of all things which come into existence, i.e. the five great [elements], the threefold world, the six categories [of sentient beings]: they are nothing else but My form, utterance and spirit. I have established [the things] as My own being. I am revealing to you the Buddhas of the three times and the sentient beings of the threefold world as My own being. Because My actuating essence is unborn, and non-conceptual, it does not exist (mi gnas), but transcends all areas of perception. It even transcends the objects of meditation and does not become apparent in mental absorption. Although My own being is imperceptible, I reveal My actuation to you as the threefold world, [consisting of] the five great [elements], and the six categories [of sentient beings]. From the five [elements] which are the apparent [form of My] own being, i.e. the perfect and pure mind, come the five self-originated and vigorous awarenesses. The five awarenesses bring forth the five sensual objects; after the five desires have come forth the five passions come forth. The five passions bring their individual results which individually appear as the six categories of the sentient beings. I am teaching you the appearance [of the universe] to be like that.
The All-Creating Sovereign, Mind of Perfect Purity, Chapter 6

krodha wrote:
The kun byed rgyal po is an interesting tantra, and I totally agree that the way it reads comes off as if it's suggesting that everything is perfect across the board from the very beginning, even ignorance, but one interesting point I've come across is that the kun byed rgyal po or 'All-Creating Monarch' is the mind, rather than the natural state.

Here's a question Soh Wei Yu (posts here as Xabir) asked Malcolm awhile ago:

Soh wrote:
"Hi Namdrol,

As you mentioned about Hindu Vedanta... a question came to mind.

I was just reading someone's post half an hour ago in another forum:
(http://collectionofthoughts.com/bbpress/topic/1499/page/7?replies=200).

He/she ('star') states that according to Dzogchen view, everything is Consciousness, and therefore everything is real.

What is your comment on this?

Also, he/she states 'The Supreme Source' as a reference... in which I also personally have some questions regarding this book: in certain parts of the book, Consciousness is described as an all-creating agent, which sounds like God to me. How does Dependent Origination apply here?"

Malcolm wrote:
"This person has confused the Trika non-dual view with Dzogchen.

The mind that is the all-creating king, as Norbu Rinpoche makes clear, is the mind that does not recognize itself, and so enters into samsara, creating its own experience of samsara.

All conditioned phenomena are a product of ignorance, according to Dzogchen view, and so therefore, everything is not real. The basis of that ignorance is the basis, which is also not established as real.

In Dzogchen, everything is unreal, from top to bottom. The basis, in Dzogchen, is described as being 'empty not established in any way at all'. If the basis is not real, then whatever arises from that basis is not real.

In Dzoghen, dependent origination begins from the non-recognition of the state of the basis, when this happens, one enters into grasping self and other, and then the chain of dependent origination begins."

And Jean-Luc Achard has said the same:

? wrote:
"That quote above still can be interpreted the same way. The Kunjed Gyalpo says that there is nothing to do, try, search etc... Because everything is from the Supreme Source, thus perfect. There is not two sources, but one. Then what can possibly be 'perfected' ?"

Jean-Luc Achard wrote:
"Supreme Source is not a Dzogchen concept. I don't know (well i suspect) why they choosed this title (way too New Age for me) but the original is 'All Creating' (kun-byed, lit. 'All Doing') refering to the mind. So mind creates everything, that's the meaning, its not a reference to some cosmic source somewhere as it may sound from the english title. What can be perfected? Well one's deluded mind can be perfected, certainly not the natural state. Nobody said the natural state has to be perfected, it's one's ultimate essence, but our ordinary being is not our essence, it is deluded, full of ignorance, and this is what has to be perfected."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
krodha wrote:
Isn't it 'birds of a feather, flock together'?... Maybe hugging together is the saying where you're from I dunno. And ok discussion over, except ka dag and lhun grub aren't really proper equivalents to the two-truths. Vidyā and avidyā is the dzogchen treatment. Vidyā the single truth, everything else falling under avidyā, including conventionality. Although even non-dzogchenpas uphold the same - Nagarjuna states; "Since the Jinas have proclaimed nirvana alone is true, what wise person would not understand the rest is false?"

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 7:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
Respectfully, I say one should not use Dzogchen to prove points.

krodha wrote:
Aren't you also using dzogchen to prove a point?

Holybla said:
If someone asks, what is the base? You can answer that. But to use points from the transmission to debate is a misuse of Dzogchen teachings.

krodha wrote:
You're also using points from transmission to 'debate' (although I'd say this is more of a discussion).

Holybla said:
If someone says, I am having trouble sleeping how can Dzogchen help? You can advise how to take Bimala and maybe do Mandarava chulen or something like that. Demonstrating your proficiency with Tibetanisms is not showing Dzogchen at all.

krodha wrote:
I never claimed to be showing dzogchen, and trust me knowing a few tibetan (and sanskrit) terms is a far cry from a proficiency.

Holybla said:
I understand you feel we are conflicting now so you say "likewise."

krodha wrote:
I'd hardly call this a conflict, you have your opinion, I have one too, and we sit online and throw them around, it's a good time if you ask me! I was saying "likewise" to point out that if you don't hold yourself to your own standards, you're creating a double-standard.

Holybla said:
But truthfully, transmission and GY are indeed indispensable to Dzogchen. Nothing else is.

krodha wrote:
True, but when you twist guru yoga and transmission into a weapon, which is then wielded against another point of view, you're rendering guru yoga and transmission equivalent to whatever intellectual vomit I'm sharing. It's the intellect that accepts and rejects, conventionally we do accept and reject on here and there's nothing wrong with that, but it's important to watch that subtle slip. Guru yoga as a notion, translated by mind is simply another point of view (you're using to argue against another point of view). I'm about to do the same here but I admit it; guru yoga is guru yoga, the experience, free of mind. That's why it's pointless to debate about dzogchen (though I like to!)

Holybla said:
Everything else including intellectual ideas are secondary. Intellectual ideas are low on the totem pole of important methods to help gain the view. Once the view is obtained and stable, secondary practices and especially intellectual ideas are passé. At that point, we use letters, syllables and words only to entice the uninitiated, but never to condition or convince. The main way to make connections and help sentient beings are part of transmission.

krodha wrote:
Also true, however again the intellect can be a useful tool and should be understood, not rejected. On the outset yes it's beneficial to use the traditional methods which don't involve the intellect, however after that point I'd say it's better to create a more overarching and holistic relationship with one's experience, understand how the intellect becomes an obstacle, and the ways to relate to the intellect that are beneficial. There are no limitations once vidyā is definitively recognized. Dzogchen doesn't give credence to the conventional/ultimate dichotomy, however that doesn't mean that the conventional is thrown out the window... and that being the case, it's important to put these things in perspective.

"By examining relative truth, establish absolute truth;
Within absolute truth, see how relative truth arises.
Where the two truths are inseparable, beyond intellect,
is the state of simplicity."
- Dilgo Khyenste Rinpoche

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche also said during this present retreat; (paraphrased) through the wisdom of vidyā, seek to understand yourself, and by understanding your condition you will be able to relax, through relaxation you will be able to relate to your experience in a way that makes life easy and enjoyable. So there's no issue implementing the discernment gained in vidyā to know yourself, know your condition, understand yourself, understand others, understand thoughts, how we fall into delusion etc... find what works for you and become a master of your domain. The universe trembles in front of the vidyādhara.

"It is said that if you know your enemies and know yourself, you will not be imperiled in a hundred battles; if you do not know your enemies but do know yourself, you will win one and lose one; if you do not know your enemies nor yourself, you will be imperiled in every single battle." - Sun Tzu

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 6:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
No one has suggested that the words are dzogchen...

gregkavarnos said:
You are saying that there is something that is not the nature of mind?

krodha wrote:
Kinda depends on the individual, wouldn't you agree? For the practitioner who is stabilized in the natural state, thoughts, concepts etc., arise as wisdoms. However if one isn't stable in their vidyā, it's important to tentatively discriminate between sems [energy of primordial wisdom adulterated into dualistic conceptual thinking i.e. an intellect] and rtsal [the same phenomena left in it's natural state divested of grasping and clinging]. For someone resting in the natural state, yeah the words are dzogchen. But for a) those who are caught in ignorance [avidyā], or b), are fluctuating in their integration [unripened vidyā]; the words are not dzogchen because they're being related to dualistically (they are wisdom essentially, but that's irrelevant because it's recognition or non-recognition which is the deciding factor).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 6:16 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
@asun...

Description of base isn't reasoning. Dzogchen is your nature not logic. Recognition depend on transmission. It's that simple indeed. The transmission isn't anything to do with talk about Karma. Ati GY and presence is awareness of ones karmic situation.

asunthatneversets said:
I never suggested one's nature was logic, nor did I suggest recognition occurs independent of transmission. I agree the rigpai tsalwang doesn't have anything to do with talk of karma, however there is no harm in understanding karma and how it functions, the cause of delusion, what fuels the fire of delusion and what extinguishes it. We're all here on an internet forum to discuss dzogchen, and we all use concepts,

words, ideas, interpretations, translations, language etc., to communicate, there's no harm in doing so. No one has suggested that the words are dzogchen, but we are all free do discuss dzogchen (subject matter appropriate for a public forum of course).

Holybla said:
I'm saying nothing you said so far is indispensable to understanding dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Likewise.

Holybla said:
Dzogchen is not a school. But you said what someone needs to know. Distinguishing mind and nature isn't intellectual.

krodha wrote:
There are no limitations to what can be a support for practice and understanding. Traditionally, studying dzogchen, the tantras etc., is seen as one of the many aspects of vidyā [rig pa], which in the Bön tradition is referred to as bsam rig. (i) Bsam rig is one of the three main modalities of vidyā which are most frequently associated with the dzogchen teachings, flanked on either side by (ii) khyab rig (equivalent to the tathāgatagarbha i.e. buddha nature which is our innate potentiality for buddhahood) and (iii) ye rig, which is precisely the knowledge of the natural state implemented as the foundation for one's practice in dzogchen. Jean-Luc Achard states that bsam rig [knowing discernment] "is the knowledge you generate when you study and get experiences of the teachings (it is a fluctuating phenomenon according to the capacities of the individual; the more you study correctly, the more you Knowing Discernement is developed)".

So for the skilled individual, the intellect can be a beneficial ally in generating proper discernment when it comes to our nature, it isn't a mandatory requirement, but it's not something to be rejected either. After all, only the intellect rejects the intellect, when authentically resting in one's nature, thoughts arise as wisdoms and there is nothing to accept or reject. As long as a practitioner can effectively discriminate between the primordial wisdom's [ye shes] dynamism [rtsal], and that which arises as an expression (or adulteration) of that dynamism [the intellect i.e. sems, etc.], thoughts are not a hinderance, they simply self-arise and self-liberate timelessly (as non-arisen wisdom display) and 'remain in their own condition' as Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche often says.

Per Loppön Malcolm Smith:
"In Ati these days, conceited elephants [claim]
the mass of discursive concepts is awakened mind (bodhicitta);
this confusion is a dimension of complete darkness,
a hindrance to the meaning of the natural great perfection..."

Same quote continued in an alternate translation:
"...If one cannot even differentiate dynamic energy [rtsal] and that which arises from

dynamic energy [sems, etc.],
what is the use in talking about the essence of the awakened mind?"

Norbu Rinpoche actually just said it today in his teaching; limitations are self-imposed. Discerning vidyā and sems is a vital aspect of the teaching, however it's important not to fall into a trap where sems is rejecting sems (thought is rejecting thought), all that accomplishes is sustaining distraction (meaning breathing life into the delusion that a point of reference [subject] stands apart from thoughts [objects] which sequence consecutively in a given span of time and can be either accepted and/or rejected).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
@asun...

Description of base isn't reasoning. Dzogchen is your nature not logic. Recognition depend on transmission. It's that simple indeed. The transmission isn't anything to do with talk about Karma. Ati GY and presence is awareness of ones karmic situation.

krodha wrote:
I never suggested one's nature was logic, nor did I suggest recognition occurs independent of transmission. I agree the rigpai tsalwang doesn't have anything to do with talk of karma, however there is no harm in understanding karma and how it functions, the cause of delusion, what fuels the fire of delusion and what extinguishes it. We're all here on an internet forum to discuss dzogchen, and we all use concepts, words, ideas, interpretations, translations, language etc., to communicate, there's no harm in doing so. No one has suggested that the words are dzogchen, but we are all free do discuss dzogchen (subject matter appropriate for a public forum of course).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Some excellent points being made here! (a big to jnana and asunthat neversets)

krodha wrote:
Big to you as well!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 3:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth

Content:
Holybla said:
I never assumed anything of the sort. Again, I'm only relating why my teacher says. I'm sorry if I offended you. I have no idea what level you or anyone might be and don't care. My point is Dzogchen is always redirecting the mind back to the nature of mind. Rinpoche's comments on cause and effect are limited to what you just said, be aware. That's it. There's really nothing he has to say about details of cause and effect, etc. His point he always reiterates is not to engage in analysis. Go with the introduction and GY. I'm only wanting to emphasize that part.

krodha wrote:
The point is to understand what it is that obscures the nature of mind, which is the causes and conditions that arise as a result of our karma or habitual tendencies to reify delusion. Recognizing one's nature and maintaining that recognition isn't so simple. Maintaining presence throughout the day etc., is good in that it curbs the proclivity to breathe life into affliction, however being present and aware isn't enough, the point is to recognize the natural state, and depending on the level of delusion that is present in one's condition, that may not be as simple as you suggest.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 10th, 2013 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
People say cause and effect, cause and effect, and it sounds scientific. But Buddha meant something completely different. He's saying, we are self-generating this whole dream. Not that it comes from somewhere.

asunthatneversets said:
Right but that is precisely the cause and effect: because of our ignorance (cause), all the myriad originations apparently arise and are attributed validity (effect).

as Nagarjuna states:
"When the perfect vidyā sees,
That things come from ignorance as condition,
Nothing will then be objectified,
Either in terms of arising or destruction."

Holybla said:
Again, Dzogchen doesn't follow these lines of reasoning. The master gives a direct introduction without recourse to analysis. Now, this is where the rubber hits the road: You said, "All the myriad originations apparently arise," but they don't actually arise. So nothing actually caused anything. Without the factors of an actual object, or an actual action, there's no actual cause and effect. The "delusion" is just like acting. If you are not acting, where's the story?

krodha wrote:
On the contrary, Dzogchen specifically follows this line of reasoning. The teaching of dzogchen is very much concerned with how ignorance arises, the factors that maintain it and how to dispel it from one's condition. The dzogchen model is one basis [Skt. sathāna, Tib. gzhi] and two paths [vidyā and avidyā]. If the basis' [gzhi] display is recognized to be self-display, then one has recognized vidyā [Tib. rig pa]. In contrast, if the display is mistaken as 'other', then one is caught in ignorance [Skt. avidyā, Tib. ma rig pa]. The guru attempts to introduce the aspirant to their nature in direct introduction, and if successful then the practitioner recognizes his/her nature and then rests in that discerning knowledge [vidyā].

Yes, all of the myriad originations 'apparently' arise, but of course just as most every school of the dharma upholds, the true nature [dharmatā] of phenomena [dharmas] is emptiness free from extremes. The issue is, that sentient beings do not recognize this to be true, and so phenomena are grasped at as valid and substantial and suffering arises. The fact that there is no 'actual' cause and effect is a redundant point, it makes no difference. Dzogchen isn't concerned with the notion of what the 'actual' state of affairs is, dzogchen is concerned with recognition of that or non-recognition of that, and the respective implications of each. This also has nothing to do with a 'story', because the fact that the 'story' is a 'story' is nothing more than a story itself (if that isn't definitively recognized). The intellectual conclusion that phenomena are in truth unborn is of little merit, the point is to recognize one's nature, stabilize and integrate with that knowledge and then eventually liberation will dawn in one's condition. Delusion may indeed be a story, but it is much more compelling and deeply engrained than a simple story, sentient beings have become conditioned habitually to function under the heavy hand of delusion. Discovering one's nature and integrating with that wisdom is a process of dispelling those delusional proclivities, so that the underlying nature can shine in it's fullness.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 9th, 2013 at 5:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
Holybla said:
People say cause and effect, cause and effect, and it sounds scientific. But Buddha meant something completely different. He's saying, we are self-generating this whole dream. Not that it comes from somewhere.

krodha wrote:
Right but that is precisely the cause and effect: because of our ignorance (cause), all the myriad originations apparently arise and are attributed validity (effect).

as Nagarjuna states:
"When the perfect vidyā sees,
That things come from ignorance as condition,
Nothing will then be objectified,

Either in terms of arising or destruction."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 9th, 2013 at 2:50 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
krodha wrote:
This seems to be a common issue that arises with some practitioners. They'll read a few texts authored by great adepts who are expounding the ultimate view from the standpoint of the highest wisdom and translate it as addressing their relative condition. Whereby they'll decide that there's nothing to do and will toss out the baby with the bath water. It happens all too often nowadays it seems, there are even some individuals who claim to be teachers who fall victim to this trend. This is why it's very important to have a strong relationship with a qualified teacher, and not rely on books alone. Dzogchen does speak of effortlessness, and the 'do nothing' approach, however these notions are describing one's practice once a certain level of familiarity and integration has occurred in the natural state. Effort is required until effortlessness takes over. Integration is a process of untangling oneself from the habitual tendencies which maintain ignorance, if we 'do nothing' too early in our path, we're simply doing nothing.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 9th, 2013 at 2:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, karma and ultimate truth
Content:
oushi said:
CrawfordHollow,

"Now, the ati-yogin of essence,
forsakes all provisional techniques
designed for straight cause and effect babes
on the lesser, ladder path,
and binds the gnostic dynamic
that supersedes all clever technique
to the yoke of the nonactive sky. - Lonchenpa"

When it comes to you long post... Fight the illusory dragon you are trying to create on your own.

krodha wrote:
You're quoting Longchenpa who is speaking from the viewpoint of the highest wisdom, fully awakened buddhahood, not our relative state.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 4th, 2013 at 12:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Unknown said:
Hello, oldbob 007!!!!

About the list of the secondary practices now. Are the practices of Tregchöd, Togal and Yangti considered as secondary?
I like the new idea that you present today.

krodha wrote:
Referencing the base, path and result trichotomy, I've seen Malcolm refer to Tregchö as equivalent to the base, Thögal as the path, and result being one of the few forms of death. So I'd say they're a little more integral to the teaching than the other secondary practices, depends on the individual though I'm sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 4th, 2013 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The fine information posted above was a collective effort provided by the fine minds of both sönam and Mutsuk Marro from vajracakra, much obliged! I do not own the rights to this information and would like to thank both cut and paste for the integral roles they played in making the precise transfer of this information possible. May it benefit countless beings!

Dronma said:
The information was originally posted in the Retreat Calendar of the Tsegyalgar West:
https://tsegyalgarwest.org/retreat-center/retreats-calendar/

krodha wrote:
The plot thickens!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 3rd, 2013 at 12:10 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Closed Webcast.

The schedule of retreat in Hotel Buena Vista is:
8th -12th May 2013

Tsegyalgar West retreat.
The teaching will be Zhinang Yeshes
Dronme (Tib. g.zhi-snang ye-shes sgron-me)
The Wisdom light of the Base.
Closed webcast.

The Lama Yangtik is made up of small inner trilogies. The Lamp of Wisdom (explaining) the Manifestations of the Base (gZhi snang ye shes sgron me) belongs to the first trilogy of the 2nd volume of the Lama Yangtik, known as the Trilogy of the Lamps (sGron me gsum) and it goes together with: (i) the Lamp Clarifying the meaning of Allegoric Examples (dPe don gsal byed sgron me) and (ii) the Lamp of the key-points of Practice (Nyams len gnad kyi sgron me).

The Lamp of Wisdom describes :
1. the primordial Base
2. the actual manifestations of the Base
3. the way they subside
4. the way they arise again after subsiding
5. the way they liberate after having arisen.

Pero said:
Don't you think it would be polite to attribute that to the person who wrote it?

krodha wrote:
The fine information posted above was a collective effort provided by the fine minds of both sönam and Mutsuk Marro from vajracakra, much obliged! I do not own the rights to this information and would like to thank both cut and paste for the integral roles they played in making the precise transfer of this information possible. May it benefit countless beings!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 2nd, 2013 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Closed Webcast.

The schedule of retreat in Hotel Buena Vista is:
8th -12th May 2013
Tsegyalgar West retreat.
The teaching will be Zhinang Yeshes
Dronme (Tib. g.zhi-snang ye-shes sgron-me)
The Wisdom light of the Base.
Closed webcast.

The Lama Yangtik is made up of small inner trilogies. The Lamp of Wisdom (explaining) the Manifestations of the Base (gZhi snang ye shes sgron me) belongs to the first trilogy of the 2nd volume of the Lama Yangtik, known as the Trilogy of the Lamps (sGron me gsum) and it goes together with: (i) the Lamp Clarifying the meaning of Allegoric Examples (dPe don gsal byed sgron me) and (ii) the Lamp of the key-points of Practice (Nyams len gnad kyi sgron me).

The Lamp of Wisdom describes :
1. the primordial Base
2. the actual manifestations of the Base
3. the way they subside
4. the way they arise again after subsiding
5. the way they liberate after having arisen.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 22nd, 2013 at 7:33 AM
Title: Re: Rigpa, mind, and the "world out there"
Content:
CrawfordHollow said:
I think that one of my problems trying to understand this (besides the fact that you really can't understand this conceptually) is that I was viewing mind and apperances at face value, not as dependently arisen empty appearances. I also took for granted that duality is something that arises out of ignorance. I have been practicing for a good amount of time- ten plus years- so you would think that I would have a better grasp on these ideas. Either way, I am glad that I brought it up because I feel like I at least have a better concpetual understanding of the view, which I believe can strengthen the fortress of the real view- to a point.

Thank you all for helping me
Troy

krodha wrote:
Better conceptual understanding (although inequivalent to the authentic view) is one type (or aspect) of rigpa, as Jean-Luc Achard shares: "bSam-rig [Knowing Discernment] which is the knowledge you generate when you study and get experiences of the teachings (it is a fluctuating phenomenon according to the capacities of the individual; the more you study correctly, the more you Knowing Discernement is developed)".

The other two he mentions in addition to (i) bSam-rig, are (ii) Khyab-rig [All-Pervasive Discernment] which is the same as Tathāgatagarbha or the potentiality for Buddhahood which is innate to every being, and (iii) Ye-rig [Primordial Discernment], which is the rigpa implemented as the view [tawa] that is the foundation for one's practice in dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 21st, 2013 at 3:24 AM
Title: Re: Question on a line from a Tibetan passage regarding Tant
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
...metaphor for all origins, large and small, up to and including the "ultimate" origin: the ground of being, (gzhi).

asunthatneversets said:
Off topic (and not to nitpick ha) but, since the four extremes arise out of grasping and ignorance, technically the ālaya (kun gzhi) is the 'ground of being' (and the ground of the other 3 extremes as well). The basis (gzhi) is free from extremes. Just seems like notions of being (and origination in general) are symptoms of ignorance... when fully integrated with the basis (gzhi) one is free of ignorance and therefore 'reality' is known to be unborn and non-arising.

gad rgyangs said:
I stated what Tibetan term I am meaning by "ground of being". You may prefer to translate it differently, but thats why its good to give the Tibetan, so there is no confusion about what is being referred to.
like notions of being (and origination in general) are symptoms of ignorance
the presence of the here and now is undeniable. I call that being, you can call it whatever you want.

krodha wrote:
True! Valid points. As long as the Tibetan term is there it doesn't matter, I agree with that... To each their own

I miss the old gad rgyangs - Malcolm discussions btw... They were so good

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 20th, 2013 at 3:55 PM
Title: Re: Rigpa, mind, and the "world out there"
Content:
CrawfordHollow said:
Thanks for the replies!

This gives me some stuff to chew on, although I am not sure how closer I am getting to understanding. Another distintion that I find confusing is the distintion that Longchenpa makes between the objects of the mind and appearances. He says something like appearances are basically emanations of the mind while objects are not, which make it sound like there is something "out there," even if that something is just a dependantly arisen appearance. I guess the problem I am haveing is trying to understand this from the point of view of subject/object, when clearly this view transends all reality. I guess this means just more cushion time. The problem I have is that a lot of these questions come up when I am away from my teachers. Thanks for your help, I will keep trying to

wrap my head around this stuff.

krodha wrote:
The intellect can definitely become a distraction, but as long as you're mindful of that it's ok to intellectualize some, just don't mistake an intellectual understanding for true wisdom experience and you're good to go. I'm not a teacher and am not trying to present myself as one, so definitely take up any questions you have with a qualified teacher... but here's a bunch of intellectual stuff in the meantime:

About the "He says something like appearances are basically emanations of the mind while objects are not", I usually look at that the other way around, objects and conditioned phenomena (meaning; phenomena which appear to accord with any of the 4 extremes) are emanations of deluded mind (i.e. avidyā). While in contrast, the term 'appearance' can be reserved for the display of primordial wisdom.

The reason objects can be considered emanations of deluded mind is because 'objects' are byproducts of projected conventional dissimulation (i.e. imputation) mistaken to be inherently real. In dzogchen, objects only arise due to non-recognition of one's nature, meaning they appear to originate from ignorance (skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa). The idea that phenomena only arise as a result of our habitual tendencies (of grasping and clinging) is a very important aspect of the buddhadharma which separates it from the nondual trika and tīrthika traditions.

Non-recognition of the basis (Skt. sthāna, Tib. gzhi) essentially means that the basis' appearance (the five lights) are not recognized to be self-display. So the basis' own radiance is unrecognized and is therefore apprehended as 'other'. That error causes the illusion of subjectve/objective phenomena to arise and through the habitual reification of afflictive patterning such as imputation, the unborn display of the basis is then adulterated, becoming the aggregates (skandhas) which serve to form the illusion of a sentient being and it's respective environment. This process is represented quite well by the 12 Nidānas (specific theory of dependent origination), but the general theory of dependent origination is also helpful, which is; "where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose". Due to grasping at phenomena as 'other', 'self' is automatically implied, with the arising of the former, the latter originates by default. This also means the absence of one implies the absence of the other, so if you follow that line of reasoning you can start to see how extremes and dualities are rendered null and void.

In the dzogchen model, the third ignorance (imputing ignorance) sets the 12 Nidānas into motion and creates a basis for the proliferation of habitual tendencies called the all-basis (Skt. ālaya, Tib. kun gzhi). The ālaya acts as a reservoir in a sense, collecting imprints and serving as a substratum for all the myriad forms of designations and actions which are mistaken as inherent aspects of experience.

The Reverberation of Sound Tantra explains the etymology of 'all-basis':
"The etymology of 'kun' (all) lies in it's subsuming everything.
The etymology of 'gzhi' (basis) lies in it's accumulation and hoarding (of karmic traces

and propensities)."

The Reverberation of Sound states:
"Here I will explain the all-basis to start off:
It is the ground of all phenomena and non-phenomena."

So the ālaya acts as the basis-of-all, meaning that it is the foundation for conditioned phenomena (phenomena which seemingly accord with any of the four extremes, which includes non-phenomena, both and neither) and the afflictive habitual patterning which sustains ignorance. For Dzogchen the ālaya is considered to be the 'ground-of-being', which is only ever one's own ignorance.

The Tantra of the Self-Arisen Vidyā states:
"The all-basis (Skt. ālaya, Tib. kun gzhi) is adulterated by diverse cognitive processes
By force of it's sustaining neurotic conceptuality;
The all-basis is the real ignorance (Skt. avidyā, Tib. ma rig pa)."

The processes of ignorance are undone via recognition of (and integration with) one's nature. In dzogchen, phenomena are viewed as empty from the very beginning, however when a certain level of integration has occurred, emptiness is directly realized, which means that phenomena which were previously attributed inherency and self-nature (svabhāva), are recognized to be empty and non-arisen.

Just as when you mistakenly view a rope to be a snake; the snake is a misconception, it's delusion, ignorance. Recognize the snake for what it is (a rope) and the snake falls, the snake is understood to have always been delusion, therefore the snake is non-arisen. Likewise, the aggregates are a misconception, delusion, ignorance. Recognize the aggregates for what they are (self-display of primordial wisdom) and the aggregates fall. The aggregates are understood to have always been delusion, therefore the aggregates are empty and non-arisen.

Dzogchen speaks of the 'full measure of vidyā' being the realization of emptiness. The 'full measure' or 'full effulgence' signifies an absence of contamination i.e. the direct realization of emptiness. In one's practice, vidyā increases by way of a decrease in the power that karmic and habitual propensities have over experience. So integration with vidyā is nothing more than resting in vidyā so that those propensities which once dominated experience exhaust themselves.

"The essence of the Buddha's teaching is the method on how to let confusion dawn as wisdom. The most vital point here is the introduction to and recognition of the buddha nature, the innate wisdom of dharmakāya that is already present within oneself. This fourth Dharma is a teaching on how to recognize, train in, and stabilize this recognition of the buddha nature. Understanding it is called the view, practicing it is called samadhi, and stabilizing it is called buddhahood."
- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

"Ordinary beings are truly buddhas,

but this fact is obscured by adventitious distortions
once these are removed, truly there is buddhahood."
- Hevajra Tantraraja Nāma

Emptiness in dzogchen is signified with the dharmakāya, which is only evident once one's condition has been divested of obscuring propensities. When direct experience appears like a reflection, meaning it is apparent yet explicitly known to be unreal, baseless, unfounded etc., that is dharmakāya.

The iconic metaphor which most adepts implement is very suiting; the objects of experience appear like a reflection of the moon in a pool of water: valid in that they are an appearance, just as the image of the moon upon the water is a valid image. Yet, just as one needs no convincing that the moon in the water is not the moon, when dharmakāya dawns it's known beyond any shred of doubt that all the constituent objects and qualities of 'reality' have never once been established or unestablished in any way... The empty appearances of experience do not create anything within or beyond their empty appearance. The experience must be akin to waking up from a dream if it's a valid knowledge of dharmakāya, it's a compelling and overwhelming epiphany that there's never been anything there at all... and yet, appearances. The empty display of primordial wisdom:

"There is no object to investigate within the view of self-originated wisdom: nothing went before, nothing happens later, nothing is present now at all. Action does not exist. Traces do not exist. Ignorance does not exist. Mind does not exist. Discriminating wisdom does not exist. Samsara does not exist. Nirvana does not exist. Even vidyā itself does not exist i.e. nothing at all appears in wisdom. That arose from not grasping anything."
- from The Unwritten Tantra [per Malcolm La]

"The arisings of paratantra (conventionality) are essenceless, since, their arising is not established from any of the four extremes: They do not arise from themselves, because for these arising and an instant in which they arise are contradictory. They do not arise from something else, since if the essential marks of these others are analyzed, they are not established. That they arise from both would be doubly contradictory, so that is not established. They do not arise without a cause, as that is impossible. The mere arising of whatever appears, mere interdependent arising like dream or illusion, is appearance of what does not exist."
- Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 19th, 2013 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Rigpa, mind, and the "world out there"
Content:
CrawfordHollow said:
Hi guys,

I am going to try to take another shot at tackling this subject. I brought this up at another forum and besides for a few helpful answers the conversation did not go all that well. I will try to present myself more clearly.

I am confused on the relationship between, mind, rigpa, and appearances, and what consequences this relationship would have to what we consider the "world out there."

Longchenpa says:

The various appearances do not exist in reality as they are percepts (appearances) of the mind and are non-dual (in relation to the mind). The essence of the mind is Mind, which is clarity, and it is self-arisen primordial wisdom. Nowadays, foolish people say: "Dzogpa Chenpo awwerts that the appearances are mind." That is totally wrong... So one should know that the appearnances are the mysteries of the percepts of the mind and they are non-existent in reality like reflections in a mirror. They appear in the mind in the manner of delusions due to habituations.
-The Practice of Dzogchen

Here is John Myrdhin Reynolds from The Golden Letters:

Appearances represent the play of creative energy or inexhaustible potentiality of Awareness (rigpa). They are not "mind" as in the Chittamartin view, but rather they are manifestations of mind, something constructed by mind out of the raw material of sense data... Whatever may arise, appearing as external phenomena to the individual, is merely one's own internal state of existence manifesting externally, that is to say, it is merely the potentiality or creative energy of Awareness (rigpa) becoming visible to the individual. Apart from this organized system of phenomena, nothing exists in reality...The manifestation of phenomena is a projection of the energy of the mind, a phantom show projected into space... It is not something independant of the mind, but on the other hand, neither is it just made up of the mind in the sense of a solipsistic fantasy.

So, I understand that what is being rejected in the Mind-Only position, and what is being posited is that appearances are the dependantly arisen by-products of delusion, but I still fail to see how appearances cannot be mind, but are still just manifestations of rigpa, or awareness. I understand there is a difference between the samsaric, dualistic mind and rigpa, but I think that something has just not clicked yet for me. And to complicate things, I am wondering how this doesn't becomce a "solipsistic fantasy," how are the appearnces somehow "out there" while at the same time being just projections of what is "in here."

Thank you, I hope I was clear in presenting that.

Troy

krodha wrote:
The lack of 'mind' is simply seeing that the notion of 'mind' is imputed onto the

experience, one way this recognition can come about is by actively searching for the mind, seeking it's location, where it's positioned, what it's shape is, it's color etc. The idea is to investigate your experience and the mind so you can gain direct experiential confidence and certainty in it's nature. Another way this is done is through investigating thought, where it arises, abides and where it goes to when it ceases. There are logical ways to explain the nature of mind, however the direct experiential recognition is of course the most beneficial (and of course direct introduction - rigpai tselwang - from a qualified teacher is mandatory and indispensable if one is to authentically practice dzogchen).

Also, it's not that appearances are vidyā (rigpa), what appearances are is the display of primordial wisdom, though this isn't recognized and therefore sentient beings are confused by their own ignorance (skt. avidyā, tib. ma rig pa). When appearances are recognized to be 'self-display', the discerning knowledge which results from that recognition is called vidyā/ripga. Awareness isn't really a good translation of vidyā, it's a very common translation but more and more translators/teachers are beginning to abandon 'awareness' as a suitable representation of vidyā. 'Awareness' has the potential to suggest the simple neutral registering cognizance of mind, and vidyā is the knowledge of one's nature which becomes the working foundation for one's practice in dzogchen. Quite different than 'awareness'.

This doesn't become a solipsistic fantasy, because solipsism requires a mind, which would be a singular point of reference. It's not as if there is a 'source' but if you must view a source, see appearances as self-sourcing... though in truth appearances are neither established nor unestablished (free from the four extremes). The 'world out there' is an abstraction, it's conventionally true (even though dzogchen doesn't uphold the two truths but instead sees the conventional as equivalent with avidyā), however in dzogchen there is no inner-outer dichotomy, subjective and objective phenomena are conventional and contextual pointers if they are implemented in dzogchen, they are not real.

"In it (Dzogpa Chenpo) the essence (ngo-bo) of vidyā, the realization of the non-existence of the apprehended and apprehender, is called spontaneously arisen primordial wisdom. But Dzogpa Chenpo doesn't assert it as self-awareness and self-clarity (rang-rig rang-gsal) as Yogācāra, the Mind Only School, does. Because (according to Dzogpa Chenpo), as there is no existence of internal and external, it (vidyā) is not established as internal mind. As there is no self and others, it isn't established as self-awareness. As the apprehended and apprehender have never existed, freedom from the two is not established. As it is not an object of experiences and awareness, the experience is not established as non-dual.

As there is no mind and mental events, it does not exist as self-mind. As it does not exist as clarity or non-clarity, it is not established as self-clarity. As it transcends awareness and non-awareness, there are not even the imputations of awareness. This is called the Dzogpa Chenpo, free from extremes. Although it is designated as self-arisen primordial wisdom, enlightened mind, ultimate body, the great spontaneously accomplished

ultimate sphere, and the naked self-clarity vidyā, these ascriptions are merely in order to signify it. It should be realized that the self-essence (of Dzogpa Chenpo) is inexpressible. Otherwise, if you take the meaning of the words literally, you will never find (in Dzogpa Chenpo) any difference from the cognition of self-awareness, self-clarity, and non-duality of apprehender and apprehended of the Mind Only School."
- Longchen Rabjam

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 19th, 2013 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Rigpa, mind, and the "world out there"
Content:
krodha wrote:
Referencing these:

"'Designating appearances as the dharmakāya obscures me,
designating whatever appears as mind obscures me,
designating wisdom as mind obscures me'
- The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra Tantra

To expand on this, nowadays common fools say, 'Appearances are your own mind! Appearances are the dharmakāya! Wisdom (ye shes) is our mind!' Really there's no difference between such people and the insane who say whatever pops into their mind: 'The head is the ass!' 'Fire is water!' 'Darkness is light!' Thus I consider these people ignorant, since they are even more conceited than such madmen. If appearances are our mind, then it follows that our mind has colors and so forth. It would entail that even when you are absent, your mind would exist in the area where you previously were, since the appearances there continue to exist (despite your leaving). Furthermore, it would entail that through one thing being born, everything is born; and through one thing dying, everything dies. When ten million people see a vase, it would entail that the entire vase is (part and parcel of each person's own particular) mind, and just so, all those individuals would be of a single mind. Since all phenomena appear in the scope of a Buddha's 'enlightened knowing of things in all their plurality', it would entail that cyclic existence is the Buddha's wisdom (ye shes). When a sentient being sees a Buddha, it would necessarily follow that this Buddha is distorted, since s/he is the sentient being's mind. Additionally it would entail that this sentient being is a Buddha, since the Buddha is the sentient being's mind. This position would also entail that these appearances could become totally adrift in a single instant, just as in a single instant our mind's movements drift here and there. Thus these and many other absurdities are entailed (by identifying appearances with the mind).

If appearances are the dharmakāya, then it would entail that appearances are beyond appearance and non-appearance, since the dharmakāya is beyond appearance and non-appearance. It would follow that the dharmakāya would be a distorted appearance, and that it would be apprehensible in terms of a substantial thing and its concrete qualities, since these appearances are distorted appearances apprehended in terms of substantial qualities. Alternatively, it would follow that it would be impossible for these

appearances to appear to (ordinary beings') distorted perspective, since the dharmakāya is the ultimate reality and, as such, can never appear to a distorted perspective."
- David Germano

I'm not sure about the 'everything arising from rigpa' but Tsoknyi Rinpoche's comments regarding rigpa completely pervading all things, and by understanding rigpa you understand all phenomena... are pointing to the fact that once recognition of one's nature has occurred, the delusion that apperceives phenomena as objectively arising qualities of experience which appear to a mind, is overcome. So that is to say, the recognition of rigpa is essentially the very first time one's experience is known accurately, and that knowledge is then the foundation for one's practice in dzogchen.

It's not only the refutation that appearances are the samsaric dualistic mind, but the very idea that appearances and phenomena are subsumed into the mind or consciousness. It's the notion that the objective phenomena are non-dual with a subjective mind or consciousness, and that there is a union of those polarities. The Dzogchen view is that both the mind/consciousness and the objective appearances are byproducts of delusion, just as Longchenpa says in the quote above; "Likewise, various kinds of phenomena are appearing in the deluded mind because of the interdependent origination of the causes and conditions of delusion." The mind/consciousness and phenomena viewed as objective, separate or subsumed within that mind are both products of delusion, grasping and clinging, imputation and conceptualization etc. The moment a mind or consciousness is posited, that which is not-that-mind arises, that is the dependent origination. The idea is to see that the mind/consciousness and the phenomena are dependently originated and therefore both are rendered empty if that is ascertained successfully.

Also, nothing truly arises from the basis (gzhi), the basis simply displays it's appearance as the five lights, but since that spontaneously and naturally formed display (lhun grub) is primordially pure (ka dag) it's not established (nor unestablished) in any way. Only when that display isn't recognized to be self-display, does phenomena arise. The basis is never involved in delusion in any way nor does it display delusion, delusion arises due to non-recognition. The recognition of rigpa is simply the knowledge or discernment which results from ascertaining the display of the basis to be self-display.

The Mahāmudrā instructions which say 'everything is mind' is usually a line of reasoning which runs like so: 'everything is mind, mind is empty' so it's a way of helping the aspirant to achieve recognition (if recognition didn't occur in direct introduction). Everything is the mind deems everything as nondual with the mind, and then the mind is empty i.e. insubstantial, unfindable, unestablished. It's just a way to say that which you perceive as 'objective phenomena' is truly neither the same nor different than the mind, both are imputed designations. Since dzogchen is resting in rigpa, the nature of the mind has already been recognized and so it's emptiness is implicit in the view to begin with.

Troy in case the dependent origination part of that isn't clear, here Nāgārjuna refutes a consciousness-only or mind-only view in his Bodhicittavivaraṇa (the Prasanga Madhyamaka view accords with Dzogchen when exploring these aspects of delusion):

For those who propound consciousness [only]
This manifold world is established as mind [only]
What might be the nature of that consciousness?
I shall now explain this very point.

"All of this is but one's mind,"
That which was stated by the Able One
Is to alleviate the fear of the childish;
It is not [a statement] of [final] truth.

The imputed, the depenent,
And the consummate - they have
Only one nature of their own, emptiness;
Their identities are constructed upon the mind.

To those who delight in the great vehicle
The Buddha taught in brief
Selflessness is perfect equanimity;
And that the mind is primordially unborn.

The proponents of yogic practices assert
That the purified mind [effected] through
Mastery of one's own mind
And through utter revolution of its state
Is the sphere of it's own reflexive awareness.

That which is past is no more;
That which is yet to be is not obtained;
As it abides its locus is utterly transformed,
So how can there be [such awareness in] the present?

Whatever it is it's not what it appears as;
Whatever it appears as it is not so;
Consciousness is devoid of selfhood;
[Yet] consciousness has no other basis.

By being close to a loadstone
An iron object swiftly moves forward;
It possesses no mind [of its own],
Yet it appears as if it does.

Likewise the foundational consciousness too
Appears to be real though it is false;
In this way it moves to and fro
And retains [the three realms of] existence.

Just as the ocean and the trees
Move about though they posses no mind;
Likewise foundational consciousness too
Move about in dependence upon the body.

So if it is considered that
Without a body there is no consciousness,
You must explain what it is this awareness
That is the object of one's own specific knowledge.

By calling it specific awareness itself,
You are asserting it to be an entity;
Yet by stating that "it is this,"
You are asserting it also to be powerless.

Having ascertained oneself
And to help others ascertain,
The learned proceeds excellently
Always without error.

The cognizer perceives the cognizable;
Without the cognizable there is no cognition;
Therefore why do you not admit
That neither object nor subject exists [at all]?

The mind is but a mere name;
Apart from its name it exists as nothing;
So view consciousness as a mere name;
Name too has no intrinsic nature.

Either within or likewise without,
Or somewhere in between the two,
The conquerors have never found the mind;
So the mind has the nature of an illusion.

The distinctions of colors and shapes,
Or that of object and subject,
Of male, female and the neuter -
The mind has no such fixed forms.

In brief the Buddhas have never seeen

Nor will they ever see [such a mind];
So how can they see it as intrinsic nature
That which is devoid of intrinsic nature?

"Entity" is a conceptualization;
Absence of conceptualization is emptiness;
Where conceptualization occurs,
How can there be emptiness?

The mind in terms of the perceived and perceiver,
This the Tathagatas have never seen;
Where there is the perceived and perceiver,
There is no enlightenment.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 19th, 2013 at 1:02 AM
Title: Re: Rigpa, mind, and the "world out there"
Content:
krodha wrote:
Which part is the most confusing? [EDIT: Nevermind you stated above what's confusing]

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 16th, 2013 at 2:41 PM
Title: Re: For the Boston Marathon victims
Content:
greentara said:
Yes, the Boston Marathon bombing is shocking yet we often disregard what happens in the third word and concentrate on the USA and first world instead.

krodha wrote:
So true, was one of my first thoughts in seeing the outpouring of concern and press the Boston bombings are receiving, the fact that it occurred in the U.S. truly seems to invoke a passionate response from people, but when the same or worse happens on a regular basis in other countries it doesn't seem to be a big deal. Very strange.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 16th, 2013 at 1:15 PM
Title: Re: Question on a line from a Tibetan passage regarding Tant
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
...metaphor for all origins, large and small, up to and including the "ultimate" origin: the ground of being, (gzhi).

krodha wrote:

Off topic (and not to nitpick ha) but, since the four extremes arise out of grasping and ignorance, technically the ālaya (kun gzhi) is the 'ground of being' (and the ground of the other 3 extremes as well). The basis (gzhi) is free from extremes. Just seems like notions of being (and origination in general) are symptoms of ignorance... when fully integrated with the basis (gzhi) one is free of ignorance and therefore 'reality' is known to be unborn and non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 13th, 2013 at 12:31 PM
Title: Re: Where to go in San Francisco for "Pointing Out" instr?
Content:
catlady2112 said:
I have been studying and practicing Thrangu Rinpoche's mahamudra teachings for several years on my own and I would like to receive a pointing out instruction somewhere locally in the bay area by a qualified teacher. I don't know what center offers these teachings/transmission locally. Any suggestions?
Thanks!

krodha wrote:
Drubpon Rinpoche (Drikung Kagyu) in SF. Not sure what his center is called, I'll find out, he's highly recommended! I'm trying to meet him soon I think he's been out of the country temporarily.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 9th, 2013 at 6:40 AM
Title: Re: Where do thoughts come from?
Content:
Mikeliegler said:
Hello I am new to all this and wonder if anyone can tell me where thoughts come from. I have seen some answers that say they originate from our clinging.

Malcolm said:
As we have seen, for Dzogchen it is because the differentiation between mind and vāyu is merely nominal (different names for the same thing in a body), and thus, all sentient beings must have a physical body, even if it is very subtle, including formless realm beings. Vāyu of course is the name of the air element, and means that. Vāyu, air (Tibetan: rlung) is given the name "prāṇa" (Tibetan: srog) soley because it gives life. Further, each of the five elements contains the potentiality of the other four elements within it.
...In Dzogchen on the other hand, mind is held to be generated by the vāyus in the body. In the Khandro Nyinthig Padmasambhava declares that mind and vāyu are just different names for the same thing:

"...the energy of that vivid luminosity arising as the diversity, that is called “vāyu”, and it is called “mind”. Though luminosity is called mind, because of movement, it is called

“vāyu”"

Mind, such as it is can be considered the subtle aspect of vāyu. But in reality, vāyu, the air element functioning in the human body, is what we call mind.

N
The mind ultimately comes from the ignorance of non-recognition. The ignorance of non-recognition itself is predicated on a dispensible or relative latent awareness that exists at the time of the basis in the basis and is a function of the movement of vāyu or rlung in the basis, the movement that is responsible for the arising of the basis from the basis. When the display of the basis is recognized as being ones own display, that latent awareness becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes avidyā.
...In a real sense, however there is neither mind no matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

N

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 24th, 2013 at 2:11 PM
Title: Re: Iconic Phrase 'SHORT MOMENTS, MANY TIMES' Copyrighted?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
So will I get sued? That was why I repeated the phrase. It will be interesting to see if they go after a teacher who uses the phrase in a written work. I don't know who 'she' is, so I can't work out her motivation. Any ideas as to who?

krodha wrote:
Candace O'Denver would be my guess.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 24th, 2013 at 1:41 PM
Title: Re: Iconic Phrase 'SHORT MOMENTS, MANY TIMES' Copyrighted?
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I think that when you are meditating on the true nature then it is important to meditate short moments, many times. This is especially important in the Dzogchen and Mahamudra traditions.

krodha wrote:
Yes of course. Apparently the nameless individual discussed above has took it upon herself to legally copyright 'short moments, many times' though... quite ridiculous IMO.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 24th, 2013 at 12:38 PM

Title: Iconic Phrase 'SHORT MOMENTS, MANY TIMES' Copyrighted?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Saw this posted elsewhere (not my writing):

"~ SHORT MOMENTS, REPEATED MANY TIMES ~

(It's now Private Property ! - so don't repeat it, you may be in breach of copyright law!)

This fundamental instruction for gaining confidence in awareness has traditionally been communicated by teachers of the Tibetan Dzogchen and Mahamudra Lineages, as part of their ancient cultural heritage.

One of the many Lamas to have done so in recent years, is Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche, whose books 'AS IT IS' clearly, frequently and openly share this important instruction, and the context which is essential for complete understanding and application of this method for realization of Awareness.

'The practice, as I state over and over again,
is SHORT MOMENTS REPEATED MANY TIMES'
(citation from Tulku Urgyen's 'As It Is'
v2. p145, published 2000).

Multiple variations of this term 'SHORT MOMENTS REPEATED MANY TIMES' are used literally hundreds of times in these two volumes of 'As It Is' alone, and also have been used extensively in the Dzogchen and Mahamudra traditions for hundreds of years.

In fact for centuries the term 'SHORT MOMENTS MANY TIMES' has been utilised, preserved and passed on by many Tibetan Wisdom masters of the Mahamudra and Dzogchen Lineages, and in the west it has been widely available to English readers for several decades, in the published works of Tibetans wisdom teachers such as Tulku Urgyen, Chokyi Nyima, Tsoknyi Rinpoche, and others.

This very precious traditional instruction, that is an essential part of the freely given wisdom inheritance of the human race, was never once 'possessed', nor were the legal rights to it's use 'owned', by any single individual or organization, as if it could be their own personal 'intellectual property' (legally enforceable under copyright law). And for the good ethical reason that to do so would have been a flagrant violation of the very spirit of the Bodhisattva tradition of compassionate wisdom activity in which that particular practice, and the terms used to describe it, were used.

The very important point i'm emphasizing here is that no phrase as central to the tradition of Dzogchen as is 'Short Moments Repeated Many Times', could ever possibly be 'legally owned' as the 'intellectual property' of any individual, or business corporation.

Even to suggest so, seems to me to be not at all credible.

And yet, incredibly, now it actually is so.

As of last year the traditional term, already widely used and previously published in easily available english language books of Tibetan Dzogchen teachings, has been seized for exclusive, and legally enforceable use, by a self-appointed American teacher of a form of hybrid Tibetan/techno-futurist self-improvement.

So now we find, in september 2010, after countless years of the term and practice 'Short Moments Many Times...' being freely available to all (altho encountered by relatively few), this one particular individual was able to seize legal control over the use of this term by buying the trademark, claiming that it was her own invention.

As bizarre as it seems, that individual now seeks to claim, as her own legally enforceable exclusive 'intellectual property', the term already used by others, and in circulation in the public domain for decades before her attempt at 'spiritual piracy' was perpetrated.

Perhaps this was just an innocent mistake made by a clever but naive individual who, believing herself infallible due to her 'brilliant unerring clarity', foolishly mistook a term, which she knew to be a traditional Dzogchen wisdom instruction, to be an item of personally obtainable intellectual property that she would seize for her own exclusive use. An understandable mistake, from some points of view, perhaps.

Whatever it is, she has succeeded in gaining the legal trademark of the term 'Short Moments Many Times' and its variants, and she and/or her business corporation will now be able to legally prevent others making any public use of the term or its variants, unless authorized by her or her organization. Using this trademark she is now legally empowered to threaten and suppress their public activities if they ever teach, or publish, the ancient traditional Dzogchen practice of 'Short Moments Many Times' (as Tulku Urgyen and many other Lamas have been doing for many years before she bought the term and removed it from the public domain.)

Of course it's not likely that she trademarked these terms to curtail the activities of authorized lineage masters in the Dzogchen tradition. That would be the height of hubris.

What then is her intent in trademarking these terms? When one reads the copyright statement that accompanies all her teachings and which students are required to sign, it would appear that she seeks to prevent anyone, beginning with her own students, from ever publicly 'competing with' her by disseminating anything 'similar to or competing with' whatever she considers to be 'her' teachings.

Her trademarking of part of a simple and profound wisdom instruction that has existed in the Tibetan Dzogchen tradition for hundreds of years, therefore, has to be understood as part of a calculated strategy to control the activities of her students, and others, now and into the foreseeable future.

It is most likely a criminal offense for anyone to trademark an item of 'intellectual

property' as if it's their own invention, when in provable fact it was already in independent use by others in the public domain, prior to the trademark date. We'll have to look into this further.

Anyway, if you want to see for yourself, please check out the company 'Trademarken' for the Trademarks #85175572 "Short Moments"; #85175579 "Short Moments Many Times"; #85175602 "Short Moments of Awareness, Many Times, Become Automatic" #85175586 "Short Moments of Clarity, Many Times, Become Continuous" ; #85175592 "Short Moments of Clarity, Many Times, Become Automatic" .

I must say that to me this individuals act of seizing 'SHORT MOMENTS...' from the 'spiritual commons' for her own very exclusive business enterprise seems very much like an attempt at spiritual and cultural theft. I find it quite difficult to imagine what could possibly serve as a credible excuse for what seems like very unethical and underhanded behavior. And it's an orientation that appears to be at odds with the tradition of compassionate wisdom from which she is known to have lifted so much of her own supposedly original material.

In fact it's very obvious to anyone familiar with the writings of Longchenpa, Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche, Tsoknyi Rinpoche, Chokyi Nyima Rinpoche, Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche, and many other traditionally trained masters of Tibetan Dzogchen, that the supposedly 'original' early teachings of this person (or her 'products, concepts, systems and technologies' as she prefers to call them) are extensively derived from those earlier Tibetan authors and their traditional perspectives.

After discovering her many trademarks for the common variations of this term 'Short Moments..', which she has bought despite the provable fact that it has been, and still is, widely used in the Mahamudra/Dzogchen traditions, I wondered if she'd succeeded in trademarking any other traditional Buddhist terms or phrases.

In fact many additional terms and phrases, clearly originating in the Buddhist tradition, and published as such for very many years, have also been very frequently used by this particular individual (The 'trademarker' of the Tradition) as if they were unique inventions of her own. These include terms and phrases such as - 'short moments of awareness' , 'resting as awareness' , 'let everything be as it is' , 'the basic space' ,'natural perfection' , 'primordial purity', 'for the benefit of all', 'body, speech, mind, qualities and activities' and 'timelessly free'.

She has in fact begun that process of trademarking other traditional terms. Not only has she seized 'Short Moments Many Times', and several variants, as if they were her own inventions, and as if she had an ethical right to do so, but to my astonishment i found she has also already gained legal control over 'for the benefit of all' ! (Trademark #85175618)

Watch out you Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the ten directions, you are all now in breach of her copyright, by using 'her intellectual property' !

Now I can't help ironically wondering if, as an ex-catholic, she would try to trademark 'Father, Son and Holy Spirit' or 'Hail Mary, full of grace, . . . '. To do so would give her great leverage over much of Christendom.
However, unlike the Tibetans, those Vatican guys would have so many lawyers onto her she wouldn't know what hit her. And she'd find it impossibly costly to enforce.

But most Buddhists who realize the lack of inherent self-existence and let everything be as it is, don't manipulate their data-streams, and may appear as push-overs, so she's probably not worried."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 8th, 2013 at 6:37 AM
Title: Re: Curious about the posting-info's new position on the rig
Content:
krodha wrote:
Seems to be fixed now!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 8th, 2013 at 6:32 AM
Title: Re: Some good literature for an introduction to Dzogchen?
Content:
M1NDFUL said:
Wow, what a coincidence. One of the teachers at the Center for Dzogchen Studies where I plan on attending is indeed Patrul Rinpoche. Thanks for the recommendation!

krodha wrote:
Different Patrul Rinpoche then, the Patrul Rinpoche who was an iconic key figure and prominent teacher of the Nyingma (mentioned above) passed in 1887. This is the Patrul Rinpoche who may be teaching at the center you're planning on attending:
http://www.patrulrinpoche.org/

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 7th, 2013 at 12:30 PM
Title: Re: On the difficulty of recognizing the natural state
Content:
monktastic said:
...So I read lots of texts and tried to put them into practice. Sit, allow this reflexive awareness to unfold, and don't... touch... anything. It doesn't need "your" help; quite the contrary, in fact. With a little luck, and a lot of investigation, one day you may a glimpse of ordinary mind! At that point your practice may transition from regular, deluded shamatha, to shamatha-vipashyana -- real Mahamudra practice.

"Trouble" is, I didn't (and haven't) recognized anything new. Yes, grasping is less, kleshas are down, and I seem to fall less frequently into the extremes of meditation and

distraction -- but it seems to be the same thought-free wakefulness sustaining itself at "my" core, just a little less obscured. And that's probably fine, because I don't feel I need anything more. That very idea doesn't make sense.

So I'm a little confused: is this the recognition that is considered very hard to come to on one's own? Any recognition, at all, of the self-aware presence that seems to underlie all of experience? If indeed it is, then perhaps I should feel thankful to have spontaneously recognized it on my own. Or maybe many recognize it, but few attach any importance to it?

My understanding is that this is what Tsoknyi Rinpoche refers to when he uses the term "baby rigpa." It's not the full-blown rigpa, but a nascent recognition that must be nurtured until it fully ripens. If what I have identified as mind essence is something else entirely, that would be surprising (but not impossible); it seems to be a matter of degree, and not kind.

The online http://www.mahamudracenter.org/MMCMemberMeditationGuide.htm draws this analogy:
At this stage, the flavor of this realization permeates the continuum of one's being and it continues in daily activity just like the flavor of a spice permeates to all of a meal into which it is mixed. No additional contrivances are necessary.
And Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche has this to say:
In the beginning, when we start this training, the master will say, "Look into your mind! Look into your mind!" This watchfulness is necessary until you are used to it. Once that has happened you don't need to look here or there. You have caught the 'scent' of the nature of mind. At that point, you do not need to struggle; the nature of mind is naturally awake.
Indeed, I believe that to be the scent I've been tracking down like a bloodhound all these years (and then relaxing into, once it was explained to me that efforting was the wrong idea). And it surprises me that this is considered out of the reach of anyone passionately curious about the nature of their mind.

I'm not looking for anyone to confirm my recognition; obviously only my own guru (which I don't have right now) can do that. But I hope to get a little more clarity about what it is (any recognition? full recognition?) that is said to be hard or impossible to recognize without a guru. Because that idea, reinforced in many texts, was the primary cause of hope and fear in my practice. "You mean this might not be it? What else could it be? But they say it's really hard..."

Perhaps it can best be explained by them taking a "rather safe than sorry" approach -- safer to dissuade one person who has some recognition of mind from actually believing it, than to let 10 others believe they see it when they don't?

krodha wrote:
Rather than a 'self-aware presence that seems to underlie all of experience', the recognition you're looking for is that that very same 'self-aware presence' is precisely experience itself, inseparable from experience. The actual recognition will be a

doubtless certainty to the degree that you won't require any confirmation about it (though it's good to confirm and talk about it with your teacher) You'll know that it's precisely what is being spoken of.

You're right that efforting is the wrong idea though... it is indeed uncontrived and naturally occurring, but mistaking it for the mere presence underlying experience is a common misconception. Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche calls the state you're currently familiar with 'stable shamatha' but to have the recognition you're looking for the leap to 'released shamatha' is necessary. Released shamatha reveals the union of stillness and movement. When stillness and movement are realized to be nondual then it no longer seems as if there is a presence which underlies experience, but it's recognized that the presence is empty while appearing as the myriad forms of experience. The presence is neither the same nor different than experience, the two are primordially nondual.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 7th, 2013 at 7:07 AM
Title: Curious about the posting-info's new position on the right
Content:
krodha wrote:
Getting used to the posting-info's (which lists the author of the post's username, number of posts etc.) new position on the right side of the page. Prior to the re-coloration the posting-info was positioned on the left - which seems to be more intuitive as far as aesthetics go when it comes to reading information on the web. I'm sure the counterintuitive feeling of the newfound positioning (on the right) stems from the fact that most cultures are very accustomed to reading left-to-right (not all of course). In most cases information is placed on the left, graphs being a prime example (most websites, blogs, forums being other examples) and dharma wheel itself still implements the positioning of information in a left-to-right schematic on it's main page and subsidiary thread menus... so I guess my question is (respectfully) what is the logic behind the positioning of the posting-info on the right (within the threads)? And does anyone else feel it's a bit counterintuitive? I'm only inquiring because I was curious if it has a certain purpose, or if it is merely an aesthetic change which was proposed when the rest of the remodeling was happening?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 6th, 2013 at 12:23 PM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:

sahaja said:
. I'm using rigpa here as direct, not as a link to, (a knowledge of base) Because with direct there is no seperation from, not one thing here linked to another there. Not 2 - non dualistic. Buddha.

Forgive my looseness in definition. Rigpa isn't the easiest thing to define or describe.

One of the first requirements in my sangha was the recognition of rigpa. Recognition of Buddha (being what you are) You'll hear of "being in rigpa" which i'm assuming is referring to it as a 'state', temporary usually. Because a permanent state would be a full Buddha, wouldn't it? Sans everything. Sans form, sans identity, sans body, sans consciousness, sans sensation and sans sans these things....I think i was about to do a version of the Prajna Paramita...Which is much better than i could ever do.

5 skandas/5 lights/5 adulterations(poisons) for the Buddhist side

krodha wrote:
It's knowledge of the basis (vidyā). Definitely not what you are. It is the basis for practice and so yes direct introduction is first and foremost. 'Being in rigpa' is resting in that knowledge.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 6th, 2013 at 9:03 AM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:
CrawfordHollow said:
Would it not be more accurate to say that we are more like a generated thought form rather than all we are is a generated thought form?

krodha wrote:
Guess that would depend on which aspect is being discussed but generally anything which apparently originates does so as a result of ignorance and clinging. 'Generated thought form' isn't a very good way to describe it but the origination of an apparent subject-object dichotomy is a result of imputation and it is sustained by habitual tendencies which result from imputing.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 6th, 2013 at 5:42 AM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:
krodha wrote:
Well my apologies for feeding the fire on this thread. Just for the record I'm in no way advocating for tulpa phenomena being a valid aspect of buddhism or dzogchen, and support whatever anyone wants to do with this thread

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 5th, 2013 at 5:34 PM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:

Kunzang said:
In the Dzogchen view, accomplished thoughtform of the kye rim mode are sentient beings as they have a consciousness field or mindstream confluence in a dynamic of entrainment-secession and organization-entropy of emergent factors or from the mindstream intentionality of progenitor(s).
What utter rubbish. There is nothing at all like that in Dzogchen.

Like Dronma said, this doesn't belong in the Dzogchen forum. It also doesn't belong in the Tibetan Buddhism forum either, because this is a Western occult practice with only a spurious connection to authentic Tibetan Buddhism.

Could one of the mods please move this to a more appropriate forum, like the lounge?

krodha wrote:
Yes well take that up with Vajranatha or the uninformed who post information to Wikipedia, I'm not sure which one wrote the passage you're objecting to but either way, I'm merely the messenger. The verbiage in the section you cited is indeed convoluted I do agree with that, but the info directly following which addresses the five lights is undoubtably relevant to dzogchen so it isn't all utter rubbish.

Also, as for dzogchen being nondual and that rendering these topics irrelevant, that isn't the case. The original tantras go very far out of their way to explore the nature of ignorance (and duality) and how it relates to the human body, the structuring of delusion etc. The fundamental ignorance which gives rise to the aberrations of the 12 nidanas is a process which isn't far off from the solidification of projection and imputation being discussed when it comes to tulpas etc.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 5th, 2013 at 11:18 AM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There's actually some websites (http://tulpa.info/

Adamantine said:
Hey sun i'm not so sure about how reputable that site is, in the intro he already spells meditation incorrectly as "medication".

krodha wrote:
Oh yeah, don't get me wrong I wasn't implying that it was legitimate, it's been awhile since I read the site, but I recalled seeing different testimonials from different individuals (or different methods) posted in the guide section. I'm not saying that it's something anyone should actually involve themselves with haha, just posted the sites to show that it's a phenomena which has seeped into the western world a little bit.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 5th, 2013 at 10:22 AM
Title: Re: Tulpas
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's actually some websites (http://tulpa.info/ | https://tulpaforce.tumblr.com/) out there with instructions for anyone who's interested in creating a tulpa to do so, but yeah the implications are pretty intense! Some of the instructions I saw have the individual start by visualizing an environment for the tulpa, and to construct that pretty in depth. Then once the environment is made they said to start visualizing the tulpa, but not to make it look like anyone you know. From there I guess you're supposed to spend pretty much as much free time as you can focusing on the visualization of the tulpa, and then at a certain point you're supposed to start speaking to it, just talking and carrying on a conversation. The verbal discussion and instructions mold how they will behave in the beginning. Then once that's done enough at some point you'll start to hear the tulpa speak back, and then you'll start to see the tulpa but no one else will be able to. I guess the tulpa will essentially just follow you around but as the experience increases others will start to be able to see the tulpa and the tulpa will start to have a mind of it's own and have it's own behavior. So you technically bring a sentient being into existence more or less. A few people said that the tulpas usually become somewhat emotionally unstable because they understand that they aren't 'like everyone else' etc. Supposedly the tulpa can't really be unmade or destroyed so it either is just around you all the time or will go off and do it's own thing. Pretty crazy stuff though, there was quite a few individuals on the site who wrote about their success in doing this.

If anything though the whole process just speaks to the accuracy of the five lights etc and how they become solidified as the five elements through adulteration.

Apparently this thing: 'The Slender Man' is supposed to be possibly tulpa-related (http://theslenderman.wikia.com/wiki/Slender_Man).

There was another story of an explorer who went to the himalayas in search of a master and apparently once he located the yogi, the yogi summoned a tulpa which approached the man and touched him on the forehead which immediately merged the guys mind with the yogi's and he said the vastness of the masters mind was beyond words.

I posted this some time ago in the main Tibetan Buddhism board:

asunthatneversets said:
New film titled "The Apparition" which is out in theatres now is (loosely) based on Tulpa (thought-form) phenomena. Prior to filming, Warner Bros. hired paranormal investigator Joshua P. Warren to actually experiment with the notion and create a tulpa.

Summary of a radio show interview with Joshua:
"...paranormal investigator Joshua P. Warren finally revealed details about the groundbreaking experiment he was hired by Warner Brothers to conduct to 'create a ghost.' He was joined in the first hour by Todd Lincoln, writer/director of Warner Brothers' new horror movie, 'The Apparition'. Lincoln said his new film is inspired by experiments conducted in the 1970s by researchers who suggested that paranormal events happen because people believe in them. The group created a fictional back story for a man named Phillip and focused on manifesting him solely through the power of the mind, he explained. Strange things occurred which terrified the researchers and the experiment was halted, Lincoln added. In The Apparition a similar experiment summons an inhuman entity that gains its power from belief and fear, he noted.

Warren reported on his own attempt at creating a ghost using a lab setup, pointing out that "this actually worked." Components of the original Phillip experiment were combined with technology that amplified brain waves, he disclosed. The subject was asked to focus on a tiki doll and her thoughts were broadcast through equipment that magnified them into the equivalent of thousands of people thinking the same thing, Warren continued. Eventually, a huge harmonic-type field built up which damaged the equipment and ended the experiment, he recalled. According to Warren, seven days later he began to hear scratching sounds in the walls and saw a distorted human-shaped shadow walk down his staircase. In addition, objects were found inexplicably strewn about, the electrical system in Warren's building melted down, and other tenants claimed to have seen a shadowy being, he said. The implications to understand the nature of ghosts and the relationship between mind and environment are startling, Warren said."
Link to audio interview: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/show/2012/08/17

Images from Warren's lab set-up:

From Wikipedia (For those not familiar with Tulpas):
Tulpa (Wylie: sprul-pa; Sanskrit: निर्मित nirmita and निर्माण nirmāṇa; "to build" or "to construct") is an upaya concept in Tibetan Buddhism and Bon, discipline and teaching tool. The term was first rendered into English as 'Thoughtform' by Evans-Wentz (1954: p. 29):
"In as much as the mind creates the world of appearances, it can create any particular object desired. The process consists of giving palpable being to a visualization, in very much the same manner as an architect gives concrete expression in three dimensions to his abstract concepts after first having given them expression in the two-dimensions of his blue-print. The Tibetans call the One Mind's concretized visualization the Khorva (Hkhorva), equivalent to the Sanskrit Sangsara; that of an incarnate deity, like the Dalai or Tashi Lama, they call a Tul-ku (Sprul-sku), and that of a magician a Tul-pa (Sprul-pa), meaning a magically produced illusion or creation. A master of yoga can dissolve a Tul-pa as readily as he can create it; and his own illusory human body, or Tul-ku, he can likewise dissolve, and thus outwit Death. Sometimes, by means of this magic, one human form can be amalgamated with another, as in the instance of the wife of Marpa, guru of Milarepa, who ended her life by incorporating herself in the body of Marpa."

John Myrdhin Reynolds (1996: p. 350) in a note to his English translation of the life story of Garab Dorje defines a tulpa thus:
"A Nirmita (sprul-pa) is an emanation or a manifestation. A Buddha or other realized being is able to project many such Nirmitas simultaneously in an infinite variety of forms."

Thoughtform may be understood as a 'psychospiritual' complex of mind, energy or consciousness manifested either consciously or unconsciously, by a sentient being or in concert. In the Dzogchen view, accomplished thoughtform of the kye rim mode are sentient beings as they have a consciousness field or mindstream confluence in a dynamic of entrainment-secession and organization-entropy of emergent factors or from the mindstream intentionality of progenitor(s). Thoughtform may be benevolent, malevolent or of complex alignment and may be understood as a "spontaneous or intentional manifestation" or "emergence" (Tibetan: rang byung) of the 'Five Pure Lights' (Tibetan: 'od lnga). The Five Pure Lights may be understood as the "radiance" (Tibetan: 'od) or Clear Light (Tibetan: 'od gsal) substrate of 'mindstream' (Tibetan: sems rgyud) and the base or root 'dimensionality of all dharmas' (Sanskrit: dharmadhatu) of Nirvana and Samsara. The mindstream is an entwining or confluence of the 'Eight Consciousnesses' (Tibetan: rnam shes tshogs brgyad). Therefore, the Five Pure Lights are the 'root' (Tibetan: gzhi) of the Western scientific conceptions of matter and energy. From the Dzogchen perspective energy is nondual to 'spiritual energy' or 'vital force' (Tibetan: rlung). For the human species, defined in Traditional Tibetan medicine as the class of entities which holds a human la (Tibetan: bla), the Five Lung are direct homologues of the Five Pure Lights.

Professor H. H. Price, an Oxford philosopher and parapsychologist, held that once an idea has been formed, it "is no longer wholly under the control of the consciousness which gave it birth" but may operate independently on the minds of other people or on physical objects. It is contended that a meme is not a thoughtform, unless it is sentient. Though, memetic theory may be deemed an informative correlation to thoughtform phenomena.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tulpa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 5th, 2013 at 6:29 AM
Title: Re: Is it possible to get a religious vaccine exemption?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I haven't had a flu shot in probably 20+ years (I'm 30) and I can't remember the last time I had the flu, probably when I was very young. My son is now 4 and he's never had a flu shot either, and no flu. It's unnecessary in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 4th, 2013 at 2:43 PM
Title: Re: Illusion
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Your body, mind, thoughts, feelings, and everything you perceive that is apparently outside of you are like reflections in a mirror...an illusion. The Nature of Mind is like the mirror...not an illusion.

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

outside of you are like reflections in a mirror

That is very interesting, how are those reflections seen regarding the mirror? A mirror can reflect that is sure, but how can outer phenomena reflect regarding the mind? Does the eye here function as the reflecting factor?

- I know there is also a view / vision possible from inside to outside.....
- From the outer side are all things which do come out of Nature absolutely pure and clear.....

Mutsug Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
The nature of mind is also illusory, everything is illusory according to dzogchen.

Inside/outside are merely conventional designations which are useful but are ultimately empty. Conventionally, notions of inside and outside the body (subjective and objective experience) are important because working with the body is an important aspect of dzogchen, but when it comes to the view everything is primordially pure and free from extremes, so when resting in the view there's no need to reify appearances being outside or inside, everything is just appearing.

Important not to fixate on the idea of a mirror (i.e. a substantiated background or substratum) either because that creates a subtle reference point. The mirror metaphor is implemented to make us notice how the mirror's capacity to reflect is inseparable from the reflections themselves (so we can apply that to our own experience). If that metaphor is applied to oneself; the mirror's capacity to reflect corresponds to our immediate capacity to experience... and the mirror's reflections correspond to the phenomena of experience. The mirror's capacity to reflect is inseparable from the reflections, and our immediate capacity to experience is inseparable from experience itself etc. When the direct intuitive knowledge (that metaphor is meaning to convey) is recognized, that is the view. But again, within that nothing is ever established or

unestablished (kadag).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 31st, 2013 at 7:35 AM
Title: Re: Question about Khenpo Gangshar's vivid awareness
Content:
rachmiel said:
One simply IS awareness.

krodha wrote:
Be weary of this notion, it has dangerous implications in Buddhism's point of view. It's closer to the hindu view refuted by the Buddha. If 'you' go from being Joe Blow to being 'awareness', then that is nothing more than 'you' identifying with something else, it merely reifies the self (and worse, the self now becomes deluded into thinking it's eternal and permanent).

rachmiel said:
...My question: Which of these types of awareness is vivid awareness?

krodha wrote:
CrawfordHollow is right you should seek guidance from a qualified teacher on questions like these. For the sake of the conversation, 'vivid awareness' in the context that book is using the term, would be the objectless, but you must be careful not to reify and objectify 'awareness' as well. Both objects and awareness are primordially empty.

rachmiel said:
Specifically, is it the subtlest form of awareness of objects, in which one perceives sensations without naming them?

krodha wrote:
That would technically still be the ālaya, it's a subtle point of reference created and maintained by habitual tendency and karmic traces. The ālaya has to fall away so that there is no subject-object split, even subtly, and that isn't done by actually removing the subject-object, but through recognition of your nature which is revealed by the teacher. You should receive introduction from a qualified teacher if you haven't already. It's good to get some semblance of an understanding through intellectual models like you're doing, but ultimately it's important to be mindful and careful not to get caught up in the mind-models.

rachmiel said:
Or is it pure awareness, in which there are no objects, just awareness itself?

krodha wrote:
Not even awareness, nothing is established, it's a freedom from extremes. So not the non-existence of objects and awareness, but the realization that they arose from confusion and so in the recognition of primordial wisdom, non-existence is not possible

because existence isn't suggested to begin with. Objects are known to be illusory, like the reflection of the moon in water, apparent yet unreal.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 19th, 2013 at 1:07 PM
Title: Re: A & Thigle in Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
That's precisely how he puts it. "Do your best". That may be considered quality of practice in Maha-yoga and Anu-yoga and that is all well and good. ChNN is teaching Anu-yoga in the theme of Ati-yoga, and so the visualizations should remain true to the practice within reason. The quality of practice is gauged in ones ability to access the authentic condition and rest in that. Fixation on the clarity and exact details of visualization is not the point and if anything it can become a distraction, especially if you think you're actually making progress or refining the quality of your practice through the power and detail of your visualization.

Dronma said:
That's right! But ChNN Rinpoche never said to construct visualizations according to our fantasy! Isn't it?
Moreover, everybody is "doing his/her best" with different way, so why not if somebody has the ability to refine the quality of the practice through the power and detail of visualization?

pawel said:
Doing practices qualified way is a matter of familiarity with them, ie of not being beginner with them. If you're going to do semzins and rushens for example you have many Tibetan letters to visualize. And they aid / lead to that knowledge you're speaking of and practitioner can develop, and they should be done precise and qualified way. And so goes with all anuyoga tantras, all Guruyogas and all else.

asunthatneversets said:
The point is that whether you visualize a hazy blue light instead of a perfect blue hum, or a English A instead of a Tibetan A, it does not obstruct the practice. The authentic condition is not Tibetan, I myself prefer the Tibetan letters, but to insist to someone else that they must aspire to eventually implement the Tibetan letters or else their practice is going to be compromised is incorrect in the view of dzogchen. Ones practice should be what the teacher gives, endowed with the blessings of the lineage.

Dronma said:
The blue, white, red lights (or whatever color in different practices), and the Latin A (in Guru Yoga) are still in the context of the transmission from ChNN Rinpoche himself, and not mental fabrication of anybody.

PS. I suspect that the confusion might come from the wrong idea that the 2 Tibetan A are something like the Latin capital A and the small a, which in fact is the same letter. Tibetan language has totally different structure than European languages, and it does not include at all capital and small letters. The so called here full A and short A are 2 different letters in Tibetan alphabet! So, trying to use the "short A" instead of the A (which is transmitted) is very peculiar idea, so much as it is trying to use any other Tibetan letter (ka, ya, zha etc) in the practice of Guru Yoga.

krodha wrote:
For the record I never suggested random self concocted visualizations.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 19th, 2013 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: A & Thigle in Dzogchen
Content:
pawel said:
That's not how Chogyal Namkhai Norbu puts it.
Details of visualizations are important, that makes partially what is meant by quality of practice.

krodha wrote:
That's precisely how he puts it. "Do your best". That may be considered quality of practice in Maha-yoga and Anu-yoga and that is all well and good. ChNN is teaching Anu-yoga in the theme of Ati-yoga, and so the visualizations should remain true to the practice within reason. The quality of practice is gauged in ones ability to access the authentic condition and rest in that. Fixation on the clarity and exact details of visualization is not the point and if anything it can become a distraction, especially if you think you're actually making progress or refining the quality of your practice through the power and detail of your visualization.

pawel said:
Yes, all of practices should be guarded with three sacred principles (beginning with right motivation, continued with Awareness and ended with dedication); if one has no capacity for the second then should be guarded with presence.

krodha wrote:
Rightly so, although 'awareness', in the context of dzogchen, is a term that should go the way of the dinosaur.

pawel said:
Doing practices qualified way is a matter of familiarity with them, ie of not being beginner with them. If you're going to do semzins and rushens for example you have many Tibetan letters to visualize. And they aid / lead to that knowledge you're speaking of and practitioner can develop, and they should be done precise and qualified way. And so goes with all anuyoga tantras, all Guruyogas and all else.

krodha wrote:
The point is that whether you visualize a hazy blue light instead of a perfect blue hum, or a English A instead of a Tibetan A, it does not obstruct the practice. The authentic condition is not Tibetan, I myself prefer the Tibetan letters, but to insist to someone else that they must aspire to eventually implement the Tibetan letters or else their practice is going to be compromised is incorrect in the view of dzogchen. Ones practice should be what the teacher gives, endowed with the blessings of the lineage, but within that practice minor variants in A's or colored light instead of a symbol does not deviate in the least. If it works for someone else then that is wonderful. The best advice I ever received was 'don't get caught up in the bullshit'... recognize the essence, return to the essence, return to the essence, return to the essence.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 18th, 2013 at 3:06 PM
Title: Re: A & Thigle in Dzogchen
Content:
pawel said:
You can use the latin 'A' (mentioned earlier as English - well,) butthe destination is to learn the Tibetan A and apply the GuruYoga correctly according to the transmission. Rinpoche mentiones this often, there's no problem in learning a few Tibetan characters. The same goes for the visualizations of GuruYoga for Padmasambhava (there's Om, Ah Hum which can be changed for lights of respective colors for beginners) and initiations. It's important to grow up from the beginner's phase.

krodha wrote:
When it comes to these symbols there really isn't a hierarchy of validity, whatever works for the individual is what's appropriate. As long as the essential characteristics of the practice are accounted for (such as the sound 'ahhhh' like Rinpoche suggested) and the right intention is there the practice is good to go. Visualizing lights instead of symbols, or symbols in a certain language isn't going to obstruct the practice. It's easy to get caught up in the minor details (and it's true sometimes the details are very important), but most important of all is the essence of the practice which is integrating with the knowledge revealed by the teacher. Practices are supports for that, and so it's not really a matter of growing up from a beginners phase, but increased familiarity with that knowledge.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 17th, 2013 at 6:35 PM
Title: Re: Advaitin vs. Buddhist takes on awareness/reality
Content:
Astus said:
Advaita thinks consciousness (vijnana) is/has an eternal part. Buddhism refutes it.

lowlydog said:
Consciousness is permanent/eternal and Buddhism does not refute this. Advaita and Buddhism are the same teachings when understood(practically experienced) correctly.

rachMiel,

bodhicitta= pure awareness= brahman, but what you are suggesting scares the crap out of those who hang on to their religious beliefs to tightly.

krodha wrote:
Buddhism definitely refutes the idea that consciousness is permanent and eternal.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 15th, 2013 at 2:59 PM
Title: Re: A & Thigle in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
You can use the english 'A' if that is easier, he's mentioned this quite a few times.

"If you prefer an English 'A' it is acceptable. The important thing is that it corresponds in your mind to the sound 'Ahhh'. It is important that when you see that letter you automatically know what its sound is. If you do not succeed in concentrating and seeing this at first, it may be that you do not know how to visualize. Try writing an 'A' on a piece of paper, put it in front of you, and stare at it for awhile. Close your eyes and this 'A' will appear before your mind immediately. In this way you will get a more precise image."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

The quote above is from the book 'Dream Yoga and the Practice of Natural Light', and so the advice is the context of that practice, but the same principle applies to Guru Yoga.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 28th, 2012 at 3:07 PM
Title: Re: What else to do. Waiting for Rainbow Body.
Content:
CrawfordHollow said:
...I sent you several PMs trying to help you find a teacher and explain what little I know about Dzogchen. I am sorry if you are above all of that, but- no teacher, no transmission, no Dzogchen. I wish you a very good night. I hope you find the answers you are looking for. Oh, and what you are practicing is not Thogal. Good luck.

krodha wrote:
I too sent a cautionary PM. I'm sorry you aren't endowed with the acumen to heed warning, Open Intelligence. As they say, you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink. You've been advised by myself and others to suspend your endeavors and seek a qualified teacher, so you can't plead ignorance. Hard to watch you hang yourself like this but seems you can't save others from themselves. William Blake once said “The fool who persists in his folly will become wise.” I hope for your sake he's right.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 25th, 2012 at 8:34 AM
Title: Re: Illusion
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Your body, mind, thoughts, feelings, and everything you perceive that is apparently outside of you are like reflections in a mirror...an illusion. The Nature of Mind is like the mirror...not an illusion.

krodha wrote:
Much better to use the mirror's capacity to reflect, rather than the mirror itself in my opinion. I wrote this awhile ago to clarify something I had written that was posted on a blog...

"...The mirror-analogy is commonly used in attempting to describe the 'nature of mind' and there is a common misconception which tends to arise from this analogy because the implementation of a mirror seems to convey a substantiated background (or unchanging source). I was attempting to point out that the analogy isn't meant to explore the mirror in itself as an unchanging basis, but solely the mirror's capacity to reflect. So the capacity is the aspect the analogy is exploring. Equating the nature of mind to the mirror's reflective capacity (but not the mirror itself). That the reflections are inseparable from that capacity, just like AEN elucidated with the fire-to-heat and water-to-wetness examples. That capacity isn't a conceivable quality, it isn't something which can be 'known' as a substantiated suchness. The capacity (to reflect) cannot be rolled, thrown or bounced, it has no shape, color, location, weight or height. There is nothing there one can point to and declare 'there it is!'. Yet in it's elusiveness it is still fully apparent in the presence of the reflections themselves. The capacity is evident because of the reflections and the reflections are evident because of the capacity, in truth they co-emergent and mutually interdependent qualities which are completely inseparable. Evident, clear and pure, yet unestablished, ungraspable and ephemeral."

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche used the capacity aspect as well in one of his Longde books....

"Our primordial potentiality is beyond form, but we have a symbol, and when we have a symbol then we can get in that knowledge. It is very easy to understand with an example. If you want to discover the potentiality of a mirror, how can you go about it? You can neither see or touch the nature or potentiality of a mirror, nor can you have contact with it in any ordinary way, the only way is to look in a mirror, and then the reflections will appear and through the reflections you can discover it. The reflections are not really the potentiality of the mirror but they are manifesting through that potentiality, so they are something visible for us. With this example we can get in the knowledge of the potentiality of the mirror...."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

"Why then do we have this symbol of primordial potentiality? Primordial potentiality in the Dzogchen teaching is explained with three principles: sound, light and rays. This does not mean that sound, light and rays are manifestations, but rather that these are the root of all manifestations. When you have this potentiality then there is always the possibility of manifestations. If we wonder, for example what the potentiality of a mirror looks like, we couldn't say very much, we could say for example that it is clear, pure, limpid and so forth, but we could not really have contact with it directly through our senses. In the same way sound, light and rays are the essence of potentiality. When we have this potentiality, if secondary causes arise, then anything can manifest.
What do we mean by secondary causes? For example, if in front of a mirror there is tree, or a flower or a person, the object instantly manifests. These are secondary causes. So if there is no secondary cause there is no manifestation. Thus in front of our primordial potentiality there are all the possibilities of manifestation of the secondary causes....."
- Chögyal Namkhai Norbu

I think it's an important distinction... the mirror itself is often used to elucidate the nature of mind, but I personally believe it can potentially convey the wrong idea, the mirror's capacity (or potentiality) allows for a much more dynamic and less substantial notion of the natural state, more of an accurate representation IMO.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 25th, 2012 at 8:20 AM
Title: Re: Illusion
Content:
krodha wrote:
The reflection of the moon in water is a good analogy, it's valid in that it's an appearance but it isn't anything substantial at all, all phenomena are like that. Appearances do not actually create anything, nor are they anything in and of themselves.

Here's the 8 similes of illusion (sgyu ma'i dpe brgyad):
1. Dream: like a dream, objects perceived with the five senses are not there, but they appear through delusion.
2. Magical illusion: like a magic illusion, things are made to appear due to the temporary coming together of causes and conditions.
3. Hallucination or trompe-l'oeil: like a hallucination, things appear, yet there is nothing there.
4. Mirage: like a mirage, things appear, but they are not real.
5. Echo: like an echo, things can be perceived, but there is nothing there, either inside or outside.
6. City of gandharvas: like a city of gandharvas, there is neither a dwelling nor anyone to dwell.
7. Reflection: like a reflection, things appear, but have no reality of their own .
8. Apparition: like an apparition, there are different types of appearances, but they are not really there.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 5th, 2012 at 4:43 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Sherlock said:
ChNN himself also kept short hair for years though.

Dronma said:
Talking about hairs, while our aim is the state of Dzogchen which is beyond any limitation, is at least funny....

krodha wrote:
True but no limitations also means total freedom to talk about hairs!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 4th, 2012 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
alpha said:
I have a question about a certain custom in Dc.I have noticed that lots of male students of Rinpoche and Rinpoche himself have long hair.
Can someone say what is the significance behind that?
This is an aspect which is never talked about or explained and i wonder if is just a mimetic kind of behaviour or is there a tradition with its rules and commitments?

When i say mimetic i dont mean this in a kind of derogatory way.As we can see in lots of sanghas the students quite often adopt styles of behaviour and dress which can be directly linked to the way the leader ,teacher of that sangha behaves and dresses.

krodha wrote:
The long hair is briefly discussed at around 4:10 in this video (the DC trend has nothing to do with this though... to my knowledge at least). Seems the interviewers attempt to ask about it but don't get too much info, and then the narrator later briefly discusses the growing of the hair and then mentions the cutting of it as being a sign that the individual is preparing for death. Usually individuals who have taken the vow curl their hair to form a little bun (or giant bun depending on how long it's been growing) and the spot in the middle of the curl has some significance. It's definitely a ngakpa thing but also transcends the ngakpa lifestyle since other yogi's do it (both indian and tibetan). The ngakpa's grow their hair long to contrast what renunciant monks following the sutric path do (shaving their heads).

Talks about the hair between 4:10 and 6:10
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }

https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, November 14th, 2012 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Critical Buddhism and "full strength anatman"
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's a quote by Longchenpa out there somewhere where he states that the tathāgatagarbha is a concept used to instill faith and motivation in aspirants who have little experience, but lacks reality apart from being implemented in that way. Found that interesting...

If anyone knows that quote please post because I've been trying to track it down for awhile!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, October 22nd, 2012 at 1:20 PM
Title: Re: Dealing with purified karma
Content:
deff said:
i think the problem in this case might be meditating while driving

krodha wrote:
I meditate while driving whenever possible... On Fridays I drive for 7-8 hours and meditate almost the whole time. Only had once or twice where some really strange nyams started to happen and I had to cut the meditation off, which is unfortunate because it would've been interesting to have those play out, but for fear of crashing I couldn't.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, October 21st, 2012 at 1:26 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
rob h said:
Have been kind of loathe to bring this back up, but to be honest I also think a point should be made : the whole idea of arguing, sectarianism and negativity towards eachother when discussing the difference between schools seems like a clear sign that as we do this we're caught in delusion.

krodha wrote:
Actually debate is a big part of many schools and isn't seen as a sign of delusion at all. It's always been a cornerstone of these traditions. Rejection of debate is just as much delusion, it all depends on how it's being related to. Pacifism isn't a sign of being in accord with the authentic condition. Plus a lot of this thread has been in response to a

certain few people who had been casting unfounded aspersions on this forum for awhile prior to the inception of this thread, and it just came to a head here. It's all good!

"When one who is aware of the correct teachings has judgmental thoughts, the demon of permanence does not make them an obstacle. Finding the differences and refuting the assertions of others is a characteristic of full maturity that cannot be taken away."
- Sūtralamkāra

"If, with the intention of identifying and teaching higher and lower views, other precepts are deprecated, this is not transgression, but greatly increases merit."
- Commentary on The 14 Root Downfalls | rtsa ltung bcu bzhi

Highlights: Tibetan Debate
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V6daHMqrMUY
(Excerpts from the inaugural program in Asia Society's Great Debates series, featuring monks from the Drepung Loseling Monastery and a discussion between Geshe Thupten Jinpa [The Dalai Lama's principal translator] and Professor Daniel Perdude.)

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 16th, 2012 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: Strange sleeping experience
Content:
krodha wrote:
The one or two times it happened to me I never felt a presence, my good friend has it happen all the time and never feels a presence. But there's a room his house where 4 different people have slept and woke up unable to move, they all said the sheets were being pulled tight around them. Weird stuff.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 13th, 2012 at 3:29 PM
Title: Re: Strange sleeping experience
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've had experiences where it feels like I'm dropped into bed and I wake up to the feeling of impact. But I've only had sleep paralysis once or twice both times just waking up and can't move, no fear associated though, more of a confusion type thing. I'm pretty sure the more you meditate the more you'll have unique experiences in sleep/dream states. I used to have that tilting sensation anytime I'd close my eyes, there's a video on YouTube that talks about it being a sign of development/maturation of the subtle body but that's just a video on the internet so no way to know if it's valid... I'll try to find it and post it.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, October 13th, 2012 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Oracles and taking trance...
Content:
Yudron said:
Cool video, asunthatneversets. Unfortunately, I didn't notice til the end it was put up on Youtube by a Shugden person, with links to their site.

You probably didn't notice that.

krodha wrote:
Ah didn't see that! Otherwise yes I would've found a different link, interesting though, I'm curious as to what the motivation would be behind an organization/individual in support of that cause essentially sponsoring/promoting this video. I'll leave the extent of my prying with that question though and let that sleeping dog lie. Lie in both senses of the word.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, October 12th, 2012 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: Oracles and taking trance...
Content:
krodha wrote:
Interesting documentary on the Dalai Lama's oracles...

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:
catmoon said:
All righty. With that kind of agreeent, it must surely be impossible that there would be sects in Dzogchen, since all the teachers are in perfect agreement. It must be nice to enjoy the sort of universal agreement that no other religion in the history of humanity has attained. This would also explain the complete absence of conflict in the Dzogchen threads here.

Nope, couldn't say it with a straight face.

krodha wrote:

By 'sects' are you referring to lineages? There may be minute differences between the traditions/practices of different
lineages but when it comes down to the heart of the matter it's all the same. The universal agreement is merely knowledge of one's state, which is an innate aspect of all beings (and reality in general), if that is recognized then where would contention arise from? Contention and conflict arise from attachment/aversion to ideas and concepts, those ideas aren't dzogchen... though they may be about dzogchen. If debates form then it's only ever ideas which are being discussed, dzogchen in itself is never subject to the debates, this would be impossible.

I'm sure that for those who are unfamiliar with dzogchen, making a statement of that nature sounds like a cop-out, like a member of a religion claiming that their god is beyond everything. And I can even make the statement that "it's not the same", but I'm sure those members of the other religions would say the same thing. So nothing that can be said about dzogchen will prove to be valid, that's why it's based on experiential knowledge. Dzogchen isn't a religion, philosophy etc..

I'm sure that if every individual who contributes to this forum was abiding in the knowledge of their authentic condition then there may be less conflict, but this is (most likely) not the case. So the character of these discussions naturally reflect the variety of individuals involved, this is only natural.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
byamspa said:
Energizer bunny thread...it keeps going and going and going....

greentreee said:
funny you mention that, in some ways, this does seem like a tortoise and hare debate about where or more appropriately, what, the end is, and who'll get there first!

krodha wrote:
I don't think the discussion is of that nature in any way. It's not about what the end is, or who will get there first... those are childish concerns, in my opinion at least. Yogācāra is all well and good, it is what it is... and likewise dzogchen is what it is. The issue is that there are individuals posting here, who don't understand dzogchen and are baselessly asserting that the two (Yogācāra and Dzogchen) are equivalent. That, is why there has to be extensive clarification and refutation, because they are not the same, and it is reckless and dangerous to claim that they are. As long as those who are actively engaged in making unfounded statements of that nature continue to do so, rebuttals will occur. And if it never ends then so be it.

This is a public platform that is somewhat popular, it's certainly a valuable resource and wellspring of knowledge (this day in age) for those interested in these teachings. People

come here to learn and further their own understanding, if we sit idly by and allow incorrect or uninformed statements to be made regarding certain traditions then that is what is being read, and that information is what people are walking away with. It would not be fair to them nor to the teaching itself to remain silent and enable exegetical degradation of that nature.

Not that the teaching truly can be degraded, but disinformation should not be allowed. I get that there are some aspects of opinion which differ in regards to some minute details, and we're all welcome to our own opinions, they should all be celebrated. But taking the entire body of ati-yoga and making uninformed blanketed statements regarding it's nature that aim to present yogācāra as it's equal (or greater than) is incorrigible. So the debating isn't meant to degrade or belittle yogācāra, it's purpose is to maintain, fortify, and point out those aspects which separate the two (yogācāra and dzogchen).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2012 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Posted this quote before, but it's relevant to this topic, and a good quote...

"The pure mind, the ubiquitous essence -
it is spontaneously, originally, perfect;
so strenuous engagement with the ten techniques
is unnecessary, superfluous.

...I am inscrutable and cannot be cultivated.
All the ten techniques are likewise transcended,
so nothing can be done to affect me.
Those who try to approach me on a causal path,
desirous of catching a glimpse of my face,
seeking me through the ten techniques,
fall straight to earth like a tenderfoot sky-walker,
tumbling down due to deliberate effort.

I, the supreme source, I am the revelation,
and transcend every sphere of activity,
so a view of me cannot be cultivated,
and the ten techniques are meaningless.
If you still think that the ten techniques have purpose,
look at me, and finding nothing to see,
taking no view, remain at that zero-point.
Nothing ever separates us from unoriginated simplicity,
so vows and discipline are redundant;
the essence is always spontaneously present,

so any effort to find it is always superfluous;
self-sprung awareness has never been obscured,
so gnostic awareness cannot be generated;
everybody already lives on my level,
so there is no place to reach through purification;
I embrace all and everything,
so there can be no path that leads to me;
I am forever incapable of dualization,
so there is never anything to be labeled 'subtle';
my form embraces everything,
so there has never been any 'duality';
I am self-sprung awareness from the very beginning,
so I can never be nailed down;
since I am the heart of total presence,
there is no other source of secret precepts."
- Samantabhadra

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 25th, 2012 at 7:32 PM
Title: Re: Masturbation & Sexual/Porn Addiction
Content:
krodha wrote:
Hey, it's safer than a real sex addiction where someone is risking exposure to sexually transmitted diseases. No reason to feel guilty vajrahorizon, things like this only become an issue if they are impeding upon other aspects of your life. For example, if you couldn't stop masturbating and it began to impact your work/social life etc... but everything in moderation is healthy and there's no need to feel guilty. In other facets of the teaching there are subtle aspects to the appearance of lust being a dualistic (and therefore delusional) expression of experience, but that can be argued as being relative as well depending on the individual's relationship to it. Overall though I wouldn't worry about it, it's good for the system every now and again.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 25th, 2012 at 7:15 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The only dichotomy dzogchen employs is delusion and wisdom.

Jyoti said:
There is no such dichotomy in dzogchen, yogacara or any definitive teaching, as dichotomy does not apply in term of opposites, but the speculation of the body as two. Nonduality literally refers to not-two, not about any opposites or extremes.

krodha wrote:

There certainly is such a dichotomy in dzogchen, there is ma-rigpa and rigpa, ignorance and wisdom, but neither are ever truly established. Nothing is truly established.

asunthatneversets said:
Dependent arising is the way in which distinct things or qualities seemingly exist.

Jyoti said:
What you refer is the aspect of mere appearance, not the aspect of dependent arising, the latter is the function of means, which is based on the alaya-vijnana and the 7 consciousnesses. The function is depended on the seeds and the perfuming agents (7 consciousnesses).

krodha wrote:
No, it refers to the way in which distinct things or qualities seemingly exist, including your notion of the 7 consciousnesses.

asunthatneversets said:
Dependent arising can't be an object of the 7 consciousnesses because the 7 consciousnesses only exist on a conventional level and therefore are dependently originated themselves.

Jyoti said:
Of course not. The consciousnesses are the causes of dependent arising appearances. However, they have intimate relationship. Dependent arising is the ripening appearance of the seed, the cause of the ripening of the seed is the 7 consciousnesses (the perfuming agents). Both the appearance of dependent arising and the 7 consciousnesses arise sponteneously from the basis (alaya-vijnana).

krodha wrote:
The consciousnesses being empty, cannot be the cause of anything. There are no agents. The basis is not the ālayavijñāna.

asunthatneversets said:
Since dzogchen is experiential, the truth it points to is unassailable and cannot be adulterated. Certain groups or individuals (such as yourself) may attempt to interpret dzogchen within the frame of their own structure of reasoning, and in doing so, adulterate it... but at that point it's no longer dzogchen which is being adulterated, all that is being botched is a mere intellectual translation/interpretation.

Jyoti said:
The structure of the three principles (body, form and means) is not exclusive ownership of dzogchen, true ownership belongs to reality (dharmadhatu). Any teaching will have individual who wrongly interprete them, but these wrong interpretation has nothing to do with the principles. Thus, yogacara represent the three principles, when dzogchenpas judge yogacara based on interpretation of individual, this is termed relying on the persons and not the dharma. Any person who understand the dharma on the

standpoint of yogacara can easily refute such judgement, the same apply to dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
True in theory.

asunthatneversets said:
You only enjoy Mipham because his exposition matches your own point of view, and therefore you continually champion his exposition in The Lions Roar. You're only looking to validate your construct of beliefs.

Jyoti said:
For person who didn't understand the dharma, then the attachment to words, rather than the meaning is the norm, such a person will easily attached to other norms of their chosen tradition, and based on these as 'truth'. The chances of their ability to accept the teaching of other traditions is slim, as their 'truth' is based on differences that is apparent to them. Mipham does not belong to this group of dzogchenpa, he has own vision of dzogchen and understand its relationship to other traditions, this is the sign of his mastery of the dharma, and the reason that his writing is worth refering.

krodha wrote:
In your opinion... based on your attachments to the norms of your chosen tradition and considering it to be 'truth', as you put it.

asunthatneversets said:
I never said everything is consciousness, the natural state isn't consciousness.

Jyoti said:
I didn't infer to your opinion about consciousness. Dzogchen didn't avoid the term consciousness, instead it uses terms with similar meaning such as wisdom, awareness, cognition, wakefulness, presence, nature state, nature of mind, primordial experience, existential condition, etc. There is no merit in such usage of words, as it only serve to confuse with the variety of words, where the standard dharma terminology 'consciousness' is the same and doesn't confuse.

krodha wrote:
What the word implies is of incredible importance. And what YOU imply when you use the term consciousness, is not what dzogchen refers to with terms like wisdom. Don't conflate the two.

asunthatneversets said:
The reason a term like 'consciousness' is usually avoided is because if dzogchen asserted that everything is consciousness then it would run the risk of suggesting the existence of an abiding ground of being, or substratum.

Jyoti said:
Dzogchen already asserts everything is clarity (form) of awareness (consciousness). Dzogchen also claimed a common ground (alaya) of everything, so you are not making

sense.

krodha wrote:
Clarity is not form. Some translators use the term 'awareness' but they do not state that everything is awareness. So no, dzogchen does not assert that everything is clarity of awareness in any way. The ālaya, is the all-ground, which is the basis of ignorance... the ground of confusion, from which everything arises. 'Things' arise from non-recognition of the primordial state, they do not arise from the primordial state, the primordial state has never arisen. I'm making perfect sense, you don't understand this teaching, and you even went as far as to claim that there is no such thing as the ālaya in your last response. So your bias has already clouded your ability to understand what is being pointed to.

asunthatneversets said:
Saying that everything is consciousness suggests that something has been established, which is perfectly acceptable in yogācāra, but not in dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
This is a flaw reasoning, there is no assertion in yogacara that the 7 consciousnesses are established (permanent), unlike dzogchen, yogacara distinguished the body and means, and so what is not establish and what is established (8th consciousness) have no confusion, and so what belong to the realm of existent, can be admitted as permanent or existent without fear of confusion.

krodha wrote:
You're still asserting that there is something which belongs to a realm of existence (i.e. established) and can be admitted as permanent. This is not the dzogchen view.

asunthatneversets said:
The actualization of the natural state is the recognition of the authentic condition, that condition isn't consciousness, only the teaching you champion (Yogācāra and other eternalist views) claims that.

Jyoti said:
If the nature state is depended on an actualization, then it is conditional to the actualization, thus saying it is 'nature' is contradictory of term. A condition is simply a condition, no different with regards to authentic (dependent arising nature) or unauthentic (imaginary nature). Thus the ability to recognize is the same with whatever arise (mental condition or object). Due to your having to select an ultimate object (authentic condition) in order for recognition to occur, then the recognition is conditional upon the ultimate object. The problem with your view is this ultimate object is not consciousness, then the sources of arising from the 12 entrances are not it, since the 12 entrances are none other than consciousnesses.

krodha wrote:
The actualization is the removal of ignorance which obscures the primordial state. The primordial state isn't conditional to anything. There is no ultimate object to select, the recognition is conditional upon the adventitious appearance of delusion which

obscures, when the delusion is known to be delusion, then that is said to be recognition. In my opinion, the problem with your view is that you posit and ultimate and you assert it to be consciousness. Likewise you claim there are sources of arising and then state that there are 12 entrances which are none other than consciousness. You're talking about yogācāra, not dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
Consciousness (as a term) is also avoided because it suggests a number of other subtleties, for example: 'one who is conscious' and/or a localized occurrence of consciousness contrasting other pockets of consciousness (as you suggest below) and so on and so forth.

Jyoti said:
As mentioned, the term with similar meaning in dzogchen is awareness, according to your example, it suffered the same problem (which is not reasonable).

krodha wrote:
As mentioned, awareness is a term employed by a select group of translators and does not accurately represent dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
'Awakened mind' is just a relative term, it isn't to be taken literally, nothing truly awakens, and there is no mind in dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
In your own word "'Awakened mind' is just another way of saying prajñā, yeshe, sherab etc...", so I didn't bring up awakened mind, I only response to your usage of the term. That said, the body of yogacara is not mind either, but in the same way as dzogchen require the upholding of vidya, the relying on the mind (means) is clearly required. Surely nothing truly awaken, because the body can't be awakened as it is beyond change, but the whole teaching (dzogchen or yogacara) is not about the body but the means (bodhi).

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen is not about the 'means'. Again, you're talking about yogācāra, not dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
They are the result of conceptual projection. People are conceptual projections, and yes the person's body is due to dependent origination, it depends on the projected web of concepts.

Jyoti said:
You clearly failed to understand it is the ripening of the seed within the storehouse consciousness that is the cause of the manifestation of the appearances (consciousnesses) of dependent arising. If a concept can determined the appearance of dependent arising, then we don't need to accumulate merit or planting the seed of virtue, we only need to day dream with the assurance that it will be part of one's

dependent arising appearance. Unfortunately, we don't have such a dharma.

krodha wrote:
According to yogācāra it is the ripening of the seed within the storehouse consciousness that is the cause of the manifestation of appearances of dependent arising. This is not the view of dzogchen. You don't seem to get this.

asunthatneversets said:
You must be using the term "intellect" to represent knowledge of thusness, usually "intellect" is used to signify conceptual processes of reasoning.

Jyoti said:
The intellect is indeed the conceptual processes of reasoning, but with the additional knowledge of thusness, without the latter, it is not termed the intellect, at least not the intellect in concordance with the reason. In buddhist discussion, as the example of sutra, usually when speaking of intellect, it excludes the option for worldly intellect, so the word intellect is assumed to be associated with the reason of thusness.

krodha wrote:
Yes I figured this was the case but I appreciate the clarification.

asunthatneversets said:
Internal and external are conceptual projections, they do not exist inherently, they have nothing to do with vision. Even vision itself is a delusional notion when it comes down to it. They are imputed constructs. Formless meditative states (as in blank voids of closed off samadhi) have nothing to do with dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
Definitively speaking, they exist inherently as well as not exist inherently, due to being both permanent and impermanent. Thus to simply say they don't exist is to stray to the extreme of non-existent. To say they are conceptual projections is wrong since the two-fold manifestations are based on the form and means of the three principle structure (yogacara) or clarity and capacity of the three existential modes (dzogchen).

krodha wrote:
They can be said to exist conventionally, but not inherently. Within the conventional there is no actual production or origination, these seeming appearances are illusory and are products of ignorance. I'm not saying they're non-existent, they would have to initially exist to have the possibility of being non-existent.

asunthatneversets said:
There are no non-deceptive mental images being that there are no mental images.

Jyoti said:
Then why assert a conceptual construction to the two-fold manifestation of consciousness and to the dependent arising nature? This conceptual construction is where it fit here (the imaginary nature).

krodha wrote:
The conceptual construction is the result of ignorance.

asunthatneversets said:
Affliction is never bodhi. You either have one or the other and neither are ever truly established.

Jyoti said:
Affliction is none other than consciousness, the body of consciousness is the thusness, so affliction is none other than thusness, knowledge of thusness is the intellect, the intellect is associated with bodhi. Thus affliction is bodhi (i.e. for one who understand the connection).

krodha wrote:
According to yogācāra, not dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
Bodhi as a term is only implemented to signify the absence of affliction, in contrast of affliction, otherwise bodhi is simply the natural state.

Jyoti said:
Bodhi literally translated as 'awakening', the nature state is the thusness, thusness is of the body, whereas bodhi is of the means.

krodha wrote:
Semantics.

asunthatneversets said:
Only according to Yogācāra are there natures which inherently exist, according to dzogchen, nothing exists inherently, everything is illusory.

Jyoti said:
Definitively speaking, only the ultimate nature inherently exist, whereas the dependent arising nature both exist and non-exist. However, when the dependent arising nature is posited as illusory, then the illusory nature (dependent arising nature) still exist and non-exist, thus to say 'nothing exists inherently' is falling into the extreme of non-existent. However, even this exist and non-exist dependent arising nature (means) is not the ultimate nature (body), thus there is the two truths, which is the unity of the means and body.

krodha wrote:
Again, only according to yogācāra. There is no ultimate nature which inherently exists in dzogchen. To say 'nothing exists inherently' means just that (nothing exists inherently). It isn't falling into the extreme of nihilism, because nihilism would require something to be negated in the first place. You assume that there are aspects which have been established and therefore within your reasoning, to posit them as lacking inherency is a

nihilistic view, but this conclusion is predicated on your initial assumption. As it is, essentialism/eternalism/nihilism are all conceptual notions which are based on the notion of something to be affirmed or negated. Dzogchen understands that these notions belong to conceptualization and do not transcend conceptualization. Reality is free of extremes (as was pointed out above).

asunthatneversets said:
there is no specific faculty called the 'imaginary nature' in dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
Dzogchen has employed deity yoga as well as symbols of visualization, yet it didn't has 'imaginary nature' as a terminology, is indication that dzogchen is not as great as its name suggest. Also this imaginary nature is not a faculty (but of the three natures), there is only six faculties (sense organ) spoken of in buddhism. As a side note, dzogchen also mistakenly associate the 7th and 8th consciousnesses as the skandas, there is only five skandas in buddhism. This is the reason it associates the 8th consciousnesses as the means, and so must invent a body such as alaya (ground) devoid of consciousness. If one read the 'Doctrine of Mere Consciousness', there is passage showing how the 8th consciousness can be proven to exist independently of the dissolution of the skandas.

krodha wrote:
Maha-yoga and anu-yoga employ deity yoga and symbols of visualization, dzogchen (ati-yoga) is the primordial state. The ālaya gives rise to the appearance of consciousness, the ālaya is the kun-gzhi or all-ground, the basis of samsara and nirvana (samsara, because it is the basis of confusion... nirvana, because it provides the potentality for actualizing liberation). The gzhi, or ground is most likely what you are referring to as that which is 'devoid of consciousness'... it is the ever-pure and unborn.

asunthatneversets said:
The nirmanakaya is the unconfined, unobstructed and uninterrupted capacity and/or energetic display of the primordial state.

Jyoti said:
This 'capacity' in dzogchen is another word for 'means' in yogacara.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps, I actually have no idea what you're referring to with a lot of the terminology you use, unfortunately.

asunthatneversets said:
Those were rhetorical questions. But if we must answer them (as you attempted to do), the correct answers are, yes, the intellect is responsible for their inception and yes, it is

also responsible for the notion of sensory consciousnesses and any subsequent perceptions based on those consciousnesses. In dzogchen none of these qualities are established.

Jyoti said:
Only the body is considered established (as permanent), not the means, so rendering the means as unestablished is to maintain the dynamic and creativity of it.

krodha wrote:
Yes, according to yogācāra... according to dzogchen nothing is established.

asunthatneversets said:
According to Yogācāra... not dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
It is also according to Dzogchen based on Mipham's texts.

krodha wrote:
We have already established that you are basing these notions off of some texts (specifically 'The Lion's Roar') written by Mipham which are denatured exegetically.

asunthatneversets said:
Those differences point to nothing except for what you wish to extract from them. The existence of space and time are delusory notions born of conceptualization, predicated on the delusory notion of a subject-object dichotomy. Your example assumes that you as a subject are in fact observing an objective aircraft. It also assumes that the aircraft is an object which is truly apprehended by the eye consciousness and ear consciousness. You presuppose the appearance of a consecutive unfolding of moments in time to be authentic and again, also consider experience to be divided into an internal-external dichotomy. Far too many suppositions occurring, your argument and example are again irrevocably flawed.

Jyoti said:
As stated the two-fold division (subject and object) of consciousness is the form and means of the body (yogacara) or clarity and capacity of the essence (dzogchen), it is the support of the dependent arising nature (nirmanakaya) as well as pure realms (sambogakaya). Conceptual construction only responsible for the formation of the

imaginary nature, a term which is foreign to your tradition that also entertained visualization practices.

krodha wrote:
You're talking about yogācāra.

asunthatneversets said:
Any dharma of permanence is a deluded dharma.

Jyoti said:
So the dharmakaya (samantabadra) and nirvana of your tradition are not permanent, because if the dharmakaya (samantabadra) and nirvana are permanent it is a deluded dharma?

krodha wrote:
They are not permanent, nor are they impermanent.

asunthatneversets said:
There is no quality which possesses only non-cessation, nor any which possesses only endurance. The quote above is stating that out of this apparent reality, which is unborn, appearances seemingly manifest, yet within those appearances nothing is ever truly established, there is only the timeless display of the primordial nature. Because it is beyond the four extremes, within apparent enduring there is no endurance, nothing is created or established. Within apparent cessation, there is nothing which ceases, nothing is destroyed or terminated.

Jyoti said:
I'm not saying the manifested appearance or means are permanent. But refering to the unborn and primordial nature, how can this be impermanent and yet unborn at the same time?

krodha wrote:
How can that which is unborn posses any such characteristics?

asunthatneversets said:
In dzogchen phenomena are products of delusion, if the authentic condition is known then what was previously mistaken as phenomena is known to be the luminous self-

display of the basis, and the basis is uncreated. Stating that the dynamism and creativity of reality require a permanent and non-arising basis is flawed logic and nothing more than wishful thinking.

Jyoti said:
Delusion is refering to the imaginary nature produce in the absence of knowledge, but the cause of this delusion which is the dependent arising nature is not produce by the delusion. Otherwise, the delusion which is depended on the dependent arising nature produce the dependent arising nature is not logical, as the former would not exist prior to the 'production' of the latter.

krodha wrote:
Delusion is referring to ma-rigpa.

"Kyema! Although I am devoid of confusion, confusion arose from my expression. After the nature manifested unobstructedly from the unchanging ground, ignorance naturally manifested from the indeterminate compassion. For example, although the sky does not truly posses clouds, the clouds still arise momentarily. Likewise, no ignorance exists in the ground, yet ignorance naturally arises from the aspect of what manifested as compassion. Thus, the 'natural state of the ground of spontaneous presence' was formed."
- The Tantra Of Great Auspicious Beauty

asunthatneversets said:
Padmasambhava had this to say about the two truths in Self Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness:
"The Madhyamikas are (mentally) obscured by their attachments to the extremes of the Two Truths."

Jyoti said:
This is refering to the Madhyamikas (persons) and not Madhyamika, if there is a person with realization of the non-extremes (nonduality) of the two truths, then even though he is of Madhyamika, there is no fault. Similarly a Buddha can take the position of Madhyamika and has flawless view. The difference is just one with realization and one without the realization. One without the realization will rely on the method of analysis to arrive at conceptual understanding of the meaning, this is the cause of the extremes of the two truths (separate and not nondual). However, the doctrine of Madhyamika is not at fault, it is the person who failed to realise the true meaning. The same thing applied to yogacara and dzogchen, faults belonged to individual but not the teaching.

krodha wrote:
That is your interpretation of his statement. Madhyamaka is a wonderful and effective teaching, but he is addressing Madhyamaka in this quote.

asunthatneversets said:
Internal and external are concepts, and while those concepts are useful, they have no authenticity beyond their place as mere concepts. Believing them to be authentic and inherent aspects of experience is delusion.

Jyoti said:
Again only the imaginary nature within the internal and external field are conceptual construction, such conceptual construction has no meaning, not to mention being useful (for what?). This does not include the dependent arising nature within the internal and external field, as this is not of conceptual construction, nor of product of delusion. Also, the two-division of consciousness itself is the form and means of the body which is not of conceptual construction.

krodha wrote:
There are no internal and external fields in dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
Your notion of the "underlying truth and reason" is another concept which you've attached to and yes it certainly does provide you with notions of what to accept and reject, as we've all seen regularly on this forum. I do enjoy how you contradict yourself and fall victim to your own projections as your response goes along though.

Jyoti said:
So you are proposing to negate the truth or reason of authentic nature (thusness), viz. the vidya?

krodha wrote:
Only the concepts regarding it.

asunthatneversets said:
The metaphor of the mirror is implemented to elucidate the characteristics of the primordial state, the tendency to interpret the metaphorical use of the mirror-itself as suggesting an abiding ground is a common misconception. In that metaphor it is more accurate to explore the reflective capacity of the mirror, instead of the mirror itself,

otherwise we fall victim to the essentialist/eternalist views such as yours. So the mirror's reflective capacity is never tainted by the reflections themselves, much like the natural state's empty essence is ever-pure. The mirror helps to describe the natural state's primordial purity (kadag), spontaneous radiance/presence (lhundrup) and responsiveness (thugs rje).

Jyoti said:
As I mentioned the use of mirror is to communicate the capacity, or means. Rather than 'to elucidate the characteristics of the primordial state' or body, the mirror is to show the means is capable of reflecting the 'reason' (vidya) of thusness', thus capable of holding the reason in the state of arising, whereas the body itself does not have the arising. This capacity of holding the reason in the state of arising is the intellect. If the body is to be rely instead of the means (intellect), the use of mirror is redundant. The mirror symbolize the thought (means), the thought of the reason of thusness is symbolize by the mirror's reflection of thusness, which is the same but of different side, the side of non-arising (without thought) which is the original state and the side of arising (with thought) which is the reflected state.

krodha wrote:
This is your yogācārin interpretation of this metaphor.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen is only the primordial state, the anu-yoga practices may be used as supports for maintaining the dzogchen view, but they are not dzogchen any more than walking down the street is dzogchen (if one is maintaining the view). Anu-yoga practices are very useful, but they are not ati-yoga in essence, only when practiced by one who is abiding in the knowledge of ati.

Jyoti said:
In other words, you are saying vidya is dzogchen, I can also say the intellect is yogacara, so what is the difference?

krodha wrote:
We can say lots of things, the difference is that dzogchen is the experience, not the words.

asunthatneversets said:
Samantabhadra is only representative of the primordial state, and in fact is the personification of the primordial state. Samantabhadra has nothing to do with the

individuals consciousness.

Jyoti said:
In that case, this is monotheism, since this Samantabhadra has nothing to do with your own consciousness.

krodha wrote:
Your statement is predicated on your assumption that consciousness is the end-all and be-all. And your monotheism comment is in turn predicated on the assumptions that 1) a consciousness exists 2) the primordial state is an object which could exist outside or beyond consciousness, and 3) that the primordial state is an established omniscience of some sort.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen speaks of the destruction of the world at the end of the great kalpa as a metaphor, not to be taken literally, no world has ever been created or destroyed in the view of dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
Metaphor for what? I'm aware of the meaning of non-arising, but that is only refering to the ultimate condition, the dependent-arising nature (the appearance of time) has persistance and it is not terminated on awakening.

krodha wrote:
The dependent arising nature is illusory in dzogchen. The 'ultimate condition' is dzogchen. I believe it's a metaphor in reference to certain mennagde practices.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen only accepts the level of the individual mind-stream as a tentative and relative appearance, which is rendered null and void apart from conventional appearance, so it is completely illusory, but a useful illusion. Individuated seeds of karma are products of delusion and are eradicated upon the actualization of the primordial state. You're reaching quite far in attempting to equate dzogchen to your view you enjoy propagating, it cannot be done.

Jyoti said:
Illusory nature with persistance, this is the meaning. It is not a negation of mere

appearance and dependent arising nature. The seeds are always on the constant change of state, from active to inactive based on the presence of perfuming or lack of perfuming. On attaining the bodhi, the bad seeds become inactive, whereas the good seeds become active and multiply and manifest as pure realms, otherwise the cause of pure realms would be absence. It is not the case where the bad seeds are eradicated, they simply become inactive. The various bhumis are the result of maturing the various good seeds and their multiplying. No result happened without a cause, and dzogchen is no exception.

krodha wrote:
According to yogācāra, not dzogchen. Dzogchen is beyond cause and effect.

asunthatneversets said:
It's all conceptual construction.

Jyoti said:
So you are saying the trikaya and four wisdoms are conceptual construction, then we can day dream and attained the trikaya and four wisdoms?

krodha wrote:
You would be day dreaming if you thought you had in fact attained them in any circumstance.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen isn't a buddhist teaching, it is your true nature. The teachings are a tool which aid one in recognizing that nature, but the teachings are not dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
So you are saying Buddhist teaching is not about your true nature and therefore not the same as dzogchen?

krodha wrote:
The teachings are 'about' the true nature... dzogchen is that true nature.

asunthatneversets said:
Good and bad are relative notions which are always product of thought, in recognizing the primordial state thought is pacified and benefit is already present. Rigpa is synonymous with bodhicitta.

Jyoti said:
The recognizing is also of thought, otherwise you are talking about the body which can't be attained. Pacified thought is not the aim of knowledge. Bodhicitta shared the same means as the deluded mind, it is termed bodhicitta in the presence of the intellect, and termed the deluded mind in the presence of delusion, so it is not the same as knowledge (vidya), although knowledge is the cause of bodhicitta.

krodha wrote:
The recognition is not of thought, and nothing is attained, there is no recognizer. Relative bodhicitta shared the same means as the deluded mind perhaps. Absolute bodhicitta is rigpa.

asunthatneversets said:
there's no other reason why you would actively seek to devalue other traditions.

Jyoti said:
Saying dzogchen is in fact equalled or comparable to yogacara in term of the structure, how is this devalue other traditions?

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
Because it's not equivalent to or comparable (in most every aspect) to yogācāra in terms of structure. On the level of it's teaching, it does share some vague comparisons, but as mentioned above, the teaching isn't dzogchen. Ok it's 4:30am, luckily Rinpoche's webcast kept me awake to do this response, bedtime now, goodnight Jyoti

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 23rd, 2012 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: Is it possible to get a religious vaccine exemption?
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
Lhugpa, ummmm... Do you really expect anyone with any critical thinking skills to take the above websites seriously?! Come onnnnn... That first link alone sounds like it was written by some paranoid 18 yr old living in his parents' basement. I mean, if you're gonna make all those outlandish and unsupported claims, at least do yourself a favor and don't make the whole piece riddled with spelling and grammatical errors.

How about something from some sort of peer reviewed journal with support and citations?

krodha wrote:
There's a good documentary out there called "The Greater Good" about vaccination dangers. Unfortunately it appears to be somewhat suppressed although some television channels like Current TV have aired it in the past. I've tried to keep an objective point of view on the issue but some of the evidence is very compelling, enough so that apart from 2 or 3 important ones, my son doesn't get vaccinations. That documentary is definitely worth checking out if you want more info.

Personally, If I was going in for a job and they wouldn't give it to me unless I injected some sh*t into my body I would respectfully decline and be on my way.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: Six Types Of Mindfulness in Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Found this on the bhūmi's, they're innate aspects of the primordial state and though they're always presented as a hierarchical structure, because dzogchen isn't a gradual or causal vehicle they shouldn't be approached as separate levels in a structured hierarchy...

"Well, if I am really a buddha right now, are the six levels of realization present or not? They are totally, absolutely present!

'The sign of this unceasing, self-arising pristine awareness is the utter clarity of the five sense organs. This is called 'the level of light everywhere'. The absence of any form of attachment or objectification is known as 'desireless lotus'. This state of pure and total presence which does not arise and is indestructible I also call indestructible comprehension. Self-arising pristine awareness is arrayed throughout my immeasurable, true nature. This is known as 'the level of intense display'. All the phenomena which exist in the integrative structure of pure and total presence, my very self, are known as 'the level of the great wheel of letters'. Because form, communication, and awareness neither come about, nor are they destroyed. This is known as 'the level of indestructible comprehension'. Here cause and effect are not different. The phenomena which arise from mind - good and bad, acceptance and rejection - are primordially nonexistent. This I call 'the level of non-differentiation'.'

Though we can distinguish six aspects in this unity, they are not other than the singular dimension of self-arising pristine awareness. Thus we speak of 'the one level of total completeness'.
This present awareness, from the very beginning, is without obstructions and does not

stir from reality as-it-is. The individual clarity of the five sense perceptions and the individual clarity of the passions manifesting as the five pristine awarenesses are known as the play of pristine awareness. Because they are complete in themselves without having to be sought for, it is not necessary to hope or fear."

"'Light everywhere' is the eleventh bodhisattva level, 'desireless lotus' is the twelfth, 'intense display' is the thirteenth, 'the great wheel of letters' is the fourteenth, 'indestructible comprehension' is the fifteenth, and 'non-differentiation' is the sixteenth. For a detailed discussion of the ten lower stages (bhūmis) see H.V. Guenther, 'The Jewel Ornament of Liberation', (Berkeley; Shambhala 1971). The eleventh through sixteenth levels are discussed in the gsang ba'i snying po and it's many commentaries, for which see 'Matrix Of Mystery'."

- Longchenpa|Kennard Lipman|Merrill Peterson, (2000). "You Are The Eyes Of The World", Snow Lion

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 11:51 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The Nyingma Dzogchen doesn't posit a two-truth dichotomy either.

Jyoti said:
Again, the two-truth itself is not dichotomy. Because there is only one body within the two-truth. The body is the ultimate truth, whereas the means of this body manifest as conventional truth. Conventional truth is none other than the dependent arising nature, the dependent arising nature is none other than object of the 7 consciousnesses.

krodha wrote:
The only dichotomy dzogchen employs is delusion and wisdom. Dependent arising is the way in which distinct things or qualities seemingly exist. Dependent arising can't be an object of the 7 consciousnesses because the 7 consciousnesses only exist on a conventional level and therefore are dependently originated themselves.

asunthatneversets said:
just because (as a teaching) it has survived within the systems of the Nyingma or Bön doesn't mean it in itself has been adulterated in any way, shape or form. That would be impossible.

Jyoti said:
The teaching has been adulterated, partly due to translation to Tibetan, and it will get worse when translated into other languages, and partly due to incorporating into the gradual vehicles, as the definitive meaning contradict the provisional meaning. That's why we need capable scholars like Mipham who can make commentaries that has a significance with respect to main stream buddhism. That's also the reason why it need

to be compared against scriptures of definitive meaning especially from the chinese tripitaka as well as yogacara of chinese buddhism. It may choose to be isolated from the rest of buddhism, and being subject to further corruption due to the work of human nature, where the means to rectify will be completely absence. Or it can choose to be part of the main stream buddhism, able to criticize others, as well as being criticized if something goes wrong. The later approach is recommended, being able withstand criticism through the intellectual writings will help the teaching to stay on the right track, as well as helping others who have wrong in their tradition and teaching. If one is on the right track, there should be no fear being able to defend what is right, and opposed to what is wrong.

krodha wrote:
Since dzogchen is experiential, the truth it points to is unassailable and cannot be adulterated. Certain groups or individuals (such as yourself) may attempt to interpret dzogchen within the frame of their own structure of reasoning, and in doing so, adulterate it... but at that point it's no longer dzogchen which is being adulterated, all that is being botched is a mere intellectual translation/interpretation. You only enjoy Mipham because his exposition matches your own point of view, and therefore you continually champion his exposition in The Lions Roar. You're only looking to validate your construct of beliefs.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen is the actualization of the natural state within one's experience, you either experience dzogchen or you don't, talking about dzogchen isn't dzogchen, the texts about dzogchen aren't dzogchen, these things point to it... and if you can recognize it within your own experience, then that is dzogchen.

Jyoti said:
Since everything is consciousness (nature state or experience), saying about the actualization of consciousness is not making sense. This is one example of what would be corrupting the teaching when relying on specific words as ultimate rather than relying on the meaning.

krodha wrote:
I never said everything is consciousness, the natural state isn't consciousness. The reason a term like 'consciousness' is usually avoided is because if dzogchen asserted that everything is consciousness then it would run the risk of suggesting the existence of an abiding ground of being, or substratum. Saying that everything is consciousness suggests that something has been established, which is perfectly acceptable in yogācāra, but not in dzogchen. The actualization of the natural state is the recognition of the authentic condition, that condition isn't consciousness, only the teaching you champion (Yogācāra and other eternalist views) claims that. Consciousness (as a term) is also avoided because it suggests a number of other subtleties, for example: 'one who is conscious' and/or a localized occurrence of consciousness contrasting other pockets of consciousness (as you suggest below) and so on and so forth.

asunthatneversets said:

'Awakened mind' is just another way of saying prajñā, yeshe, sherab etc...

Jyoti said:
Prajna is not subject to awakening (bodhi), it belong to the category of the body, which is existence, permanent, non-arising, uncreated, etc. Bodhi belongs to the category of the means, which is existence and non-existence, permanent and impermanent, non-arising and arising, uncreated and created, etc. As is the association of mind with 'awakened', mind as stated previously belongs to the category of the means.

krodha wrote:
'Awakened mind' is just a relative term, it isn't to be taken literally, nothing truly awakens, and there is no mind in dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
The delusory appearances of conventional truth are a great lie, means that the seeming persons, places, things etc... that appear to exist as a result of conceptual projection are illusory

Jyoti said:
These (persons, places, things etc.) are not the result of conceptual projection. If you rendered persons as conceptual projection for example, you basically rendered the person's body is not due to the dependent arising nature, and you also rendered the person's consciousness as non-existence. Then you suffered the consequence of having to rationalize your own consciousness as a singular reality, viz. the alaya-vijnana in others are false.

krodha wrote:
They are the result of conceptual projection. People are conceptual projections, and yes the person's body is due to dependent origination, it depends on the projected web of concepts.

asunthatneversets said:
Unwittingly believing the illusion to be truly authentic is delusion (avidyā). When delusion is recognized to be delusion, then ignorance is neutralized and wisdom remains.

Jyoti said:
In the absence of illusion (imaginary nature), one merely remained authentic with the dependent arising nature (consciousness), this is not any different than one who practice the formless and cessation meditation, since in both cases, one absorped into what remains, i.e. consciousness itself (absolute nature). Then how come the arahat and the worldly meditators who attained this is said to be not the awakening (bodhi) of buddhahood? The answer is the intellect is absence.

krodha wrote:
Only according to Yogācāra. In dzogchen there is only delusion and wisdom. You must be using the term "intellect" to represent knowledge of thusness, usually "intellect" is

used to signify conceptual processes of reasoning.

asunthatneversets said:
This is referring to ignorance (avidyā).

Jyoti said:
One can visualize deity (mental image) and perceive what is not, as long as one view the deity with the intellect, it is not consider a view of delusion. Therefore, delusion has nothing to do with vision, whether of imagery or of dependent arising nature, but has to do with the absence of the intellect.

krodha wrote:
Avidyā is ignorance of the authentic condition.

asunthatneversets said:
It is certainly referring to the basis of external and internal as imaginary, because that basis is avidyā.

Jyoti said:
External and internal are also of vision, as stated above avidyā is not determine by the vision. Avidya as it literally translated as the absence of knowledge, even in the absence of external and internal vision through force of conceptual construction or in formless meditative condition, if the knowledge is absence, these formless/nondual conditions or states are not free of avidyā.

krodha wrote:
Internal and external are conceptual projections, they do not exist inherently, they have nothing to do with vision. Even vision itself is a delusional notion when it comes down to it. They are imputed constructs. Formless meditative states (as in blank voids of closed off samadhi) have nothing to do with dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
This is stating that the appearance of environments (external world) and life forms (sentient beings endowed with internality) only seem real due to the deceiving nature of the conceptual superstructure amassed by the intellect.

Jyoti said:
You don't called it 'intellect' in the absence of knowledge, the right word is 'delusion'. On the other hand, in the presence of intellect, what seem 'real' (deceptive) is considered the dependent arising nature, and what seems unreal (non-deceptive mental image) is considered imaginary nature, there is no confusion between the two and the latter is not considered as the conventional truth. Again what seems real and unreal, has nothing to do with the knowledge of the ultimate meaning that constitutes the ultimate truth.

krodha wrote:
Intellect is a term which is acceptable, or delusion works as well if you prefer that term. The issue seems to be that you're using the term 'intellect' to signify some type of

faculty of enlightened wisdom. There are no non-deceptive mental images being that there are no mental images. As for the rest of your answer you're derailing into obfuscation as usual.

asunthatneversets said:
The rampant habitual proclivity to presuppose conventional imputation is accurately framing the nature of experience, dissimulates reality and makes it appear as that which it is not, just like misperceiving a rope to be a snake.

Jyoti said:
Like the visualization of deity, it is of imaginery nature (fake), but there is no binding if the intellect is present, viz. even affliction is bodhi in the presence of the intellect. But identify what is imaginery nature is to separate it from the dependent arising nature, because it is due to the truth of dependent arising nature, that true bodhicitta can arise, to negate it in favour of the formless ultimate truth therefore strayed from the point of mahayana, thus the middle path.

krodha wrote:
Affliction is never bodhi. You either have one or the other and neither are ever truly established. Bodhi as a term is only implemented to signify the absence of affliction, in contrast of affliction, otherwise bodhi is simply the natural state.

asunthatneversets said:
Metaphorically, the snake is a figment of the imagination, the rope is the nature of mind (or 'thusness' as you like to say).

Jyoti said:
The imaginery nature is also thusness, as everything is mere consciousness, the body of consciousness is the thusness. But thusness does not negate the imaginary nature, as there is no requirement since the negation is not the cause of thusness. Similarly thusness has no requirement to negate the dependent arising nature, and consequently the conventional truth, since the negation is not the cause of thusness. Hence, there are the three natures, but only two inherently exist, whereas the other imaginery exists.

krodha wrote:
Only according to Yogācāra are there natures which inherently exist, according to dzogchen, nothing exists inherently, everything is illusory.

asunthatneversets said:
So the nature of the two-truths is that the delusional appearances of avidyā have no reality whatsoever apart from delusion, they are birthed and sustained by conventional dissimulation and the authentic condition has nothing to do with these delusional appearances, nor is it truly ever effected by them (even the notion of an authentic condition is a conventional dissimulation, though the notion is warranted since it requires distinction from delusion).

Jyoti said:
Imaginary nature exist even in the state of vidya, for example in deity meditation while holding the view (vidya), and in the case of buddha, is expressed as the state of sambogakaya. Basically the buddha has no fear with regards to the three natures, as these are none other than the trikaya.

krodha wrote:
When I say "the delusional appearances of avidyā" I'm addressing how the 'imaginary nature' is related to, if the authentic condition is known, then the 'imaginary nature' is no problem, if it isn't known, then the imaginary nature wreaks havoc.... but of course there is no specific faculty called the 'imaginary nature' in dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
The conventional truth wasn't outright negated, but it wasn't reaffirmed either, it was considered comparable to delusion, which it is.

Jyoti said:
You compare the knowledge of the conventional truth as delusion, but conventional truth is none other than the truth of the dependent arising nature, it is the potency (means) of the body (nirvana) that manifest as the nirmanakaya.

krodha wrote:
The nirmanakaya is the unconfined, unobstructed and uninterrupted capacity and/or energetic display of the primordial state.

asunthatneversets said:
So if the intellect is the party responsible for distinguishing objects, and also responsible for the 'imaginary nature' attributed to these alleged objects... why is it not also responsible for their inception? And why is it not responsible for the notion of sensory consciousness and perception as well?

Jyoti said:
This is due to the six sensory consciousnesses are the support of the desire realm (corresponds to nirmanakaya), in their absence, the 7th consciousness can indeed function on its own, and in that case, it manifests the form realm (both internal and external). This corresponds to the sambogakaya.

krodha wrote:
Those were rhetorical questions. But if we must answer them (as you attempted to do), the correct answers are, yes, the intellect is responsible for their inception and yes, it is also responsible for the notion of sensory consciousnesses and any subsequent perceptions based on those consciousnesses. In dzogchen none of these qualities are established.

asunthatneversets said:
Are there really objects? Objects 'out there' which are gathered by sensory consciousness? Aren't these objects in fact the presence of the senses themselves?

Can you truly separate an object from the modalities of tactile and visual sensation? And aren't these senses in fact the presence of consciousness itself? Can you truly separate consciousness from sensation? Sensation from objects?

Jyoti said:
Mere appearance of object both exist and non-exist, it exists as mere appearance with dependent arising nature, it non-exists as permanent appearance with essence of such characteristics. Knowledge of what exist and non-exist in term of mere appearance is the conventional truth. All objects are mere perceptions (consciousness). Sensation is also perception (consciousness). Thus everything is consciousness and consciousness is none other than thusness. Knowledge of the conventional object in term of the body of consciousness is the ultimate truth. Thus the two truths exist, being different, yet inseparate from within the same conventional object.

krodha wrote:
Those were also rhetorical questions.

asunthatneversets said:
Objects seem to exist because one is ignorant of their true condition, if that condition is known then it is also known that no objects have ever existed (or not existed).

Jyoti said:
As stated above, conventional truth has its object exists in the mode of mere appearance and dependent arising, whereas the knowledge of the ultimate truth of object does not cause mere appearance to cease to appear, nor for dependent origination to cease while in the presence of condition, this is the reason that both truths exist without one capable of negating the other. The ultimate truth only negate the essence exists for the characteristics of appearance to be permanent, whereas conventional truth negate the ultimate truth possessing the characteristics of dependent origination, thus none of them capable of negating the truth that established each of them distinctively.

krodha wrote:
According to Yogācāra... not dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
you're right that initial moment of contact is free of conceptual activity... so therefore it's also free of 'objects' and likewise free of the 'senses' is it not?

Jyoti said:
There is existence of space and time that can clearly distinguished the existence of subject and object distinctions. In term of space and time, it is best by observing a supersonic aircraft, when one see the aircraft with the eye consciousness, one cannot hear with the ear consciousness the sound of the aircraft approaching, until a moment later, the reason is that the existence of space and time between the subject (consciousness) and object (consciousness) is the cause of the delay of the arriving of the sound. The differences of object (light) and the object (sound) point to a causality

factor which is the dependent arising nature, the differences also point to the dependent arising nature has two division of internal and external field of experience.

krodha wrote:
Those differences point to nothing except for what you wish to extract from them. The existence of space and time are delusory notions born of conceptualization, predicated on the delusory notion of a subject-object dichotomy. Your example assumes that you as a subject are in fact observing an objective aircraft. It also assumes that the aircraft is an object which is truly apprehended by the eye consciousness and ear consciousness. You presuppose the appearance of a consecutive unfolding of moments in time to be authentic and again, also consider experience to be divided into an internal-external dichotomy. Far too many suppositions occurring, your argument and example are again irrevocably flawed.

asunthatneversets said:
Or perhaps you don't see that your habitual tendency to employ conceptual activity has become a deeply engrained perception that governs your experience. After years and years of this vicious little cycle you have formed (what are now 'subconscious') presuppositions regarding these divisions and conceptual activities. You actually believe that some of these activities are somehow inherent, or left-over when conceptualization has ceased, and you don't question them but instead try to convince others that this is true so you can feel safe and warm in your little bubble of delusion. If you would question these presuppositions, you would find that, "such is the moment where the dependent arising nature of object is established as" COMPLETELY dependent on conceptual construction. You have not taken your investigation of dependent arising all the way to the ground.

Jyoti said:
Our relative dimension of existence that correspond to nirmanakaya, possessses dependent arising nature, time and space relativity, all these are not base on conceptual construction. Whereas the blissful dimension of existence that correspond to the sambogakaya, is all about subject and object images that are pure, objects here can be imaginary and mind-only, but in the presence of intellect, there is no binding, and due to permanence in appearances as opposed to the dependent-arising appearances, there is bliss. Thus, even by leaving dependent arising nature and engaged in conceptual construction in the presence of intellect does not bind. This is what the tantra of generation/transformation all about, what is generated is the internal and external appearance, the means of transformation is the mind (imaginary construction).

krodha wrote:
They certainly are based on conceptual construction.

asunthatneversets said:
In buddhism 'emptiness' is another word for dependent origination, and just as Nāgārjuna points out in his 60 Stanzas: "The supreme knower of reality, said that dependent production is not production."

"The wonder of it! This marvelous, astounding event/reality (Dharma):
From that which involves no origination, everything originates;
and in that very origination, there is no origination!
The wonder of it!
In it's very enduring, there is no enduring!
The wonder of it!
In it's very cessation, there is no cessation!"
- Guhyagarbha Tantra

Jyoti said:
This is not contradictory, in the mahayana, the dependent origination is the means to communicate the dharma of permanence which is about the absolute - buddha nature. Whenever there is cessation and no cessation, or enduring and no enduring coming in pairs, it is pointing to the means, by pointing to the means, the means point to the body which has only non-cessation and enduring. Since only by the existence of the truth of non-cessation and enduring as a basis, can there be the truth in the manifestation of cessation and no cessation, or enduring and no enduring.

krodha wrote:
Any dharma of permanence is a deluded dharma. There is no quality which possesses only non-cessation, nor any which possesses only endurance. The quote above is stating that out of this apparent reality, which is unborn, appearances seemingly manifest, yet within those appearances nothing is ever truly established, there is only the timeless display of the primordial nature. Because it is beyond the four extremes, within apparent enduring there is no endurance, nothing is created or established. Within apparent cessation, there is nothing which ceases, nothing is destroyed or terminated.

asunthatneversets said:
I can agree with the former half of this (regarding the dependent arising nature), although I'm not sure if I'd derive permanence from it's ceaselessness. Also, since the phenomena in question are merely deceptive appearances they can only appear to be simultaneously impermanent/permanent, they (being empty) cannot truly posses such traits.

Jyoti said:
Phenomena or appearance is manifestation, it is not the basis or body. Only the manifestation can have the characteristic of arising and ceasing, or permanent and impermanent coming in pairs. The basis or body has to be permanent, and non-arising in order to maintain such dynamic and creative occurrences.

krodha wrote:
In dzogchen phenomena are products of delusion, if the authentic condition is known then what was previously mistaken as phenomena is known to be the luminous self-display of the basis, and the basis is uncreated. Stating that the dynamism and creativity of reality require a permanent and non-arising basis is flawed logic and

nothing more than wishful thinking.

asunthatneversets said:
If Mipham did deviate from the traditional view in an attempt to create some form of coalescence between Dzogchen and Mādhyamaka

Jyoti said:
Dzogchen is actually the greater Mādhyamaka (refer to 'Self-liberation by Nakedly Awareness' by Padmasambhava). Padmasambhava is also the one who continously maintained the two truths in his dzogchen discourses to Yeshe Thogyal. So Mipham is certainly not the first to maintain the two truths and Madhyamaka in dzogchen. So by corruption it referred specifically the recent effort to dismiss the two truths and Madhyamaka (including the common mahayana) in dzogchen. Bear in mind that without these two, your tradition will be no different from the 2 yanas which also realises the same emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Padmasambhava had this to say about the two truths in Self Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness:

"....Also there exist others who, being attached to their own personal ideas and interpretations,
Become fettered by these attachments and so do not perceive the Clear Light.
The Sravakas and the Pratyekabuddhas are (mentally) obscured by their attachments to subject and object.
The Madhyamikas are (mentally) obscured by their attachments to the extremes of the Two Truths.
The practitioners of the Kriya Tantra and the Yoga Tantra are (mentally) obscured by their attachments to seva-sadhana practice.
The practitioners of the Maha-yoga and the Anuyoga are (mentally) obscured by their attachments to Space and Awareness.
And with respect to the real meaning of non-duality, since they divide these (Space and Awareness) into two, they fall into deviation...."

asunthatneversets said:
Mainly the two-fold division of the "ultimate" into "non-deluded subject and non-delusory object", this is an incorrigible notion in the eyes of ati-yoga. Therefore to associate concepts such as these with the teachings of dzogchen, is to contaminate those teachings.

Jyoti said:
However, to think that the mere identification of internal and external is a concept, and such concept contaminate the teaching, then such a person already have a concept as to what to accept and reject, irrespective of the underlying truth and reason. Then such a concept is not in concordance with the way things are. The same with the means and body, without knowing the different, one misses the key point of practice as well as in analysis. For instant, thought is of the external and of the means, whereas original

wisdom is of the internal and of the body, by knowing the site of the internal, by remaining in that, the nature is seen, this is the equavalent of direct introduction of the original face. Similarly, by knowing the external means, the internal state can be reflected externally as an object like a reflection is exactly the same as the original, an analogy of using mirror, to be generated at anytime once becoming familiar, and utilize as the reason for the function of the non-analytical intellect.

krodha wrote:
Internal and external are concepts, and while those concepts are useful, they have no authenticity beyond their place as mere concepts. Believing them to be authentic and inherent aspects of experience is delusion. The only contamination which apparently takes place is your own inability to recognize your authentic condition. Your notion of the "underlying truth and reason" is another concept which you've attached to and yes it certainly does provide you with notions of what to accept and reject, as we've all seen regularly on this forum. I do enjoy how you contradict yourself and fall victim to your own projections as your response goes along though.

Jyoti said:
The intellect being connected to the bodhi, the integration of the intellect with the exernal basis (7 consciousnesses), is the function of perfuming the seeds of bodhi, which directly lead to the progress in the bhumi. Whereas the body itself, by absorbing into that, a function is lost, like a boat being driven by the torrent, being passive it become one with the torrent. The body beyond progress and degeneration, will remain the same whether one pretend to be with it or not, thus one does not intentionally trying to become the body, nor bother with it, but one rely only on the reflected reason that is the capacity of intellect. But without knowing the difference of internal and external, the knowledge of means and body, even to progress and bhumi in the bodhi would be absence, such a person only know the body, the wisdom, without knowing the means, a progress can't be made.

krodha wrote:
The point you're attempting to make is obfuscated by your use of terminology.

asunthatneversets said:
Again, Dzogchen does not uphold that an inherent division exists. Dzogchen also doesn't create a distinction between one consciousness and other consciousnesses nor does it ultimately give credence to the notion of other beings (being that it considers the duality of sentient and non-sentient to be delusory, and therefore does not purport such notions).

Jyoti said:
Dzogchen does distinguish the means and the body, example is the use of mirror's reflection to symbolize the means (vidya) of the primordial state (body). Then there is the use of deity or symbol for visualization to generate the primordial state (object), and then rely on the mental impression which is the reflected image of the original object, this mental impression is on the side of means and can be generated after becoming familiar, and so can be brought into function of the intellect. If you read Longchenpa's

work, he does make commentary regarding the individual 8 consciousnesses. It is really impossible for a mahayana doctrine, especially for one claiming to be the summit of all vehicles not being equipped with such basic knowledge of buddhism It is commonly accepted knowledge that the higher vehicle cover the knowledge of the lower, but not the lower the higher. In this case, it is expected that dzogchen cover the basis of buddhism, regardless of what others say due to their motive of isolating dzogchen from the common mahayana. Dzogchen share the same view with the common mahayana regarding the existence of beings with their own individual mind stream, regardless of the notion of Samantabadra as unique, as Samantabadra is only regarding the individual's consciousness. Example is dzogchen accept the destruction of the world at the end of the great kalpa, where beings only left with their alaya-vijnana, with all other consciousnesses annihilated, this is clearly showing dzogchen accept individual possessing separate mind-streams (not just illusion). The notion of there being no separate mind-streams, hence no separate alaya-vijnana in beings is not acceptable in buddhism or dzogchen is due to the requirement of maintaining individual seeds of karma, if beings has no separate alaya-vijnana, then each of them has no persistent within dependent-origination.

krodha wrote:
The metaphor of the mirror is implemented to elucidate the characteristics of the primordial state, the tendency to interpret the metaphorical use of the mirror-itself as suggesting an abiding ground is a common misconception. In that metaphor it is more accurate to explore the reflective capacity of the mirror, instead of the mirror itself, otherwise we fall victim to the essentialist/eternalist views such as yours. So the mirror's reflective capacity is never tainted by the reflections themselves, much like the natural state's empty essence is ever-pure. The mirror helps to describe the natural state's primordial purity (kadag), spontaneous radiance/presence (lhundrup) and responsiveness (thugs rje).

The visualization and generation practices are not dzogchen, they are maha-yoga and anu-yoga practices. Dzogchen is only the primordial state, the anu-yoga practices may be used as supports for maintaining the dzogchen view, but they are not dzogchen any more than walking down the street is dzogchen (if one is maintaining the view). Anu-yoga practices are very useful, but they are not ati-yoga in essence, only when practiced by one who is abiding in the knowledge of ati. Samantabhadra is only representative of the primordial state, and in fact is the personification of the primordial state. Samantabhadra has nothing to do with the individuals consciousness. Dzogchen speaks of the destruction of the world at the end of the great kalpa as a metaphor, not to be taken literally, no world has ever been created or destroyed in the view of dzogchen. Dzogchen only accepts the level of the individual mind-stream as a tentative and relative appearance, which is rendered null and void apart from conventional appearance, so it is completely illusory, but a useful illusion. Individuated seeds of karma are products of delusion and are eradicated upon the actualization of the primordial state. You're reaching quite far in attempting to equate dzogchen to your view you enjoy propagating, it cannot be done.

asunthatneversets said:

The two-fold division is itself a product of conceptual construction. Mere appearances only appear to establish themselves in such a (two-fold) manner due to conforming with the initial imputed designation of two-fold division.

Jyoti said:
Unless you are saying the 8 consciousnesses are product of conceptual construction, they are not. Otherwise the four wisdoms and trikaya would be conceptual construction as well.

krodha wrote:
It's all conceptual construction.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen doesn't stray into ultimate truth or relative truth, neither of these notions can contain it.

Jyoti said:
There is no buddhist teaching outside the two truths, as these are termed the truth, they are not of notion, nor can notion establish either of them.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen isn't a buddhist teaching, it is your true nature. The teachings are a tool which aid one in recognizing that nature, but the teachings are not dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
It's actually another thought which determines whether a prior thought is good or bad, and that
whole process is dependent on thought (memory) itself and is therefore completely illusory.

Jyoti said:
Of course the previous is only a brief description, fuller meaning is whether the content of thought is determine by the intellect or delusion. For the former, what is beneficial for self and others is considered good, what is otherwise is considered bad. For the latter, all determination of what is good or bad would be non-definitive, and of individual opinion only.

krodha wrote:
Good and bad are relative notions which are always product of thought, in recognizing the primordial state thought is pacified and benefit is already present. Rigpa is synonymous with bodhicitta.

asunthatneversets said:
Only in Yogācāra does awakened wisdom refer to consciousness, awakened wisdom in dzogchen has nothing to do with consciousness. Thus the meanings are worlds apart.

Jyoti said:

Nothing is outside consciousness, positing an element outside consciousnesses is no longer a teaching of buddhism, some dzogchenpa even proposes an alaya separate from consciousness, there cannot be such alaya, thus there is only alaya-vijnana but no such thing as alaya. Sometime we use simplified term like body or basis to refer to the ground consciousness, in that case, alaya sometime used, but it does not imply there is such element as a body, basis or alaya without the consciousness.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
You're merely imputing your understanding of yogācāra onto dzogchen without knowing dzogchen. These are baseless intellectual assertions predicated on your own interests, your active engagement in downplaying dzogchen is a reflection of your own need to feel a certain way about yogācāra, more specifically your own identification with yogācāra. I don't even understand why you come and post here apart from this specific thread, you clearly have no interest in dzogchen, all you do is attempt to negate it, or compromise it by somehow twisting it to match your own eternalist/essentialist view, which it never ever will. You're welcome to post here of course, but you're only deluding yourself in your efforts to mitigate dzogchen. I can't even imagine going to another forum for the sole purpose of attempting to refute the topic there, activity of that nature screams insecurity. I'm not sure what your vendetta is with dzogchen, but perhaps your time would be better spent examining yourself, and the reasons for your diametric opposition to dzogchen (and most likely anything which isn't Chinese Yogācāra). Your campaign against dzogchen is merely an expression of your own relationship with yogācāra, there's no other reason why you would actively seek to devalue other traditions. You don't see any of us here going to yogācāra forums in order to refute it in the name of dzogchen, what value or benefit would that produce for anyone? Dzogchen isn't a belief system, or a philosophy, or an intellectual theory or ideology. You don't seem to understand that.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 14th, 2012 at 4:45 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Perhaps some facets of the Nyingma school uphold the concept of conventional truth, but we aren't discussing The Nyingma. There is another board available for that if you'd like to discuss the Nyingma's view of conventional truth.

Jyoti said:
There is no dzogchen without the discussing the nyingma's perspective of dzogchen, to posit otherwise is ignorance of the history of dzogchen, or to posit there is a pure form of dzogchen would be a mistake, because we didn't live in the time of Hevajra. The very fact of the requirement of dzogchen for direct transmission instead of preserving the teaching in the authenticity of the original scriptures, make dzogchen impossible to not be contaminated through the passing of the lineage by the opinions of different

teachers. The effort of nyingma scholars like Mipham who make the dzogchen teaching stand out in writing among other Tibetan buddhist traditions contribute much to the authenticity of dzogchen as a buddhist teaching in the main stream buddhism throughout the world. However, later effort of some who attempt to isolate dzogchen from main stream buddhism will have negative impact on any such previous effort.

krodha wrote:
As for the allegations of contamination, that is an unfounded accusation and cannot be proven. Getting into that realm of discussion is merely going to produce a debate predicated on conjectured supposition which will only serve to reify (and reflect) our already established points of view, ergo deviating into historicity seems like an unproductive and trivial route to take (in my opinion). The Nyingma Dzogchen doesn't posit a two-truth dichotomy either. I did however find another quote from Longchenpa which isn't as extreme as his other statement (regarding the conventional) I cited in a prior reply in this thread:

"The two truths are not different like two horns; in the conventionally real phase, when one sees the reflection of the moon in the water, insofar as there is the reflection, this is the conventionally real; insofar as this reflection is not the moon, this is the absolutely real. The fact that both represent one fact insofar as there is the presence of the moon in the water of the well without existing there, is the indivisibility of the two truths. About the intellect that understands it in this way, it is said that it understands the two truths."
- Longchenpa (Shing rta chen po)

Dzogchen is dzogchen, just because (as a teaching) it has survived within the systems of the Nyingma or Bön doesn't mean it in itself has been adulterated in any way, shape or form. That would be impossible. Dzogchen is the actualization of the natural state within one's experience, you either experience dzogchen or you don't, talking about dzogchen isn't dzogchen, the texts about dzogchen aren't dzogchen, these things point to it... and if you can recognize it within your own experience, then that is dzogchen.

asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen does not uphold the duality of conventional and ultimate truth but instead sees this distinction as a fallacious projection of conceptualization.

Jyoti said:
To assert conventional and ultimate truth as a duality is not having understand the meaning of the inseparability of the conventional and ultimate.

krodha wrote:
It is a subtle duality, but it has it's uses and I understand what you're saying.

"By examining relative truth, establish absolute truth;
Within absolute truth, see how relative truth arises.
Where the two truths are inseparable, beyond intellect,
is the state of simplicity."
- Dilgo Khyenste Rinpoche

asunthatneversets said:
The Dzogchen treasure text Experiencing The Enlightened Mind Of Samantabhadra states, "In the awakened mind there is no relative or ultimate truth", and this is because Dzogchen is precisely the experience of awakened mind, and not dualistic conceptual elaboration about awakened mind. Though the Great Perfection is considered to be the quintessence and heart of all paths, it does consider all other approaches apart from itself to involve supposition, which is not an authentic apprehension of wisdom.

Jyoti said:
Thusness has no different with regard to relative or ultimate, knowledge of this nondifferentiation is the 'intellect of nondifferentiation', or the 'intellect of the origin' which is non-analytical in nature, this is what the text referred to as the awakened mind. 'Awakened' correspond to bodhi, whereas mind correspond to the 6th and 7th consciousnesses, these are the sites for the function of the intellect.

krodha wrote:
'Awakened mind' is just another way of saying prajñā, yeshe, sherab etc...

asunthatneversets said:
"The delusory appearances of conventional truth are a great lie.
When everything is brought into the condition of gnosis in the vast expanse,
The subject and object in flickering awareness, like a child's dance,
Are neutralized in the state of awareness transcending intellect."
- Longchen Rabjam

Jyoti said:
'Lie' is sometime translated as deception, appearance is deceptive in the sense that it is the cause of mistaken perception. Again thusness itself has no different in terms of the all (12 entrances).

krodha wrote:
The delusory appearances of conventional truth are a great lie, means that the seeming persons, places, things etc... that appear to exist as a result of conceptual projection are illusory and therefore, yes, they are potentially deceptive. Unwittingly believing the illusion to be truly authentic is delusion (avidyā). When delusion is recognized to be delusion, then ignorance is neutralized and wisdom remains.

asunthatneversets said:
"Like mistakenly seeing a rope as a snake,
with these varied appearances
we perceive them as what they are not,

Jyoti said:
This is refering to the imaginary nature

krodha wrote:

This is referring to ignorance (avidyā).

asunthatneversets said:
giving rise to the duality of externality and internality,
i.e. the material environments and life forms therein.

Jyoti said:
This is refering to the imaginary nature within the internal and external field of perception, for example, the imaginary self and the imaginary self of others as well as the imaginary object as real substance.

Without reading the full context exist above regarding the rope analogy. This part of the sentence can easily confused as refering purely to the basis of external and internal as imaginary, the term 'externality' refer to external contents rather than merely the 'external' field of perception itself.

krodha wrote:
It's speaking of precisely the material environments and life forms therein, just as it says. Not the imaginary nature within the material environments and life forms therein. It is certainly referring to the basis of external and internal as imaginary, because that basis is avidyā. You assume the above quote is referring to external contents (rather than the external field) because you assume that perception is inherently endowed with external and internal aspects, when it isn't.

asunthatneversets said:
However, upon scrutiny only the rope itself is found -
These environments and life forms are primordially empty,

Jyoti said:
The statement is fine as it refer to the thusness, since in term of thusness, even the dependent arising nature is thusness, and the term emptiness is refering to thusness, not an absolute emptiness in the conventional sense.

krodha wrote:
The term 'primordially empty' is being attributed to these alleged environments (externality) and life forms (internality), to say that they - since beginningless time - have never had any reality apart from the delusory facade of avidyā, which is no reality at all.

asunthatneversets said:
as the ultimate only seems to have such concrete form
within the dissimulating process of the conventional.

Jyoti said:
This is description for mere appearance and conventional truth, thus if the emptiness in previous passage were taken as absolute in the conventional sense, then the word 'seems to have such concrete form' (equavalent to 'mere appearance') and 'conventional' (conventional truth of the dependent arising nature) would have no place.

krodha wrote:
This is stating that the appearance of environments (external world) and life forms (sentient beings endowed with internality) only seem real due to the deceiving nature of the conceptual superstructure amassed by the intellect. The rampant habitual proclivity to presuppose conventional imputation is accurately framing the nature of experience, dissimulates reality and makes it appear as that which it is not, just like misperceiving a rope to be a snake.

asunthatneversets said:
The perception of a snake is phenomenologically true in terms of our seeing it as so, but seeing the rope instead is authentically true;

Jyoti said:
The snake is the imaginary nature, the rope is of the dependent arising nature, thus only the dependent arising nature is true.

krodha wrote:
Metaphorically, the snake is a figment of the imagination, the rope is the nature of mind (or 'thusness' as you like to say).

asunthatneversets said:
analogically, it is like the appearance of a bird on a promontory:
The nature of these two truths is that
this transitory world is merely conventional dissimulation,
which the authentic reality has no relationship to -
In the expanse of emptiness
everything is free within it's essence."
- Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra

Jyoti said:
The analogy is refering to the truth of the imaginary nature (bird) and the truth of the dependent arising nature (promontory). The 'nature of the two truths' refer to the truth of the dependent arising nature and the truth of the absolute nature. 'Conventional dissimulation' refering to the impermanence of the apparent phenomena contain the truth of dependent origination. 'Authentic reality has no relationship to' refer to the truth of the absolute nature has no relationship to the truth of dependent origination.

krodha wrote:
The 'nature' of these two-truths, is only referring to the character or makeup of the truths being described. You're seeing the term 'nature' and associating it with the way 'nature' is sometimes used in these texts, but in this instance the term 'nature' is simply signifying the characteristics of these two truths. So the nature of the two-truths is that the delusional appearances of avidyā have no reality whatsoever apart from delusion, they are birthed and sustained by conventional dissimulation and the authentic condition has nothing to do with these delusional appearances, nor is it truly ever effected by them (even the notion of an authentic condition is a conventional

dissimulation, though the notion is warranted since it requires distinction from delusion).

Jyoti said:
In no place did this quote of Longchenpa negate the conventional truth in favour of the ultimate truth, he is just describing the thusness. While the thusness may be describe from the position of the ultimate meaning, it causes more confusion (in the absence of right interpretation) than it does to generate understanding.

krodha wrote:
This wasn't a quote by Longchen Rabjam, (his quote was the quote above this one). The quote directly above that we were just discussing is from the Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra, which is one of the 17 original dzogchen tantras. The conventional truth wasn't outright negated, but it wasn't reaffirmed either, it was considered comparable to delusion, which it is.

asunthatneversets said:
Within this schematic you're speaking of there is no sensory consciousness which exists apart from conceptual imputation.

Jyoti said:
No, the conceptual imputation is the function of the 7th consciousness. The 6 sensory consciousnesses have no such capacity. The 6 sensory consciousnesses are merely responsible for the gathering of the object of perceptions, they are able to distinguish objects but have no capacity of arising the imaginary nature based upon such object.

krodha wrote:
Well you're correct in saying that they're unable to distinguish objects, only the intellect (or 7th consciousness as you like to call it) does that. So if the intellect is the party responsible for distinguishing objects, and also responsible for the 'imaginary nature' attributed to these alleged objects... why is it not also responsible for their inception? And why is it not responsible for the notion of sensory consciousness and perception as well? Are there really objects? Objects 'out there' which are gathered by sensory consciousness? Aren't these objects in fact the presence of the senses themselves? Can you truly separate an object from the modalities of tactile and visual sensation? And aren't these senses in fact the presence of consciousness itself? Can you truly separate consciousness from sensation? Sensation from objects? I find that this cannot be done... but I commend your valiant effort to do so. Objects seem to exist because one is ignorant of their true condition, if that condition is known then it is also known that no objects have ever existed (or not existed).

asunthatneversets said:
Your notion that "the former 6 sensory consciousnesses are free of conceptual imputation" is a presupposition that is held in place due to a failure to effectively apperceive the authentic condition.

Jyoti said:

A simple method is to know why this is not a notion but a fact is to know that it take time for
conceptual activity to occur after the senses having contact with the object, so the intiatial moment of
sense contact is free of conceptual activity, such is the moment where the dependent arising nature of
object is established as not depended on conceptual construction. That's why I have suggest you read
Mipham's or other buddhist material on valid cognition before asserting what you apparently have no
knowledge about.

krodha wrote:
Yes, it certainly does appear to take a moment for conceptual activity to occur after the senses having contacted an object, and you're right that initial moment of contact is free of conceptual activity... so therefore it's also free of 'objects' and likewise free of the 'senses' is it not? Or perhaps you don't see that your habitual tendency to employ conceptual activity has become a deeply engrained perception that governs your experience. After years and years of this vicious little cycle you have formed (what are now 'subconscious') presuppositions regarding these divisions and conceptual activities. You actually believe that some of these activities are somehow inherent, or left-over when conceptualization has ceased, and you don't question them but instead try to convince others that this is true so you can feel safe and warm in your little bubble of delusion. If you would question these presuppositions, you would find that, "such is the moment where the dependent arising nature of object is established as" COMPLETELY dependent on conceptual construction. You have not taken your investigation of dependent arising all the way to the ground.

asunthatneversets said:
You say the 'body' is the absolute (a.k.a. emptiness), I don't see how emptiness can be said to be permanent, since emptiness is not a quality which can be said to retain characteristics such as permanence or impermanence. In what way does this 'body' abide? And in what way is it permanent?

Jyoti said:
As I said, in buddhism emptiness is another word for the absolute, anything of absolute exists, and such existence is permanent, viz. permanence has to do with existence, and existence with permanence.

krodha wrote:
In buddhism 'emptiness' is another word for dependent origination, and just as Nāgārjuna points out in his 60 Stanzas: "The supreme knower of reality, said that dependent production is not production."

"The wonder of it! This marvelous, astounding event/reality (Dharma):
From that which involves no origination, everything originates;
and in that very origination, there is no origination!

The wonder of it!
In it's very enduring, there is no enduring!
The wonder of it!
In it's very cessation, there is no cessation!"
- Guhyagarbha Tantra

Jyoti said:
Conversely the dependent arising nature has to do with the false/deceptive appearance, such false/deceptive appearance is impermanent and permanent, it is impermanence because appearance changes, it is permanent because of its capacity for ceaseless/permanent arising due to conditions. The body abides permanently in nirvana (ceasing/non-arising aspect).

krodha wrote:
I can agree with the former half of this (regarding the dependent arising nature), although I'm not sure if I'd derive permanence from it's ceaselessness. Also, since the phenomena in question are merely deceptive appearances they can only appear to be simultaneously impermanent/permanent, they (being empty) cannot truly posses such traits.

asunthatneversets said:
So in a cryptic way, you're stating that the intellect and emptiness are inseparable?

Jyoti said:
Emptiness is the thusness, the reason of thusness is the intellect, so thusness (emptiness) is not separated from the intellect.

krodha wrote:
According to Yogācāra of course.

asunthatneversets said:
From the text that Sönam was kind enough to share, it seems that relying on Mipham for an
accurate account of the dzogchen view in some of his writings may prove to be problematic...

Jyoti said:
So you rather believe in the opinion Jean-Luc Achard, someone who has no known authority in the
dzogchen nor having produce any philosophical commentary on dzogchen, than in the wisdom of
Mipham's philosophical thesis?

krodha wrote:
He has no known authority according to you perhaps. If Mipham did deviate from the traditional view in an attempt to create some form of coalescence between Dzogchen and Mādhyamaka then he's (by default) introducing exegetical tenets which serve to

obfuscate Dzogchen. Mainly the two-fold division of the "ultimate" into "non-deluded subject and non-delusory object", this is an incorrigible notion in the eyes of ati-yoga. Therefore to associate concepts such as these with the teachings of dzogchen, is to contaminate those teachings.

asunthatneversets said:
Yes vidyā is the knowledge of the natural state (or 'thusness', as you choose to define it, though that term isn't employed in dzogchen), and the natural state has no division. Dependent arising is the way in which apparent phenomena seemingly exist, and there is no division of subject and object within dependent origination since the subject/object dichotomy is itself a rather bold example of dependent origination.

Jyoti said:
Conventional appearances always have two-fold divisions, as it is inherent division of consciousness itself, thus this inherent distinction allow one to know instinctively what is external and internal. What is external also have reality not share on the internal, such reality as the consciousnesses (mind
stream) of other beings which may only be perceive by the external senses (including divine sight of the gods), whereas the internal senses can only perceive the mind stream of one's own. This is due to the fact that the internal division is of the 8th consciousness, the rest of the sensory consciousnesses
are based on the external division. The 8th consciousness is also considered as the body of other consciousnesses, the other consciousnesses act as the means, thus all of the 7 consciousnesses are permanent and impermanent (the dynamic and creativity of the means).

krodha wrote:
Again, Dzogchen does not uphold that an inherent division exists. Dzogchen also doesn't create a distinction between one consciousness and other consciousnesses nor does it ultimately give credence to the notion of other beings (being that it considers the duality of sentient and non-sentient to be delusory, and therefore does not purport such notions).

Jyoti said:
The fact that conventional appearances is conventional, there is no need to try to eliminate the characteristics of the two-division by shear negation, since mere appearances still continue to appeared in two-fold division regardless of the conceptual construction that attempt to modify it. As conventional truth is conventional truth, ultimate truth is ultimate truth, attempting to convert the appearance of conventional truth to match the description of the ultimate truth is all proliferation.

krodha wrote:
The two-fold division is itself a product of conceptual construction. Mere appearances only appear to establish themselves in such a (two-fold) manner due to conforming with the initial imputed designation of two-fold division.

asunthatneversets said:

I believe the issue here is again the issue of the two-truths. According to the two-truths, yes, relatively there is division, though within that apparent division, no actual division is ever created. Ultimately there is no division, and within dzogchen not even the division of relative and ultimate is established, so any division posited to exist relatively is given no credence at all.

Jyoti said:
Again what is not establish as two divisions is only when speaking of the thusness. If dzogchen strayed to the ultimate truth to the exclusion of relative truth, then it strayed from the middle path, when it talks of attaining nirvana, liberation from samsara or of suffering, then it disqualified itself as a teaching of definitive meaning and consequently downgrade itself to the view of the 2 yanas.

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen doesn't stray into ultimate truth or relative truth, neither of these notions can contain it.

asunthatneversets said:
A thought is none other than thought, a notion is a thought which is seemingly directed towards (or is about) something. In it's most basic state, yes, a notion is none other than thought, but if we're going to say that then why not say that about everything? The point was to address the notion of a 'notion', in a relative sense.

Jyoti said:
Even in a relative sense, a thought itself is neutral to the position of good or bad, rather it is the content of the thought that determined whether such a thought is good or bad. Otherwise, thought would have an essence that determine it as good, and an essence that determine is as bad, etc. Since there is no such individual essence, thought itself attached to the content (matter and reason) of dhamadhatu, and according to such content, determine itself as good or bad thought.

krodha wrote:
It's actually another thought which determines whether a prior thought is good or bad, and that whole process is dependent on thought (memory) itself and is therefore completely illusory.

asunthatneversets said:
I didn't say it existed inherently, I was pointing out that, that which is dependently arisen is not inherent, and since everything is dependently arisen, nothing exists inherently.

Jyoti said:
Only the imaginary nature can be said to be not inherently exist as it is artificial constructed by mind, but those of dependently arisen nature is inherent aspect of existence. The term 'nothing exists inherently' is a gross generalisation which is only true in the ultimate sense in contrast to thusness but not in the relative sence, since mere appearance and dependent origination still continue to arise without ceasing and these are not based on imagination.

krodha wrote:
Dependently arisen phenomena are not inherent aspects of experience.

"The imputed, the dependent,
And the consummate - they have
Only one nature of their own, emptiness;
Their identities are constructed upon the mind."

"The conventional is taught to be emptiness;
The emptiness itself is the conventional;
One does not occur without the other..."
- Nāgārjuna (Bodhicittavivaraṇa)

asunthatneversets said:
You actually were making sense up until you brought up the body and means again. I'm not sure
what you're suggesting the basis of the similarity between the two is, they certainly don't share the
same basis. The basis in yogācāra is mind (or consciousness) as you choose to see it, while the basis in
dzogchen is awakened wisdom.

Jyoti said:
The basis in yogacara refered to the body (consciousness), whereas awakened wisdom, primordial
wisdom, self-existing gnosis or whatever, in dzogchen these all refer to the body (consciousness), thus
it is not different in meaning to the yogacara. Yogacara will not rely on the body, neither is
dzogchen, as dzogchen rely on the means which is vidya, but it seems some dzogchenpa only know
the body and miss the crucial point of the means.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
Only in Yogācāra does awakened wisdom refer to consciousness, awakened wisdom in dzogchen has nothing to do with consciousness. Thus the meanings are worlds apart.

*This discussion is growing exponentially with every reply and is getting to be almost unmanageable, I suggest we either consolidate some sections or condense it to a few key points of interest before continuing.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, September 10th, 2012 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Right, within your proposed model, which is flawed according to the dzogchen view. There is no
phenomena, all dharmas are products of conceptual imputation and are utterly empty.

Jyoti said:
This is ignorance and negation of the dependent-arising nature and consequently contradicting the
concept of conventional truth uphold by nyingma dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps some facets of the Nyingma school uphold the concept of conventional truth, but we aren't discussing The Nyingma. There is another board available for that if you'd like to discuss the Nyingma's view of conventional truth. Dzogchen does not uphold the duality of conventional and ultimate truth but instead sees this distinction as a fallacious projection of conceptualization. The Dzogchen treasure text Experiencing The Enlightened Mind Of Samantabhadra states, "In the awakened mind there is no relative or ultimate truth", and this is because Dzogchen is precisely the experience of awakened mind, and not dualistic conceptual elaboration about awakened mind. Though the Great Perfection is considered to be the quintessence and heart of all paths, it does consider all other approaches apart from itself to involve supposition, which is not an authentic apprehension of wisdom.

"The delusory appearances of conventional truth are a great lie.
When everything is brought into the condition of gnosis in the vast expanse,
The subject and object in flickering awareness, like a child's dance,
Are neutralized in the state of awareness transcending intellect."
- Longchen Rabjam

"Like mistakenly seeing a rope as a snake,
with these varied appearances
we perceive them as what they are not,
giving rise to the duality of externality and internality,
i.e. the material environments and life forms therein.

However, upon scrutiny only the rope itself is found -
These environments and life forms are primordially empty,
as the ultimate only seems to have such concrete form
within the dissimulating process of the conventional.

The perception of a snake is phenomenologically true in terms of our seeing it as so,
but seeing the rope instead is authentically true;
analogically, it is like the appearance of a bird on a promontory:

The nature of these two truths is that
this transitory world is merely conventional dissimulation,
which the authentic reality has no relationship to -
In the expanse of emptiness
everything is free within it's essence."
- Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra

asunthatneversets said:
Likewise consciousness is also utterly empty. Consciousness and it's alleged contents are inseparable,
experience is timeless and lacks a center, borders, edges or divisions, and that being the case both sides
of that equation (consciousness / contents) are simply products of conceptual imputation.

Jyoti said:
You seems to define the consciousness within the characteristic of the 7th consciousness, where the
imaginery nature is sustained by conceptual imputation. However, it is clear that the former 6 sensory
consciousnesses are free of conceptual imputation. Thus, the perception of object prior to moment of
conceptual activity is considered direct perception of the conventional validating cognition. This is
prove of external object of phenomena is not due to conceptual imputation.

krodha wrote:
Within this schematic you're speaking of there is no sensory consciousness which exists apart from conceptual imputation. Your notion that "the former 6 sensory consciousnesses are free of conceptual imputation" is a presupposition that is held in place due to a failure to effectively apperceive the authentic condition. Again, there is no internal or external apart from relative conceptualization, nor objects. Conceptualization is the culprit in this predicament, but it is also the only means of communication, so it is a double edged sword in that respect. We implement language to convey descriptions, ideas, instructions to one another and this is a useful tool, but we fall into a subtle trap when we start to actually believe that language is describing pre-existent elements of experience, instead of actually creating them. This is something that needs to be recognized within your own experience, it cannot be understood intellectually, so I don't expect you to accept this fact, but I hope that it becomes evident in time.

asunthatneversets said:
Again there are no sides. And the authentic condition transcends permanence, impermanence, both
and neither. The same goes for existence. There is no permanence to be found anywhere, the

permanence or true existence you are speaking of is an illusion which is product of delusion.

Jyoti said:
This is only refering to the means only, but the body is permanent.

krodha wrote:
You say the 'body' is the absolute (a.k.a. emptiness), I don't see how emptiness can be said to be permanent, since emptiness is not a quality which can be said to retain characteristics such as permanence or impermanence. In what way does this 'body' abide? And in what way is it permanent?

asunthatneversets said:
Nowhere in experience has there ever once been a sense faculty present (or absent). Sense organs,
sense faculties, sense fields etc... are equivalent to horns on a hare and/or hair on a tortoise. The same
goes for internal and external. You can insist on the presence of these dualities as much as you like,
but doing so is nothing more than clinging to affliction. (The same goes for me denying the presence
of these dualities, but I'm merely doing so in the name of this discussion to make a point).

Jyoti said:
This is attempt to negate the means in favour of the characteristic of the body, the fact is the means
and body is inseparable.

krodha wrote:
So in a cryptic way, you're stating that the intellect and emptiness are inseparable?

asunthatneversets said:
You can believe that if you'd like, but it is a grievous error to do so, and a definite deviation from the
authentic view. There is no inherent aspect of consciousness, being that consciousness itself isan empty
notion.

Jyoti said:
This is contradictory to what Mipham says regarding the existence of ultimate subject and ultimate
object.

krodha wrote:
From the text that Sönam was kind enough to share, it seems that relying on Mipham for an accurate account of the dzogchen view in some of his writings may prove to be

problematic...

Sönam wrote:

"(out of a bad translation of mine, from French ... but the sense should not be affected)

'It is fascinating to notice that in the rNying ma pa tradition of the Great Perfection (rDzogs chen), the majority of topics to be interpreted, to understand regarding oral transmission's norms (snyan brgyud) founded upon an Awawakening experience pure from all corruption, was already fixed in a very early date and that almost all following interpretations given by exegete from this school never brought something new, or few. Excepted, perhaps, 'Ju Mi pham rgya mysho (1846-1912) who tried a philosophical connection with Madhyamaka tradition, denaturing in that way the original principes of rDzogs chen. To speak about denaturation or else of adulteration of a tradition can certainly sound shocking in a 'correct ecumenisme' context, but it's clear for purists that the Great Perfection's mind cannot be reduced to sutra or tantra's conceptions.'
- Jean-Luc Achard - La base et ses sept interprétations dans la tradition rDzogs chen"

asunthatneversets said:
The absence of ignorance is vidyā, and I can assure you there is no division to be found in vidyā. Your
reliance on the intellect as your vessel to access your true nature is a poisoned seed which will never
germinate.

Jyoti said:
Vidya is knowledge of the thusness, thusness itself has no division, but the dependent arising nature
has a division of subject and object reality, and both reality is inseparable from thusness. Thus your
word regarding the division of thusness, show that you don't know what you are talking about.

krodha wrote:
Yes vidyā is the knowledge of the natural state (or 'thusness', as you choose to define it, though that term isn't employed in dzogchen), and the natural state has no division. Dependent arising is the way in which apparent phenomena seemingly exist, and there is no division of subject and object within dependent origination since the subject/object dichotomy is itself a rather bold example of dependent origination. I believe the issue here is again the issue of the two-truths. According to the two-truths, yes, relatively there is division, though within that apparent division, no actual division is ever created. Ultimately there is no division, and within dzogchen not even the division of relative and ultimate is established, so any division posited to exist relatively is given no credence at all.

asunthatneversets said:
In dzogchen no consciousness has ever been established, so building outside of

consciousness would be
an impossible endeavor. In regards to your notion of division, again, there is no division.

Jyoti said:
In other words, you are trying to be superior to Mipham by opposing his thesis.

krodha wrote:
I've made no mention of Mipham in the above statement, nor have I asserted anything close to what you're suggesting. I could play the same game with you by making a brash statement such as "In other words, you are trying to be superior to (insert dzogchen master of choice) by opposing his thesis", but I don't find that to be an effective response or anything which would resemble a productive addition to this discussion.

asunthatneversets said:
You may want to find another translation for the cited text because it already lacks sound
grammatical continuity just in reading it plainly, so I'm not sure what other errors may be present. If
you want to read Mipham, I suggest "A Lamp That Dispels Darkness", it is an exemplary exposition
on the dzogchen view.

Jyoti said:
I never based my understanding on any text on mere words, your opinion is just saying that you are
emphasizing on the words and not on the meaning.

krodha wrote:
I'd hope neither of us would leave our understandings based on mere words. As for my lack of emphasis on the meaning of the quote you provided, I found it to be incongruent with the dzogchen view, and again this seems to be an issue which has stemmed from Mipham's exegetical denaturation that Sönam pointed out.

asunthatneversets said:
I challenge you to provide an example of a neutral notion.

Jyoti said:
A notion is none other than thought. For example I can arise the thought of no-thought (the reason
of thusness), and enter the state of no-thought, then from the state of no-thought, I can arise the
thought again, will my first and last thought have a non-neutral position?

krodha wrote:
A thought is none other than thought, a notion is a thought which is seemingly directed towards (or is about) something. In it's most basic state, yes, a notion is none other than thought, but if we're going to say that then why not say that about everything? The point

was to address the notion of a 'notion', in a relative sense.

asunthatneversets said:
The imaginary is also dependently arisen. Nothing exists inherently.

Jyoti said:
No, the imaginary nature does not exists inherently, that is why is it termed imaginary nature.

krodha wrote:
I didn't say it existed inherently, I was pointing out that, that which is dependently arisen is not inherent, and since everything is dependently arisen, nothing exists inherently.

asunthatneversets said:
It's your opinion that it is the definitive dharma of course. I see no practical application for these notions apart from reifying ignorance which obscures, obstructs and obfuscates.

Jyoti said:
So you are saying dzogchen is not a definitive dharma?

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen is simply your true nature. I was saying that the conceptual structure you've amassed with all of these apparent divisions and dualities has no practical application apart from reifying itself, and thus it obscures, obstructs and obfuscates the authentic condition. But that doesn't mean it doesn't have any redeeming value, we all have to walk our own paths and like someone else was saying, I commend your affinity for the dharma and your willingness to engage in these discussions.

asunthatneversets said:
I see. Essence in dzogchen refers to either one aspect of the trifold nature of mind (essence, nature and compassion), the essence being emptiness, the nature being clarity/luminosity. Or it refers to svabhāva.

Jyoti said:
Essence is none other than nature, nature is none other than essence, compassion/capacity is the means of essence/nature. Essence and nature, or nature and compassion versus body and means are precisely the basis of the similarity of yogacara and dzogchen.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
You actually were making sense up until you brought up the body and means again. I'm not sure what you're suggesting the basis of the similarity between the two is, they certainly don't share the same basis. The basis in yogācāra is mind (or consciousness) as you choose to see it, while the basis in dzogchen is awakened wisdom.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 9th, 2012 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
There is no content of consciousness. Consciousness isn't a container. There is nothing beyond the appearances.

Jyoti said:
Contents here refer to the phenomena (dharma) in that stream of consciousness.

krodha wrote:
Right, within your proposed model, which is flawed according to the dzogchen view. There is no phenomena, all dharmas are products of conceptual imputation and are utterly empty. Likewise consciousness is also utterly empty. Consciousness and it's alleged contents are inseparable, experience is timeless and lacks a center, borders, edges or divisions, and that being the case both sides of that equation (consciousness / contents) are simply products of conceptual imputation.

asunthatneversets said:
What is it that you consider the absolute to be? And how are you defining 'emptiness'? Where are
you finding permanence and true existence?

Jyoti said:
The side of the body is the absolute.
'Emptiness' is another term for the absolute (body).
On the side of the body, one finds permanence and true existence.

krodha wrote:
Again there are no sides. And the authentic condition transcends permanence, impermanence, both and neither. The same goes for existence. There is no permanence to be found anywhere, the permanence or true existence you are speaking of is an illusion which is product of delusion.

asunthatneversets said:
The sense faculties are imputed notions of ignorance. As are both internal and external.

Jyoti said:
No, the sense faculties are neutral of any imputed notions of ignorance, the same for the all (internal
and external.

krodha wrote:
Nowhere in experience has there ever once been a sense faculty present (or absent). Sense organs, sense faculties, sense fields etc... are equivalent to horns on a hare and/or hair on a tortoise. The same goes for internal and external. You can insist on the presence of these dualities as much as you like, but doing so is nothing more than clinging to affliction. (The same goes for me denying the presence of these dualities, but I'm merely doing so in the name of this discussion to make a point).

asunthatneversets said:
Consciousness doesn't perceive any objects of form, being that objects of form are also products of
imputation and ignorance.

Jyoti said:
Consciousness is that which perceived in two divisions (subject and object), these two divisions
(including the various forms) of perception are the inherent aspect of consciousness which are not
cause by imputation and ignorance. Therefore, in the absence of imputation and ignorance, the two
divisions remained as the two-fold manifestation of consciousness.

krodha wrote:
You can believe that if you'd like, but it is a grievous error to do so, and a definite deviation from the authentic view. There is no inherent aspect of consciousness, being that consciousness itself isan empty notion. The absence of ignorance is vidyā, and I can assure you there is no division to be found in vidyā. Your reliance on the intellect as your vessel to access your true nature is a poisoned seed which will never germinate.

asunthatneversets said:
However you are correct in stating that a subject must be present in order for objects to be seemingly
perceived. Dzogchen's dividing line isn't clear because there's no such thing as a dividing line outside
of imputed ignorance, and being that no dividing line is truly established within imputed ignorance,
there is no dividing line. Truly, in dzogchen there isn't even 'no dividing line', because such a
conclusion would require the initial presence of a dividing line to negate in the first place.

Jyoti said:
The dzogchen system does not build outside consciousness, therefore it is subject to the same principle
of consciousness, i.e. subject to its two-fold divisions, even though it is not clearly

stated, the
distinction exist.

You may need to study Mipham's The Lion’s Roar Proclaiming Extrinsic Emptiness:

"the ultimate has both a nondeluded subject and a nondelusory object, because what exists there
cannot be invalidated (gnod pa) by a valid cognition that proves otherwise, because it is what is
proven after the reasoning establishing emptiness has already been applied, and because in
establishing it according to conventional validating cognition, no one in this world, including the
gods, can dispute it in accordance with the Dharma. "

krodha wrote:
In dzogchen no consciousness has ever been established, so building outside of consciousness would be an impossible endeavor. In regards to your notion of division, again, there is no division. You may want to find another translation for the cited text because it already lacks sound grammatical continuity just in reading it plainly, so I'm not sure what other errors may be present. If you want to read Mipham, I suggest "A Lamp That Dispels Darkness", it is an exemplary exposition on the dzogchen view.

asunthatneversets said:
How can a notion be neutral? A notion needs to be "about" something. One can only have a notion
in relation to a person, place, thing, idea etc.

Jyoti said:
Notion itself is neutral, but when it is derived from the basis of delusion or intellect, then it is of
delusion or intellect.

krodha wrote:
I challenge you to provide an example of a neutral notion.

asunthatneversets said:
and I suppose one could argue that conceptualization is itself a mere appearance if it's left in it's
suchness

Jyoti said:
Thought or conceptualization is not the dependent arisen nature, if a mental image is maintained by
thought, it is of the imaginary nature, hence does not inherently exist. Though thusness

exists in both
natures.

krodha wrote:
The imaginary is also dependently arisen. Nothing exists inherently.

asunthatneversets said:
Define 'means', I'm not sure what you're referring to with the term 'means'?

Jyoti said:
In the definitive dharma and yogacara of the chinese buddhism, the means refer to the function of the body. It is not skillful means, provisional meaning, gradual means and so on, rather it is the capacity that is inherent, in the same way as the two-fold manifestation of consciousness is inherent.

krodha wrote:
It's your opinion that it is the definitive dharma of course. I see no practical application for these notions apart from reifying ignorance which obscures, obstructs and obfuscates.

asunthatneversets said:
I take it by 'essence' you mean svabhāva? I define thusness/suchness the same as mere appearance.

Jyoti said:
Essence here refered to the body (thusness), mere appearance (dependent arisen nature) is the means of the body, not the body itself.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
I see. Essence in dzogchen refers to either one aspect of the trifold nature of mind (essence, nature and compassion), the essence being emptiness, the nature being clarity/luminosity. Or it refers to svabhāva.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 8th, 2012 at 6:37 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
viniketa said:
Thank you for your note, MalaBeads. Education doesn't necessarily imply wisdom, so I am always trying to find new ways to 'see' things.

This discussion on the Four Reliances has given some new light. Joyti's words about of 'the wisdom of the body' may be a little strange, but it sure has me looking at things from a new perspective. The 'wisdom of the body' is the wisdom of the trained athlete. Sometimes in English it is called 'muscle memory'. Rather than trying to intellectually 'triangulate' their way through a physical task that requires concentration, highly trained athletes (including yogis) will tell you to let go of thought and let your body remember what to do. And it works. The wisdom of the body, separate from conceptual thinking about 'how to', is a form of 'direct perception'.

krodha wrote:
I'm fairly certain that when Jyoti's speaking of 'the body' she's using the term 'body' to represent consciousness or some other quality of that nature. So a phrase like 'wisdom of the body' isn't really speaking of ones physical body. The use of words like 'body' to mean whatever it is she's referencing is certainly confusing. Especially when others are using 'body' in it's traditional sense to represent one's body, it just creates a mess. At least 'reality-body' or something of that nature would help to distinguish what's being spoken of. Jyoti you could just say 'consciousness' (or whatever the appropriate label would be) and get your points across much more clearly! Something to consider...

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 8th, 2012 at 12:37 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
he inherent nature of phenomena is "absolute" and "dependently arisen"? A dichotomous separation
of experience into internal and external is certainly a notion which is product of imputation. Where
are you finding an internal field of perception? Or an external? Where is the dividing line between
these two fields?
There are no internal or external fields.
Again I'm not seeing where you're locating external phenomena, the only thing that makes phenomena seem external is the erroneous identification with the body (which is ultimately an imputation itself) and the notion that there are internal facets of experience which exist within the body.

Jyoti said:
The 6 external sense faculties only perceived external phenomena, whereas the 6 internal sense
faculties only perceived the internal phenomena, thus the dividing line between internal and external
is the sense bases. Also in order for consciousness to perceive an object of form, the existence of the
subject is required, with the exception of the formless realms, but even in the condition

of
formlessness, the dividing line still exist in the form of means and body. Without understanding the dividing line, there is no possibility to apprehend the dharma of definitive meaning. The dzogchen's dividing line of the two is not clear, this is the major cause of many errors and contraditions in various texts and words of teachers.

krodha wrote:
The sense faculties are imputed notions of ignorance. As are both internal and external. Consciousness doesn't perceive any objects of form, being that objects of form are also products of imputation and ignorance. However you are correct in stating that a subject must be present in order for objects to be seemingly perceived. Dzogchen's dividing line isn't clear because there's no such thing as a dividing line outside of imputed ignorance, and being that no dividing line is truly established within imputed ignorance, there is no dividing line. Truly, in dzogchen there isn't even 'no dividing line', because such a conclusion would require the initial presence of a dividing line to negate in the first place.

asunthatneversets said:
The only things that obscure pure perception are all of these notions which are imputed onto experience.

Jyoti said:
Notion itself is neutral, it is the mistaken notion of appearance itself.

krodha wrote:
How can a notion be neutral? A notion needs to be "about" something. One can only have a notion in relation to a person, place, thing, idea etc.

asunthatneversets said:
Mere appearance (which is simply neutral experience devoid of imputed conceptual overlay) is precisely thusness. Or are you defining 'thusness' as non-dual perception?

Jyoti said:
Mere appearance is not thusness, mere appearance is a derived knowledge of dharmas due to the presence of the intellect, that is the knowledge of appearance as devoid of essence, and arise based on causes and conditions. Thusness is non-definable by words, but may be realized within the wisdom (prajna) of the consciousness (body). Unlike the intellect (jnana) of the means which is derived from the reason of thusness, this wisdom is so called because of the body containing the reason of thusness.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
Mere appearance is simply the ceaseless and continual presence of phenomena in the immediacy, prior to conceptualization (and I suppose one could argue that conceptualization is itself a mere appearance if it's left in it's suchness). Define 'means',

I'm not sure what you're referring to with the term 'means'? I take it by 'essence' you mean svabhāva? I define thusness/suchness the same as mere appearance, but to each their own.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 7th, 2012 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
Jyoti said:
The absolute does not dependent upon the relative (dependently arisen nature). Because their natures are not two, both absolute nature and dependently arisen nature are from the same stream of consciousness, absolute nature is the essence of the contents of this consciousness, whereas the dependently arisen nature is the appearance of the contents of this consciousness.

krodha wrote:
There is no content of consciousness. Consciousness isn't a container. There is nothing beyond the appearances.

Jyoti said:
The relative is the dependently arisen nature, this nature is not based on ignorance, that is why it is termed dependently arisen.

krodha wrote:
Dependent arising is the nature of all appearance.

asunthatneversets said:
The dependently arisen nature, emptiness, should negate the imaginary and absolute, along with itself.

Jyoti said:
Then you have two absolutes, i.e. emptiness and the absolute, this is duality. Such absolute cannot negates the absolute due to permanence and true existence of both.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
What is it that you consider the absolute to be? And how are you defining 'emptiness'? Where are you finding permanence and true existence?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 7th, 2012 at 2:06 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
In dzogchen, ignorance is the basis for all phenomena (dharmas), the notion of a personal self
(ātman) falls under that umbrella.

Jyoti said:
Ignorance is not the basis of all phenomena, because in its absence the 2 of the 3 natures still
inherently exists. Igorance is cause of the existence of the imaginary nature of phenomena. The 3
natures are: absolute nature, imaginary nature and dependently arisen nature.

krodha wrote:
I take it you're implying that the absolute nature and dependently arisen nature still inherently exist? And that the imaginary nature is the nature which is absent when ignorance is absent?

How can the absolute nature be inherently existent? Isn't the absolute dependent upon the relative? If the relative is merely a product of ignorance, upon the removal of the relative the absolute would likewise be negated. We can't have a one sided coin. The dependently arisen nature, emptiness, should negate the imaginary and absolute, along with itself.

asunthatneversets said:
realizing the emptiness of mind

Jyoti said:
This is not what I have stated in the thesis, the thesis merely attempt to explain the meaning of
'realizing the emptiness of mind'. I did not indicate there is such a mind in the thesis, consciousness
is not mind.

krodha wrote:
Ok.

asunthatneversets said:
and that the notion of a dichotomy is an imputation of mind in the first place

Jyoti said:
This is not a notion, nor an inputation of mind, for these 2 only refer to the imaginary nature. The
two-fold manifestation of consciousness is the inherent nature of phenomena (i.e. the other 2
natures). The root consciousness (alayavijana) manifested itself as the internal field of perception
which also pervades the 7 consciousnesses, the 7 consciousnesses that it manifested

constitutes the
bases for the external field of perception.

krodha wrote:
The inherent nature of phenomena is "absolute" and "dependently arisen"? A dichotomous separation of experience into internal and external is certainly a notion which is product of imputation. Where are you finding an internal field of perception? Or an external? Where is the dividing line between these two fields?

asunthatneversets said:
The realization of anātman should lead to the realization of śūnyatā since both sides of the
dichotomy are dependent on one another

Jyoti said:
Atman is only the internal field of the imaginary nature, you still have the external field of the
imaginary nature that will obscured pure perception of the external field of the inherent nature
(absolute nature, and dependently arisen nature), viz. the knowledge of mere appearance and thusness
of external phenomena.

krodha wrote:
There are no internal or external fields. The only things that obscure pure perception are all of these notions which are imputed onto experience. Mere appearance (which is simply neutral experience devoid of imputed conceptual overlay) is precisely thusness. Or are you defining 'thusness' as non-dual perception? Again I'm not seeing where you're locating external phenomena, the only thing that makes phenomena seem external is the erroneous identification with the body (which is ultimately an imputation itself) and the notion that there are internal facets of experience which exist within the body.

asunthatneversets said:
the empty aspect of the nature of mind is meant to cover this two-fold emptiness from the very beginning through recognizing primordial purity.

Jyoti said:
The yogacara covered this in one word 'thusness'.

krodha wrote:
The dzogchen doesn't cover this in any words. But if you had to choose one, 'emptiness' would do the job.

asunthatneversets said:
The difference is that within dzogchen nothing is established, which contrasts the Yogācāra view that everything is mind.

Jyoti said:
The yogacara view all phenomena as mere consciousness, not mind. May be you are referring to Tibetan version of the yogacara, I don't relied on that version.

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
Perhaps. I would have to read what the differences are in the yogācāra traditions. At any rate, both phenomena and consciousness (and/or the union or separation of the two) are considered empty in dzogchen.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, September 7th, 2012 at 10:47 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Distinction Between The Buddha-Essence Of Dzogpa Chenpo And Of Yogācāra:

"In Dzogpa Chenpo the Intrinsic Awareness is designated as self-awareness and self-clarity. But it is free from elaborations and non-existence. So it is superior to the thoroughly established self-awareness and self-clarity of consciousness of the Yogācārya school. Longchen Rabjam explains:

Jyoti said:
By comparing the designation of 'Intrinsic Awareness' of Dzogpa Chenpo with the designation of consciousness of the Yogācārya school and then rendered the former as superior is fundamentally flawed. The reason is that Yogācārya does not rely on consciousness but the intellect.

krodha wrote:
Doesn't rely on consciousness but the intellect? You probably would've been better off stating that it relies on consciousness, as far as these teachings go - in the schematic that could potentially unfold between 'relying on consciousness' and 'relying on the intellect' - I'd say (solely) relying on the intellect would be a downgrade from simply relying on consciousness. Dzogchen doesn't rely on either.

asunthatneversets said:
In it (Dzogpa Chenpo) the essence (Ngo-Bo) of Intrinsic Awareness, the realization of the non-existence of the apprehended and apprehender, is called spontaneously arisen primordial wisdom. But Dzogpa Chenpo doesn't assert it as self-awareness and self-clarity (Rang-Rig Rang-gSal) as Yogācārya, the Mind Only School, does. Because (according to Dzogpa Chenpo), as there is no existence of internal and external, it (Intrinsic Awareness) is not established as internal mind. As there is no self and others, it isn't established as self-awareness. As the apprehended and apprehender have never existed, freedom from the two is not established. As it is not an object of experiences

and awareness, the experience is not established as non-dual.

Jyoti said:
Refer to my thesis below on the two emptinesses, it is not established there is a different between apprehended and apprehender (subject and object).

<<Both the subjective and objective perception are just the two-fold manifestation of consciousness. The subjective perception is the basis for atman, whereas the objective perception is the basis for all phenomena (dharmas), both the atman and dharmas does not exist in reality, only the thusness of consciousness is true. The subjective field of perception corresponds to the inner six sensory entrances, whereas the objective field of perception corresponds to the outer six sensory entrances, therefore the twelve entrances are none other than consciousness. The emptiness conventionally speaking is the consciousness, ultimately speaking it is the thusness. So the twelve entrances are none other than thusness, subject and object have no difference. This is the meaning of the terms as stated above: ' realising the emptiness of mind is realising the emptiness of all things', 'awareness without abiding on any referential point', 'whether one sees the emptiness of self or any phenomenon, the result is the same wisdom.'>>

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
That's your own thesis? That's all well and good but your thesis is only validating the statement that longchenpa made above. Dzogchen doesn't implement a subject(ive)-object(ive) dichotomy but instead finds the two to be empty from the very beginning. In dzogchen, ignorance is the basis for all phenomena (dharmas), the notion of a personal self (ātman) falls under that umbrella.

And this isn't regarding dzogchen but in reference to your thesis: realizing the emptiness of mind should in theory cause one to realize of the emptiness of all things, like you stated, but this isn't always the case, hence the two-fold emptiness (anattā/anātman & śūnyatā). The realization of anātman should lead to the realization of śūnyatā since both sides of the dichotomy are dependent on one another (and that the notion of a dichotomy is an imputation of mind in the first place), but depending on the amount of karmic traces one is afflicted with there is sometimes a gap in those insights.

In dzogchen, the empty aspect of the nature of mind is meant to cover this two-fold emptiness from the very beginning through recognizing primordial purity. Within that primordial purity nothing has ever been established which is later revoked, so phenomena is not "cut with the razor of emptiness" as Jigme Lingpa says, but is inherently empty.

The difference is that within dzogchen nothing is established, which contrasts the Yogācāra view that everything is mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 6th, 2012 at 1:31 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
Jyoti said:
The two truths are inseparable, due to only one is true (1), the other false (0) (1+0=1, 1=inseparable/nondual), there are two truths because the imaginary (means) is support of dependent-origination, whereas the ultimate truth is the body. The same formula applied to samsara (0) and nirvana (1).

Jyoti

krodha wrote:
"...In the same section of Yeshe Lama, Jigme Lingpa further refines the definition of the position that is the subject of his critique; it is the statement that mind is existent in relative truth (kun rdzob kyi bden pa) and nonexistent in ultimate truth (don dam pa'i bden pa). This combines the doctrine of mind-only with the two truths of the Madhyamaka. Jigme Lingpa argues that in such a system, even the idea of union (zung 'jug) - that is, of the two truths - is actually the union of two existents (yod pa gnyis). The object of the critique, indicated in the text only with the phrase 'elsewhere' or 'according to others (gzhan du)', seems to be one or more contemporary traditions. Jigme Lingpa has no qualms about naming the Yogācāra school directly when he is criticizing it's doctrines; as is usual in Tibetan polemic writing, it is living writers or traditions that he does not name directly."
- Sam Van Shaik (Approaching The Great Perfection, pg. 79)

Jyoti said:
The inexpressible is the equavalent of the thusness in yogacara. 'Cognition of self-awareness' is a term foreign to yogacara and to Buddhism in general, maybe Longchenpa refered to the Tibetan version of yogacara, in that case, this has no relevant to the yogacara of chinese buddhism which is based on the scriptures of definitive meaning.

krodha wrote:
'Cognition of self-awareness' = self-reflexive awareness (or simply 'reflexive awareness'), it certainly isn't foreign to yogācāra and dzogchen, nor is it foreign to buddhism in general.

"There is another aspect of the Yogācāra doctrine, related to the mind-only doctrine, that is criticized in Yeshe Lama and elsewhere in Jigme Lingpa's work: the concepts of reflexive awareness (rang rig) and reflexive luminosity (rang gsal). These terms near-synonyms, are fundamental of the Yogācāra understanding of the way the mind works. They refer to the activity of a mind that does not cognize phenomena as extrinsic: it is cognizant only of itself, and, like a lamp that needs no other light source to be visible, it illuminates itself. Both terms were utilized in this way by Śāntarakṣita in his eighth-century works setting out the Yogācāra Svātantrika Madhyamaka position.

Jigme Lingpa writes in Yeshe Lama, 'If…when you examine that which abides, the mere reflexive luminosity (rang gsal) of the ālāyavijñāna comes up as truly accomplished, then you approach the mistake of the Anākāravāda mind-only doctrine.' We have seen above how the Sākāravāda form of Yogācāra is criticized by Longchenpa and Jigme Lingpa, based on the distinction between mere perceptions and the objective basis for perceptions. The Anākāravāda form of Yogācāra, which did not accept the ultimate reality of consciousness as the objective basis for perceptions, is criticized for a different reason. In his Khyenste Melong, Jigme Lingpa sets out what he understands the Anākāravāda position to be:

'We hold that the outer object does not exist, and the awareness that apprehends it does not exist either. The awareness that realizes the apprehender and apprehended as nondual is a reflexive awareness and a reflexive luminosity. This is designated as truly existent. This is the ālāya-vijñāna. Actions and their result are based on it.'

The Anākāravāda position is criticized for attributing reflexive awareness with true existence. The terms reflexive awareness and reflexive luminosity are often used in the Great Perfection, and figure frequently in the Longchen Nyingtig texts themselves. Jigme Lingpa cannot criticize the use of the terms themselves. He must object to the designation of them being truly established, that is, existent. As the passage from Khyenste Melong suggests, this is also a criticism of the position that holds the ālāya-vijñāna, the basis of consciousness, as the basis of both samsaric and nirvanic awareness. For Jigme Lingpa, and his Seminal Heart sources, the ālāya-vijñāna is samsaric in nature, a result of delusion and separation from the ground, as I have shown in chapter 4. Thus these criticisms of the Yogācāra are rooted in the Seminal Heart distinction between two types of basis, the nirvanic basis known as the ground (gzhi) and the samsaric basis of consciousness, the ālaya (kun gzhi). Because the distinction is not made in the Indian Yogācāra texts, the versions of reflexive awareness and reflexive luminosity found there are considered flawed. Yet the Seminal Heart owed a great debt to Yogācāra philosophy in it's treatments of both samsaric and nirvanic awareness, and this is why Jigme Lingpa, like Longchenpa before him, felt the need to strongly distinguish the differences between the models of awareness in Yogācāra and Seminal Heart literature."
- Sam Van Shaik (Approaching The Great Perfection, pg. 84)

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 6th, 2012 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
"...So it is superior to the thoroughly established self-awareness and self-clarity of consciousness of the Yogācārya school...."

"...Otherwise, if you take the meaning of the words literally, you will never find (in Dzogpa Chenpo) any difference from the cognition of self-awareness, self-clarity, and non-duality of apprehender and apprehended of the Mind Only School...."

- Longchen Rabjam (excerpt from "The Practice Of Dzogchen" pg. 103[/i]

Lhug-Pa said:
Also on the Mind-Only school:

The Precious Treasury of Philosophical Systems by Longchen Rabjam

And:

Bönpo Dzogchen Teachings by Lopon Tenzin Namdak Rinpoche

krodha wrote:
And Approaching The Great Perfection by Jigme Lingpa/Sam Van Schaik has an excellent section on the contrasts between the two

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, September 6th, 2012 at 4:47 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Distinction Between The Buddha-Essence Of Dzogpa Chenpo And Of Yogācāra:

"In Dzogpa Chenpo the Intrinsic Awareness is designated as self-awareness and self-clarity. But it is free from elaborations and non-existence. So it is superior to the thoroughly established self-awareness and self-clarity of consciousness of the Yogācārya school. Longchen Rabjam explains:

In it (Dzogpa Chenpo) the essence (Ngo-Bo) of Intrinsic Awareness, the realization of the non-existence of the apprehended and apprehender, is called spontaneously arisen primordial wisdom. But Dzogpa Chenpo doesn't assert it as self-awareness and self-clarity (Rang-Rig Rang-gSal) as Yogācārya, the Mind Only School, does. Because (according to Dzogpa Chenpo), as there is no existence of internal and external, it (Intrinsic Awareness) is not established as internal mind. As there is no self and others, it isn't established as self-awareness. As the apprehended and apprehender have never existed, freedom from the two is not established. As it is not an object of experiences and awareness, the experience is not established as non-dual.

As there is no mind and mental events, it does not exist as self-mind. As it does not exist as clarity or non-clarity, it is not established as self-clarity. As it transcends awareness and non-awareness, there are not even the imputations of awareness. This is called the Dzogpa Chenpo, free from extremes. Although it is designated as self-arisen primordial wisdom, enlightened mind, ultimate body, the great spontaneously accomplished ultimate sphere, and the naked self-clarity Intrinsic Awareness, these ascriptions are merely in order to signify it. It should be realized that the self-essence (of Dzogpa Chenpo) is inexpressible. Otherwise, if you take the meaning of the words literally, you

will never find (in Dzogpa Chenpo) any difference from the cognition of self-awareness, self-clarity, and non-duality of apprehender and apprehended of the Mind Only School." - Longchen Rabjam (excerpt from "The Practice Of Dzogchen" pg. 103

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 1:22 PM
Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?
Content:
krodha wrote:
In 3 separate places I've found 3 different deities being referenced to as the black wrathful goddess in the "Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra"...

In the OP I copied the run-down of the 17 Tantras from a website which listed the Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra (nag mo khros ma); as referring to a black form of Vajrayogini (khros ma nag mo).

In another more in depth run-down I found done by Khenpo Ngakchung it lists this tantra as the Tantra of The Wrathful Black Guardian Shri Ekajati, which resembles a sharp razor, describes how to protect the practitioner against harms inflicted by others. Obviously referencing Ekajati.

And then on Vajranatha's website he has this as referencing Simhamukha: The secret sadhana (gsang sgrub) is for the exceedingly wrathful black Krodha Kali Simhamukha (khros-ma nga-mo), "the wrathful black goddess", who appears to annihilate the delusion of ego, symbolized by the insatiable demon king Rudra, much like Durga cutting the head off the demon king Mahisha. The secret sadhana is also connected with the practice of Chod (gcod), the severing or cutting off of the ego. For this reason, this form of Simhamukha is also called Vajra Nairatma (rDo-rje bdag-med-ma), “she who destroys the notion of an ego.”

Which deity is actually being discussed in this tantra?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 1:58 PM
Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body
Content:
humanpreta said:
C'mon Pero, It's all in good fun and harmless. DW is a sausage party. Jyoti is a big girl and can take it--she's out of control and can use a some straight settin. A little levity ain't ever killed nobody. Come on old boy ....you dig?

Buddhists often suppress their ids. Mine's probably too lose...what can I say? That's what happens when I see a pretty image. Don't mean to offend no one.

krodha wrote:

It's all in good fun and harmless if everyone is on the same page, but singling out a member of the opposite sex with some sort of half cocked cat call on a forum such as this, is hardly a demonstration of everyone having harmless fun. It has nothing to do with suppressing ids, but understanding the right circumstances in which to express behavior of that nature, a bar, club, spring break cancun 2012, stumbling down the street drunk at 2:10am... those may be acceptable settings depending on the circumstances. There's an appropriate time and a place, this is neither.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body
Content:
magnagei said:
Is ordinary dying when the son wisdom recognizes the mother wisdom?

krodha wrote:
Ordinary death just means a natural death, like most every being... but supposedly at the moment of death it's easier for the son to recognize the mother, so for those who had difficulty doing so in life, that moment is a excellent opportunity for this to occur.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Rewalsar Lake and it's surrounding caves

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 4:11 AM
Title: New Film "The Apparition" BasedOn Tulpa Phenomena/Experiment
Content:

krodha wrote:
New film titled "The Apparition" which is out in theatres now is (loosely) based on Tulpa (thought-form) phenomena. Prior to filming, Warner Bros. hired paranormal investigator Joshua P. Warren to actually experiment with the notion and create a tulpa.

Summary of a radio show interview with Joshua:
"...paranormal investigator Joshua P. Warren finally revealed details about the groundbreaking experiment he was hired by Warner Brothers to conduct to 'create a ghost.' He was joined in the first hour by Todd Lincoln, writer/director of Warner Brothers' new horror movie, 'The Apparition'. Lincoln said his new film is inspired by

experiments conducted in the 1970s by researchers who suggested that paranormal events happen because people believe in them. The group created a fictional back story for a man named Phillip and focused on manifesting him solely through the power of the mind, he explained. Strange things occurred which terrified the researchers and the experiment was halted, Lincoln added. In The Apparition a similar experiment summons an inhuman entity that gains its power from belief and fear, he noted.

Warren reported on his own attempt at creating a ghost using a lab setup, pointing out that "this actually worked." Components of the original Phillip experiment were combined with technology that amplified brain waves, he disclosed. The subject was asked to focus on a tiki doll and her thoughts were broadcast through equipment that magnified them into the equivalent of thousands of people thinking the same thing, Warren continued. Eventually, a huge harmonic-type field built up which damaged the equipment and ended the experiment, he recalled. According to Warren, seven days later he began to hear scratching sounds in the walls and saw a distorted human-shaped shadow walk down his staircase. In addition, objects were found inexplicably strewn about, the electrical system in Warren's building melted down, and other tenants claimed to have seen a shadowy being, he said. The implications to understand the nature of ghosts and the relationship between mind and environment are startling, Warren said."
Link to audio interview: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/show/2012/08/17

Images from Warren's lab set-up:

From Wikipedia (For those not familiar with Tulpas):
Tulpa (Wylie: sprul-pa; Sanskrit: निर्मित nirmita and निर्माण nirmāṇa; "to build" or "to construct") is an upaya concept in Tibetan Buddhism and Bon, discipline and teaching tool. The term was first rendered into English as 'Thoughtform' by Evans-Wentz (1954: p. 29):
"In as much as the mind creates the world of appearances, it can create any particular object desired. The process consists of giving palpable being to a visualization, in very much the same manner as an architect gives concrete expression in three dimensions to his abstract concepts after first having given them expression in the two-dimensions of his blue-print. The Tibetans call the One Mind's concretized visualization the Khorva (Hkhorva), equivalent to the Sanskrit Sangsara; that of an incarnate deity, like the Dalai or Tashi Lama, they call a Tul-ku (Sprul-sku), and that of a magician a Tul-pa (Sprul-pa), meaning a magically produced illusion or creation. A master of yoga can dissolve a Tul-pa as readily as he can create it; and his own illusory human body, or Tul-ku, he can likewise dissolve, and thus outwit Death. Sometimes, by means of this magic, one human form can be amalgamated with another, as in the instance of the wife of Marpa, guru of Milarepa, who ended her life by incorporating herself in the body of Marpa."

John Myrdhin Reynolds (1996: p. 350) in a note to his English translation of the life story of Garab Dorje defines a tulpa thus:
"A Nirmita (sprul-pa) is an emanation or a manifestation. A Buddha or other realized being is able to project many such Nirmitas simultaneously in an infinite variety of

forms."

Thoughtform may be understood as a 'psychospiritual' complex of mind, energy or consciousness manifested either consciously or unconsciously, by a sentient being or in concert. In the Dzogchen view, accomplished thoughtform of the kye rim mode are sentient beings as they have a consciousness field or mindstream confluence in a dynamic of entrainment-secession and organization-entropy of emergent factors or from the mindstream intentionality of progenitor(s). Thoughtform may be benevolent, malevolent or of complex alignment and may be understood as a "spontaneous or intentional manifestation" or "emergence" (Tibetan: rang byung) of the 'Five Pure Lights' (Tibetan: 'od lnga). The Five Pure Lights may be understood as the "radiance" (Tibetan: 'od) or Clear Light (Tibetan: 'od gsal) substrate of 'mindstream' (Tibetan: sems rgyud) and the base or root 'dimensionality of all dharmas' (Sanskrit: dharmadhatu) of Nirvana and Samsara. The mindstream is an entwining or confluence of the 'Eight Consciousnesses' (Tibetan: rnam shes tshogs brgyad). Therefore, the Five Pure Lights are the 'root' (Tibetan: gzhi) of the Western scientific conceptions of matter and energy. From the Dzogchen perspective energy is nondual to 'spiritual energy' or 'vital force' (Tibetan: rlung). For the human species, defined in Traditional Tibetan medicine as the class of entities which holds a human la (Tibetan: bla), the Five Lung are direct homologues of the Five Pure Lights.

Professor H. H. Price, an Oxford philosopher and parapsychologist, held that once an idea has been formed, it "is no longer wholly under the control of the consciousness which gave it birth" but may operate independently on the minds of other people or on physical objects. It is contended that a meme is not a thoughtform, unless it is sentient. Though, memetic theory may be deemed an informative correlation to thoughtform phenomena.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tulpa

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 3:10 PM
Title: Re: becoming a wandering yogi?
Content:
Jyoti said:
RikudouSennin, looking at your age and economic situation, I would recommend you find a part time job while continue your academic study. You will regret when you are older and find yourself without any qualification needed to work in society. Forget about retreat or dzogchen (for a while) since these are beyond your means, if you are serious about dharma, the scriptures are free at any buddhist libraries (this is where I have used to study to gain the knowledge of dharma).

krodha wrote:
Bullshit.

Rikudou, follow your heart and seize the day, don't wait for anything! Not even the next

minute is guaranteed. Your strong interest and affinity for the teachings means you're ready. Never pass up an opportunity to learn/practice the dharma. And dzogchen is beyond no ones means, it is your authentic condition, always has been and always will be. It is innate and cannot be lost or acquired, you only need to recognize it.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 12:24 PM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
What role does Tsogyel Drollo (Vajra Mamo Tsogyel Trollo) have in reference to Dorje Drollo? Or in terms of practice? I only see info on her available from the Aro lineage when I do a search on the web... don't hear about her often if at all.
http://aroencyclopaedia.org/shared/text/t/tsogyel_trollo_dr_01_01_full_eng.php
http://www.aroencyclopaedia.org/shared/text/t/tsogyel_trollo_dr_01_02_close_eng.php

username said:
He & his mandala of followers & donors & those with positive karmic inclination towards him, some of whom but not all practice this plus other things of his, said in private it is not his mere "experience" but his actual "terma" & now after years of consistent denials, which also turned out to be untrue in the end, some of them are coming out & saying it publicly, ie: he is a terton. Personally I don't think so. It is getting out of hand as expected but these things have a well defined cycle.

krodha wrote:
Interesting. That guy seems to be shrouded in controversy.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 3:04 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
What role does Tsogyel Drollo (Vajra Mamo Tsogyel Trollo) have in reference to Dorje Drollo? Or in terms of practice? I only see info on her available from the Aro lineage when I do a search on the web... don't hear about her often if at all.
http://aroencyclopaedia.org/shared/text/t/tsogyel_trollo_dr_01_01_full_eng.php
http://www.aroencyclopaedia.org/shared/text/t/tsogyel_trollo_dr_01_02_close_eng.php

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 6:30 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen
Content:

krodha wrote:
He's one of the wrathful manifestations of Padmasambhava. Along with Guru Dragphur. (Which is why he's closely associated with the teaching).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 6:49 AM
Title: Six Types Of Mindfulness in Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche briefly mentions in his book Rainbow Painting (pg. 120) six types of mindfulness within the dzogchen tradition specifically:

"...Often there is mention of several types of mindfulness: deliberate mindfulness, effortless mindfulness, dharmatā mindfulness, wisdom mindfulness, all-pervasive mindfulness and so forth. These latter terms lay out in great detail the differences between the seven impure and the three pure bhumis. Of course we could delve into this terminology intellectually, but that is not so beneficial at this time. The different stages have to be related to our personal experience.

The dzogchen tradition describes six types of mindfulness. Other systems mention only two: deliberate and effortless. The first type is called mindfulness of deliberate attention. The second type is called innate mindfulness. The dzogchen tradition phrases it this way: 'Sustain primordially free awareness with innate mindfulness.' There is no transformation involved here at all. It is the original state of awareness that is sustained by natural mindfulness. The ultimate is 'all-pervasive mindfulness' in which there is no distraction whatsoever. Awareness reaches as far as space reaches. It is unbroken and without interruption. Day and night, there is only all-encompassing awareness. All distraction has vanished into the state of dharmatā. This is the dharmakāya of all buddhas...."

He mentions that they lay out in great detail differences in relation to the bhumis, and I'd assume compare and contrast the differences between themselves, although that is merely a guess. I was curious to know where more information might be available on these six aspects of mindfulness? Or where these six aspects of mindfulness are originally discussed in reference to the tantras or termas etc. I realize that very rarely are hierarchical degrees or stages mentioned in reference to dzogchen, and for good reason, but these peaked my interest and I figured I'd see if anyone else knew anything about them.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 11:43 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
well in that case im curious as to the meaning thoughts arise from emptiness?

Lately it has appeared to me that the objective world is a projection of mind or thoughts,like this laptop began as a tought in a persons mind etc but now here it is manifest before my eyes.
i think im on the right track here,im not trying to cram it all in at once just get familiar with the nature of reality etc from a dzogchen pov

krodha wrote:
The fact that it's believed to be an objective 'thing' existing separate from you, is indeed a product of conceptualization. So imputation of thought does play a role on that level (a rather large role), but not in the sense you proposed though. It's much more immediate than the process you posited. Conditioning and habitual tendencies are what maintain it.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Milarepa -- too lazy to practise Dzogchen or no results?
Content:
Sherlock said:
There are two different versions of Milarepa's story about receiving Dzogchen teachings, in one he just slacks off because he hears about how rapid Dzogchen is and in the other he practises diligently without results until his teacher sends him away. Which is the older one?

krodha wrote:
Is there links to both versions online? I have the book "The Life Of Milarepa" not sure which version is in there though I'll have to look...

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
wow i did not know that, there is alot i need to learn but im glad to be alive at the time of this great master and have the chance to connect with him.

im sure there will be many hardships but im happy to have discovered what ive been

looking for,i just need to hold onto this enthusiasim for the ret of my life.

also afer i attend the WWT and join the DC will i be considered a disciple of Rinpoche? i know he has thousands of disciples,how do i go about having a personal relationship with CNNR?obviously to meet him in person is the goal but even then wont it be a huge amount of people trying to meet him at the same time.

krodha wrote:
He travels almost constantly doing retreats so if you put the effort in to be mindful of his schedule I'm sure you'd be able to attend one. As for really establishing a personal relationship though, he would want you to focus on the true guru which is your own natural state. After direct introduction his method of guru yoga is his primary practice he gives to help maintain that connection. Although he would be your teacher, it's not so much about being a disciple of him specifically as in focusing on idolizing his physical form, because that actually serves to maintain a dualistic view. Rinpoche, being the embodiment of primordial perfection would want you to focus on your own primordial perfection which is inseparable from the recognition he abides in. Being able to lay that subject-object approach aside is vital to this teaching, though relatively it's perfectly fine to consider him the teacher and you a student.

It definitely makes me happy to see you excited about the teaching that is a beautiful thing!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:22 PM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Jyoti no offense, but where are you learning this stuff and why is it being presented as dzogchen? You said you received transmission from ChNN I recall... And these certainly aren't his teachings, I'm just curious. I guess specifically what's the source of these notions and is that source presenting them as dzogchen? Or are you taking other teachings and applying it to what it appears dzogchen is stating and presenting your own take?

Jyoti said:
As a person who studied both so it is not difficult to know the similarities. The source all contained in the chinese mahayana tripitaka, the chinese words as stated are the key to decipher the meaning from the scriptures related to this topic, you need to rely only the definitive scriptures. Having a prior knowledge of dzogchen and ch'an helps a lot in the deciphering of the meaning in the scriptures.

krodha wrote:
I can't even bring myself to follow up on these responses, the other thread where you were correcting Tsele Natsok Rangdrol pretty much set the tone. Quite presumptuous. I'm sure you mean well but you're doing more harm than good answering questions here.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 9:03 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
krodha wrote:
Jyoti no offense, but where are you learning this stuff and why is it being presented as dzogchen? You said you received transmission from ChNN I recall... And these certainly aren't his teachings, I'm just curious. I guess specifically what's the source of these notions and is that source presenting them as dzogchen? Or are you taking other teachings and applying it to what it appears dzogchen is stating and presenting your own take?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:56 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:

RikudouSennin said:
Am i correct in assuming the dzogchen state is not a type of nirvikalpa samadhi or samadhi state or transcendental state but our natural state of non dual awareness? so its not like some divine state where your lost to the world in meditation correct?

krodha wrote:
Perhaps closer to Sahaja Samadhi if anything, but i couldn't say definitively being that my knowledge of sahaja and it's attributed is limited, definitely not a void absorption like nirvikalpa though.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 2:35 PM
Title: Re: Dreaming of Ekajati
Content:
krodha wrote:
I dreamt of Ekajati two nights ago... In the same dream ended up assembling some altar with a wood block carving of her that hung on the front of some mini stupa thing too... We partied.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 2:08 PM
Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
True,

"You might now ask, 'why wouldn't confusion reoccur as before, after the spontaneous presence dissolved back into primordial purity and one was liberated through naturally cognizing the manner of the spontaneously present ground-appearance manifesting from the ground?' This is because no basis exists for it's re-arising. Samantabhadra's liberation into the ground itelf and the yogi liberated through practicing the path are both devoid of any basis for reverting back to becoming a cause, just like a person who has recovered from a plague or the fruit of the se tree (a particular tree which is poisonous to touch, causing blisters and swelling. Once recovered, one is then immune). Other than these two cases, all sentient beings became confused when the ground-appearance of spontaneous presence manifested from the original ground of primordial purity and they failed to recognize that manifestation to be their own self-display."
- Tsele Natsok Rangdrol

Jyoti said:
In response to the quote, the status of buddha is actually dynamic versus being static, the word 're-awakening' is used to describe this dynamic. When a process is being repeated, it become a cycle, a cycle is permanent, this permanence revealed the true body which is the dharmakaya. Just like samsara is impermanent, but being a continuous revolving cycle reveal the permanence of its true body which is nirvana.

However, without the mechanism that support the process, the circle that form the re-awakening dynamic will not form, that mechanism is not make up of permanent element, but of causal components, such as the mental factors and transformation of consciousnesses. When the right cause is present, all these components start to function as directed, and the awakening dynamic begin to form, this is termed bodhi, it is a functioning component, a form of means, not to be confused as the body which is static and beyond cause (beyond the possibility of doing anything with regard to awakening or delusion).

krodha wrote:
While these threads concerning the basis do tend to get somewhat abstract, I'm having difficulty deciphering what you're attempting to say. The terminology you're using is causing this to appear somewhat obfuscated, which is making the point you're attempting to make unclear (at least to me). I actually can't even tell if you're validating the quote and this is a commentary of sorts, or if you're refuting it and this is your own view.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 5:21 AM
Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis

Content:
Nighthawk said:
As pointed out by Malcolm many times there are two types of buddhahood in dzogchen. One that reverts back to the basis and one that does not, the one that does not revert back can never fall back into sentient being hood. That buddhahood can said to be permanent such as the buddhahood of Padmasambhava, Milarepa etc.

krodha wrote:
True,

"You might now ask, 'why wouldn't confusion reoccur as before, after the spontaneous presence dissolved back into primordial purity and one was liberated through naturally cognizing the manner of the spontaneously present ground-appearance manifesting from the ground?' This is because no basis exists for it's re-arising. Samantabhadra's liberation into the ground itelf and the yogi liberated through practicing the path are both devoid of any basis for reverting back to becoming a cause, just like a person who has recovered from a plague or the fruit of the se tree (a particular tree which is poisonous to touch, causing blisters and swelling. Once recovered, one is then immune). Other than these two cases, all sentient beings became confused when the ground-appearance of spontaneous presence manifested from the original ground of primordial purity and they failed to recognize that manifestation to be their own self-display."
- Tsele Natsok Rangdrol

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 11:34 PM
Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
: Andrew108 and Heart, please don't take it personally. My intention is not to criticise anybody but bring what I consider to be a problem into focus.

krodha wrote:
Actually seems like Andrew108 and Heart are saying close to the same thing, just in different ways, I can see the points they're both trying to make. It's just that this subject can appear contradictory due to the nature of the topic but all in all valid points are being made on both accounts IMO.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 3:29 PM
Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen
Content:
heart said:
....But no matter how we recognize the natural state our condition is still a very strong habit of delusion, anyone that pay some attention to their own mind will know this. This is why we practice, we need to let habitual delusion dissolve and gain confidence in the

spontaneously present natural state....

/magnus

krodha wrote:
I agree. I actually was just exchanging posts in a fb forum today with our old buddy ol' pal Jax about this same topic (which is like beating my head against a wall) regarding the presence of traces of delusion, which he still erroneously maintains is essentially nonexistent on any level. This is a bit of what I wrote in a response...

There are latent perceptions which have been engrained and imposed onto experience via habitual conditioning. Only in rare cases does merely recognizing stillness (which is merely non-conceptual awareness and not rigpa) resolve these assumptive notions.

Due to apparent presence of these latent karmic propensities clarity is defiled and diminished in it's appearance.

Your "beingness" (a term I personally avoid in most cases) is defiled until one's true nature is authentically recognized, in that authentic recognition blatant (debilitating and governing) ignorance is cleared away. However, although the blatant apparition of ignorance is diminished in that first instance, latent traces still remain which will continue to afflict the full presencing of one's nature. By resting in that knowledge (the certainty revealed in the initial recognition) those latent traces of ignorance will slowly burn away, and when no trace remains the fullness of the dharmakāya will reveal itself to be all pervading. Only in rare cases does the first initial recognition remain irreversible, in most cases it must be cultivated and nurtured.

"The common site is termed the foundation of straying,
and since it becomes polluted with dimmed awareness the knowable itself appears to be stained.

Since memory-based thought activity manifests within the ordinary mind,
the "essence" is polluted by the conceptual flow.

Since the six facets of the psyche unceasingly grasp and fixate,
the reality body itself is fettered as well by it's dualistic grasping at objects.

Since it becomes involved with partless atomic particles,
radiant light itself comes to be dormant.

Since the objectifications deriving from the four conditions are impure,
presences themselves manifest in pluralized (and fragmented) fashion."
- Pearl Garland Tantra | mu tig phreng ba'i rgyud

So I agree, though ignorance is ultimately illusory it's apparent presence is enough to maintain itself. Cutting through the habitual tendencies which maintain the all-ground ain't no walk in the park for most of us, and if you find that it is, you're either be in the top

tier of gifted capacities or you're deluding yourself. Integration is important, and don't get me wrong I'm not advocating a causal practice, but the initial effort needed to maintain the view once one's state is authentically recognized.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 3:06 AM
Title: Re: Death contemplation for recognizing the state of rigpa?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
True, same point I was attempting to make more or less, one shouldn't get all high and mighty off gaining a little insight and believe they've resolved all traces of ignorance, some traces are very subtle and unless some level definitive realization has been attained those karmic propensities still remain. I was just making the point that the subtle attachments to the body notion are some deeply held (or deeply latent) propensities.

Andrew108 said:
I always like reading your posts. They are always informative. I wonder sometimes if the idea of achieving realization is somewhat false, as too is the idea that one already has realization? Perhaps we can discuss this idea further in another thread?

krodha wrote:
Probably both true and false in both cases depending on how you look at it, yeah probably a good topic for another thread since it'd be going off topic a bit. Would be an interesting thread though I'm sure

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 10:07 AM
Title: Re: Death contemplation for recognizing the state of rigpa?
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:
Would DI be enough? No lung required?

Pero said:
Yup.

asunthatneversets said:
Much like that Shri Singha quote Pero(I believe) has in his signature, where he addresses being presented with death and giving oneself up. Those "bonds" are important to investigate.

Pero said:
If you mean this quote by Shri Singha (posting it since I will be changing my sig now): If you think, 'I will have no karmic ripening even if I engage in the ten unvirtuous acts,' you should be able to accept the ten unvirtuous acts of others directed towards you—even

if it might result in your death. Can you do that?

It's really about not getting delusional about our supposed realizations but that's more clear when read in context - The Treasure Of The Lotus Crystal Cave in Treasures From Juniper Ridge.

krodha wrote:
True, same point I was attempting to make more or less, one shouldn't get all high and mighty off gaining a little insight and believe they've resolved all traces of ignorance, some traces are very subtle and unless some level definitive realization has been attained those karmic propensities still remain. I was just making the point that the subtle attachments to the body notion are some deeply held (or deeply latent) propensities.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Death contemplation for recognizing the state of rigpa?
Content:
Inge said:
I wonder if the kind of contemplation where one imagines ones own death, the decomposition of the body until only bones are left, then bones turns to dust, and then finally even the dust vanish, could be considered also a method for recognizing the state of rigpa through the experience of emptiness?

krodha wrote:
Some chod practices resemble visualizations like this, except during the practice after consciousness is ejected from the head (and is separated from the body below), one rests in equipoise and then visualizes oneself as the black troma nagmo dakini. As the black mother one envisions her dismembering your abandoned body, cutting off the head etc and assembling the pieces as a mandala offering for all the enlightened beings to come. Once the guests arrive the black dakini then prepares a feast with the body for the hordes of guests, there's lots of different recipes, in one the head is cut off and used as a container to stew the rest of the body, filleted skin is used as the tablecloth or for covering the ground etc. The body's prepared various ways for the large banquet of guests and then is devoured ravenously.

"Gesturing with the curved knife in her right hand [the dakini]
flays the skin which covers the ground.
Upon that the body's bloody flesh mass is chopped open
and becomes mountains of flesh to eat,
oceans of blood to drink,
rock piles of bone to gnaw,
hills of fat and grease to lick,
long bones and gristle to suck,
a space treasury of desirables,
veritable pleasure itself!"

Overcoming those subtle attachments to the notion of body is really important, they're extremely subtle and deeply engrained. Much like that Shri Singha quote Pero(I believe) has in his signature, where he addresses being presented with death and giving oneself up. Those "bonds" are important to investigate.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 3:14 AM
Title: Re: Mind emptiness and matter
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Thanks untill now, for your contribution / replies.

Very interesting and correct seen like in Dzogchen or how Dzogchen can deal with this matter / objects.
That is no doubt about it, it is the best interpretation.

But in case we see the gradual approach here or the emancipation(s), a certain knowledge is maintained like the outer objects are true. I agree fully what is true cannot be true for someone else, what is mediicine for someone else is poison for the other person etc.

So to make the matter understandable different kinds of philosophy is "invented".

krodha wrote:
Even from the ultimate perspective, that ultimate can only exist in relation to the relative, so when dealing in the relative condition and relating to others, all views are ok, just because one sees through the illusion doesn't mean the illusion is to be denied. So relatively all of these things appear, but they're understood to be merely conventions.

kalden yungdrung said:
Objects and attachment to them, the result is everywhere seen as NOT so ok.
Objects in Bon Dzogchen or general Dzoghen are not there. Here we have the point which cannot be known to other Traditions. Not to speak about Thogal.....

But if we deal with illsusion it is at the moment very clear that when my mom is too long in the sun she will have a red painfull skin. So i must buy some oil (out of compassion) to get the pain lessened / reduced.

So to tell my mom that it is in fact illusion etc. that is of no use to her at that moment and also other moments.

krodha wrote:
True, relatively there are other beings who are functioning on the relative level, and due

to their perceptions being deluded they're subject to the conditions their minds create in their experiences.

"...since those who understand the empty nature of their bodies still feel pain when touched by fire or water or when struck by arrows, speaks, clubs, and so forth. The answer to this is the fact that as long as you have not arrived at the state of basic space in which phenomena resolve within their true nature (chho-nyid-zad-pai ying), dualistic appearances do not subside, and as long as they have not subsided, beneficial and harmful appearances occur without interruption. In actuality, though, even the fires of hell do not burn."
- Dudjom Lingpa

kalden yungdrung said:
Maybe it is and it is not like i did suggested in Jnana's post would be here the best position which is for everybody understandable. Here is not meant per se the defending of the ultimate truth contra the relative one.

So i came IMO to the conclusion that a stone and the sun do exist in this collective karma called human being and his/her/ its world. Exceptions cannot be defended by the other party to the nihilsts, they will never or seldom agree to for instance a Dzogchen view not to speak about a Yidam etc.

krodha wrote:
I would say the best position is to attempt to point one in the direction of being able to access that ultimate state first hand of course, but then in daily life of course it's best to not firmly hold to one certain position, we must be compassionate for other's views because it's all relative. One's primordial state isn't a view to be held but an actuality to experience, it can be spoken of and discussed. But in discussing it one must be mindful that as soon as one translates that experience into an intellectual understanding and then presents it to others as if it's exclusively true, others, (having no basis to validate your words in experience) merely take it as an idea the same as any other theory. And if they're attached to their own intellectual notions, by insisting your view is absolute, potential for contention and conflict arises. So it's best to respect all views in my opinion, and then through one's own practice seek to benefit others. And if there's an opportunity to speak about the view in an environment that's conducive to it, (where everyone is interested and sharing the same aspirations - like here in this forum for example) then it's ok to speak freely about it (within reason, and respecting others still of course).

kalden yungdrung said:
What i do prefer? Like mentioned earlier the Dzogchen View but cannot defend that to others mostly. Can be it among them, that is no problem but cannot argue with them about matter and ego and living after death.

So we do communicate mostly, seen in the mood of Dzogchenpas, in the common karma called human, but not conflicting our NS. So for others is that a confirmation of their view (like nihilistic view) somehow if one does not argue about the essential things

in life.....

Better stop here because i feel i am repeating or a wheel is turning.

Mutsug Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
I suppose if they take it as a confirmation of their view then it's a confirmation. Doesn't mean it truly is though, it's just a relative interpretation based on the reference point they attach to, and that's their own limitation to recognize and work on I suppose.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:03 PM
Title: Re: Mind emptiness and matter
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

.....In Dzogchen everything seems to be of mind only quality without object or subjest but objects like the sun is still shining. So the material universe or matter, like Rahula did mentioned and explained has somehow a structure without mind but that structure is once created by mind at a certain point.

Thanks in advance for your efforts to make it more clear

Mutsug Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
Both mind and objects are empty by nature. Objects are merely misconceptions, nothing more than empty projections which seemingly originate via imputation yet are in truth unfounded. Primordial wisdom mistakenly perceives it's own display as a fragmented subject-object dichotomy and due this failure to recognize itself an illusory substratum is formed which becomes the basis for the afflicted personal consciousness. This polluted basis (all-ground) is the ignorance which maintains samsaric perception. Though it may appear to, in truth nothing is received or reflected, what appears to be sensory phenomena is merely the minds own luminous display. When this is recognized it becomes wisdom. Ultimately all appearances are unsubstantiated and illusory. There's no outside or inside. No mind and no matter, all of these designations are imputed misnomers and though they may appear to be real when one is deluded, they are completely illusory.

In dzogchen what appears to be a universe etc is the empty display of primordial

wisdom, when this isn't recognized and samsara arises wisdom is seemingly obscured resulting in deluded dualistic mind which erroneously perceives a world and matter and all of it. In truth (when one isn't beguiled by afflicted perception) all that appears is the nature of mind (which is the union of empty cognizance and luminous clarity). I'm sure you've heard the analogy of the moon reflected in water, phenomena appear in that way; likened to looking at the surface of a lake and mistaking the reflection of the moon for an actual object, when in truth it is nothing more than water. In experience one mistakes the display of wisdom to be internal/external phenomena and objects (plus other co-emergent qualities such as time, space, location, emotions, sensations, perceptions etc...) when in fact it's simply primordial wisdom.

So it appears as if there is a sun in the sky which exists outside of you as an individual, and it's a completely compelling appearance, it seems truly real. In truth however it is an illusion. Materiality, physicality, matter etc.. appear to exist due to our ignorance, yet they are empty designations which are solely an expression of ignorance.

I'm not sure about Buddha Shakyamuni's son saying that matter was real, I can't see that being that Buddha Shakyamuni certainly didn't teach that view, but I could be wrong.

"Phenomena are the delusion of mind;
Apart from mind there are no phenomena.
The deluded mind appearing as phenomena
is dependently originated, illusory, and uncreated."
- An early Semde text titled Tawai Gumchung

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
A good thing in my opinion! Wake this forum up a bit, it has been sleeping.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 2:29 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
As others have also pointed out, ChNN is giving direct introduction ridiculously often... I can only think of one webcast in the last year when he didn't give it, and it was announced beforehand that it was a general public teaching and not a transmission. WWT is only as special as all of Rinpoche's other webcasts and vice versa.

krodha wrote:
I can see that, perhaps my perception of the transmission needs some refining.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Sherlock said:
Maybe I'm wrong, but if you already have a genuine experience of rigpa either from previous webcasts or through the semdzins etc, the WWT is not really that important.

krodha wrote:
I agree, I wasn't making an issue of it for my own interests, I was speaking for those like windoverwater who were looking forward to the event and unfortunately weren't able to see it.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 2:23 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pero said:
From my observation of online discussions for years you certainly aren't the only one, maybe others just don't express it in this way. I guess it has to do with it being called "World Wide Transmission", it is kind of grand sounding.

krodha wrote:
Yes I've been taken in by it's grandiose title and presentation.

Pero said:
That's not what your statement implied. Also what you say is not true. How many repetetitions of the various teachings from the Dra Thalgyur tantra, or Kunsang Jaku, or Flight of the garuda, or Sangye Lhakchang, or Yeshe Lama, or the 7 Nails of Sri Singha etc. etc. have there been? None. Whereas the WWTs are repeated every year, three times a year.

krodha wrote:
My statement implies whatever you translate it to imply, as it's filtered through what you wish to see in it, so what I said my statement meant, IS what my statement was meant to imply. However you wanted to see something different and made a slighted remark and I played ball and now you've been able to elaborate your point you vaguely hinted at to draw out a reaction. Yes, perhaps what I said isn't entirely true in the face of some other rare teachings you've brought out to make your point, but this is now merely grasping at straws to make a point.

Pero said:
Uhm what? You don't have to attend a WWT at all. It is not some kind of initial transmission the other webcasts are based on. Rinpoche gives a direct introduction

practically every retreat. He just gave it on Thursday too. Practically every retreat is a teaching standing on its own. Just attending one would be theoretically sufficient to achieve realization.

krodha wrote:
You don't have to write "Uhm what?" in some pompous manner, I'm merely trying to speak from my point of view and I'm open to others, and even yours, no need to have an attitude (I suppose I'm just as guilty of copping an attitude though, and for that I apologize). In my experience at our Ling in berkeley, if you haven't attended a WWT you're welcome to attend the practices etc.. but you're strongly advised to attend a WWT and are capable of accessing and partaking in more aspects of the community if you have. So perhaps I erroneously perceived some significance in the WWT and it stuck, but I'm open to seeing it in another light.

Pero said:
The WWT's come from a time when webcast didn't exist you know.

krodha wrote:
No I did not know that.

Pero said:
IMO attending a webcast retreat is much better for a newbie. It's not that one is more precious than the other at all but by attending a retreat it is much easier to understand something.

krodha wrote:
I agree.

Pero said:
Other issues aside, have you explained to him what it's all about and taught him what to do during the transmission?

krodha wrote:
Other issues aside? I'm glad you can find all these issues Pero. He's 3. I do what I can.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 7:02 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Regular webcast is one thing but WWT is an incredibly precious thing to miss out on in my opinion.

Pero said:
Really I'm totally flabbergasted that so many people think this.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure if 'so many people' think that, since I'm the only one who made the statement. Secondly, you're taking my statement out of context. The point I'm making is: for an aspect of the system to fail during an event that only happens 2 or 3 times a year - as opposed to a webcast that is part of a teaching which spans a few days consecutively and may contain subject matter which is soon revisited - logically, the failure occurring on the rarer biyearly event would be considered more unfortunate. That doesn't mean one is more valuable than the other.

Also, being that the other webcasts are based on the knowledge recognized during that initial transmission (and that one isn't advised to practice too extensively without that introduction), I'd consider the introduction fairly relevant. To use an example which conveys my point in a tangible way: I have a son who's very young, I'd never make him sit through a webcast, but I make sure he receives introduction whenever it happens and the circumstances allow. The transmission establishes that connection, and allows him to have had the privilege of receiving introduction from an authentic and realized teacher.

It makes sense to me. Even though ultimately grasping at the transmission is missing the point, the transmission is important.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 1:27 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Pretty unbelievable! Whether it was technical difficulties or the IT department screwing up royally, something went wrong somewhere. Unfortunate turn of events to say the least. I feel for you windoverwater, from the depths of me. That's some bullshit.

Josef said:
It was perfect for me.
From beginning to end.
Definitely NOT the webcast team or IT department.

Virgo said:
I think the problem was people couldn't connect through mobile devices.

Kevin

krodha wrote:
Yeah the mobile devices section wasn't properly hooked up for some reason. The regular audio and video were good to go but the mobile option never switched over to open access. Not sure what the percentage of people who use mobile devices is (as opposed to the traditional setup), but I'd imagine a good amount were left out in the cold on this. Regular webcast is one thing but WWT is an incredibly precious thing to

miss out on in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 11:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Pretty unbelievable! Whether it was technical difficulties or the IT department screwing up royally, something went wrong somewhere. Unfortunate turn of events to say the least. I feel for you windoverwater, from the depths of me. That's some bullshit.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 11:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
T minus 10 mins for WWT, why is the webcast still restricted? Says it requires login info, what gives?

Conceptual said:
Have you tried clearing your cache? It's unrestricted on my end.

krodha wrote:
Did that and now the audio and video are open but mobile devices still require login, only have access to the phone at the moment. Received transmission quite a few times but damn, always try to watch it. Bummer.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 10:55 AM
Title: Re: Next Transmission
Content:
krodha wrote:
Apparently the worldwide transmission isn't open?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 10:50 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
T minus 10 mins for WWT, why is the webcast still restricted? Says it requires login info, what gives?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 5:07 AM
Title: Re: Precious Vase Book
Content:
krodha wrote:
It may just be my Precious Vase PDF version, but I also have the actual book and when I compare the PDF with the book the PDF seems to have alot of pages omitted. When I first got the PDF I uploaded it on my phone and went to a SMS meeting figuring I was all set just to read along with my phone but the pages being discussed were missing. Whole sections missing. Is this the case for all the PDFs? Just in case someone leaks them online? Or is my PDF copy just defective?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2012 at 8:41 AM
Title: Re: Next Transmission
Content:
Sally Gross said:
They also fail to take daylight saving time into account -- the table was probably drawn up before it came to be used in many places. I'm not sure whether or how daylight saving time comes into it when it is summer in the northern hemisphere. It is confusing -- the lists of times need to be corrected and updated to take daylight-saving time into account where applicable.

asunthatneversets said:
It's based off of the lunar cycles which is an accurate way of measuring time that doesn't require adjusting for daylight savings like the Julian calendar the west (unfortunately) adopted.

Sally Gross said:
That is as may be, but converting from a time in a given time zone to another time-zone -- as in the list of times by time-zone -- unavoidably needs to take daylight saving time into account. People's watches and clocks tend to follow the Western system rather than the lunar cycles, alas, and tables of times compiled for convenience need to take that into account.

krodha wrote:
True.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2012 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Next Transmission
Content:
Sally Gross said:
They also fail to take daylight saving time into account -- the table was probably drawn up before it came to be used in many places. I'm not sure whether or how daylight

saving time comes into it when it is summer in the northern hemisphere. It is confusing -- the lists of times need to be corrected and updated to take daylight-saving time into account where applicable.

krodha wrote:
It's based off of the lunar cycles which is an accurate way of measuring time that doesn't require adjusting for daylight savings like the Julian calendar the west (unfortunately) adopted.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, July 20th, 2012 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Next Transmission
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm pretty sure the worldwide transmissions are at the same time every time, it's whenever the sun rises in the oddiyana area (or perhaps a different location I can't remember) but its the same time every time.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 4:14 PM
Title: Re: Spontaneously Arising Moral Ethics?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"In the ultimate definitive analysis
just as golden chains and hempen ropes are equally binding,
so the sacred and the profane do both enslave us;
and just as white and black clouds are equally enshrouding,
so virtue and vice alike veil gnosis:
the yogin or yogini who understands that
fosters release from moral conditioning."
- Treasury of Natural Perfection

but

"If you, after having resolved that everything is emptiness,
discard virtue and indulge in evil actions frivolously,
this is the view of the demon of black freedom,
it is essential not to fall prey to this demonic view."
- The Flight of the Garuda

And regarding compassion:

"In particular, if you follow those who say that although one realizes emptiness one must cultivate compassion elsewhere, you are similar to someone who claims that although one has water one must seek wetness elsewhere, that although one has fire

one must seek warmth elsewhere, or that although one is fanned by the wind one must seek coolness elsewhere. The decisive experience of certainty that samsara and nirvana are supreme emptiness is itself unsurpassable awakened mind - compassion as the display of samsara and nirvana in the equalness and purity."
- Dudjom Lingpa

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 5:27 AM
Title: Re: Zen has No Morals
Content:
krodha wrote:
These aren't Zen quotes specifically, but (with the insight being equivalent) these also apply to what's being discussed here...

"In the ultimate definitive analysis
just as golden chains and hempen ropes are equally binding,
so the sacred and the profane do both enslave us;
and just as white and black clouds are equally enshrouding,
so virtue and vice alike veil gnosis:
the yogin or yogini who understands that
fosters release from moral conditioning.

As self-sprung awareness arises from within
and the dark night of causality dissolves
the clouds of moral duality melt away
and the sun of nondual truth dawns in the field of reality.
This is final, ultimate resolution,
induced by the absence of the ten techniques,
exalted above all progressive approaches."
- Treasury of Natural Perfection

but

"If you, after having resolved that everything is emptiness,
discard virtue and indulge in evil actions frivolously,
this is the view of the demon of black freedom,
it is essential not to fall prey to this demonic view."
- The Flight of the Garuda

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 17th, 2012 at 5:16 AM
Title: Re: Did siddha Ramalinga achive the rainbow body?
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's supposedly a few other traditions which have fruition (and practices) equivalent

to rainbow body. Maybe someone else can elaborate but I remember a Taoist practice, and a Christian/Catholic practice was spoken of as well. I wouldn't be surprised if the same type of phenomena manifested for individuals of other traditions in rare cases. The fact that it's possible has to be an attribute which is universal to life in general, so if the right conditions and causes are met I don't see why not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 10th, 2012 at 1:13 PM
Title: Re: Ayahuasca and Buddhism
Content:
Tron010101 said:
Having been an active Ayahuasca Practitioner involved in at least 14 serious ceremonies AND an meditation practitioner....i will give you all a heads up.

If you have a choice.....and you do.....Do not take Ayahuasca..... or anything external.

Everything you need you all ready have. Do not go to external sources.

For those who have been down the shamatic path (I have respectfully bowed away from Ayahuasca), some of the following points will ring hard, especially in these times.

1. The Ayahuasca has been turned into a business, a disrespect to the "Madrecita/Ayahuasca" of epic proportions. As a result, the Shamans/Chefs who are preparing the brew are increasingly tainted, dirty handed, ill intended, and they are sending poison. Not all, but its becoming an epidemic.

2. Ayahuasca is real. There are some things that happen in ceremonies that are too risky for the mind. Seriously.

3. Dark Shamans are rampant, very real and can easily manipulate from a distance. Hard to believe, strange, but true. They are taking advantage of tourists. The spiritual and psychological consequences of the misuse of ayahuasca could be catastrophic.

4. There are certain boundaries and laws that are in place in our reality to permit Humans to progress and make their own choices for themselves and their race. Ayahuasca will permit you to cross these boundaries... at your risk. If you cross the boundaries and you are under the wrong supervision.....GOOD LUCK. Hungry Ghosts are REAL.

I would suggest all practicing buddhist to focus on the three jewels, stay away from all forms of dangerous intoxicants and practice compassion every day. LOVE IS THE ONLY WAY.

I would like to say, the plant is a blessing, but should be left alone and respected.

krodha wrote:

Unfortunate to hear that such abuse goes on, I guess anything is susceptible to degradation of this nature though. Ayahuasca has always intrigued me, I've never done it myself but a friend of mine doing DMT is actually what ended up sparking my initial interest in the dharma. What are some of the things that happen in ceremonies which are too risky for the mind? I've never heard of dark shamans, I mean I've heard of black practices and I know that any teaching can be made to serve the negative but I'd never heard of dark shamans specifically who deal with ayahuasca and such... interesting stuff.

Some say that the ayahuasca opens doors that would otherwise be inaccessible, and can leave these doors open. Sensors left triggered which are usually dormant and the ability to continually detect perceptive wavelengths previously unavailable (in every day life). Have you experienced anything like this? 14 ceremonies is a lot, curious to know if you've had any intuitive/extra-sensory abilities left activated. Or has it boosted the intensity of your meditative practices/experiences? I find this stuff interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 10th, 2012 at 7:20 AM
Title: Re: Can a Christian convert to Buddhist faith?..
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
If from a Christian family you say 'grace' at meals its a form of manifest prayer and merit/favor.

krodha wrote:
Grace, she passed away 30 years ago.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ZcZVugtF6w

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 10th, 2012 at 3:53 AM
Title: Re: Do you believe in ghosts?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Important to remember that disbelief is still a form of belief (one simply believes something isn't true). Anything can be turned into a religion/belief system, including atheism, agnosticism, science, psychology etc... all depends on how one relates to these things.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, July 7th, 2012 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Shambhala Mountain, forest fire getting close
Content:
krodha wrote:
Hopefully the fire won't reach there. There was a building fire in Berkeley a few months ago where a building (which was attached to a series of other buildings, like any city block) caught fire and the flames consumed the entire building and a restaurant which was a part of the next building. The next store over from the restaurant however is called "Treasures Of Tara" and the owner is a big time practitioner. The fire didn't touch his store. It's incredible, you see an entire charred and gutted building and a boarded up restaurant and then "Treasures Of Tara" just unscathed. No coincidence in my opinion.

My friend also knows someone who kept a photo of Guru Rinpoche's "looks like me" statue in their car's glove compartment. They got in a cataclysmic accident and the entire car was crushed like a tin can right up to the glove compartment, like a straight line. Both the driver and passenger walked away and the police/paramedics couldn't explain it. They said the entire front section of the car should've been crushed.

Hopefully the same goes for shambhala mountain and everyone else who could be potentially effected.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Garuda Practice And Cancer
Content:
krodha wrote:
Someone also just suggested Vajra Armor (Dorje Gotrab) which is supposedly more of an all-encompassing healing practice, would that be a better option? Or a good practice to do in addition to the garuda (as a supplement)? I know the garuda is specifically for cancer, being that cancer is generally a naga provocation. Again any information and/or suggestions are much appreciated.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 6:02 AM
Title: Dzogchen Garuda Practice And Cancer
Content:
krodha wrote:
I have a friend who was just recently diagnosed with bladder cancer and I was curious about doing practice for him. I assume it's ok to do practice for another dealing with such an affliction, what is the proper practice to do? Red garuda? I know there's a few forms, blue and black garuda etc... not sure which is the best one to implement for this. I've received transmission from ChNN for the practice, I know there's books and other info on how to perform the practice properly but I'm not sure how soon I'll be able to get access to those sources. Wondering if anyone can give some more info or perhaps even

PM me the proper practice? Supposedly this particular form of cancer is quite aggressive so I'd like to get started as soon as possible, any info would be greatly appreciated.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 5:39 AM
Title: Re: Questions regardin God and Nirvana
Content:
Astus said:
Nirvana means extinction. It is the extinction of the cause of suffering, it is the end of attachment. As an example, A is in love with B, then eventually A becomes bored with B, then A feels that B is getting rather annoying, and finally A happily leaves B. Simple story. When A finally gives up on B, that is the nirvana, the total extinction of A's infatuation with B. All beings are very much attached to the sensual impressions, their emotions and their ideas. But when one learns that it is this grasping of phenomena that is causing all the trouble, one gradually becomes disinterested in them, and turns away from them. And that is nirvana, when one has left behind all attachment for good. The bonfire of passion is now a pile of cold ash. The love story is over. Does this sound like a mystical experience? Or a divine presence?

krodha wrote:
It's a bit more than simply disinterest wouldn't you say? Detachment can be a good practice to cultivate the view (if that is the appropriate method for said individual), but it's more than ending attachment, aversion must be seen through as well. I'm not trying to be polemic or challenge what you're saying in a petty way or anything, what you're saying is right. Seems there's more to it though, in my experience at least. Disinterest may indeed be an aspect of the way the realization gradually unfolds, even more so once a genuine flash of nirvanic insight is apperceived. Nirvana does sever the allure of attachment, and true nirvana surely is the end of attachment, but the cause of suffering isn't necessarily attachment itself. The cause, is the erroneous notion that there was ever an A to be attached to B in the first place. So perhaps we're saying the same thing and I'm misreading what you wrote, but for me nirvana is a bit more than merely turning away, or leaving behind attachment, it's true extinction and total exhaustion of that which attachment is predicated on. The delusion is the entity which is born of (and sustained through the proliferation of) attachment and aversion. Being an illusion it causes suffering, because it's an aberration, a beautiful aberration, but an aberration and abstraction no doubt. The essential experience (or direct apprehension) does have the quality of the mystical... divine, but not in the sense of divine in a religious or godly sense, since that type of theological notion is certainly a projection of ignorance. In some ways though, it is the beginning of true passion and the beginning of the real love story. Beyond the dualities which produce pseudo passion and attachment/infatuation mistaken for love.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: "2+1=3 it also equals 21." ChNN
Content:
deepbluehum said:
So my questions, is it appropriate to lead students of Buddhism in this way, or is it not?

Is it more appropriate to condition students only with the dogma of the past?

If we decide to go the Dzogchen/Modern Philosophy way, does it mean we are no longer Buddhist? Or is there another way of being Buddhist that does not strictly adhere to dogma and might even challenge Buddhist dogma?

krodha wrote:
Wouldn't it be true that the perversion of the teachings into "dogma" is contingent upon individual interpretation? I suppose I see no dogma, all tenets of the dharma are merely pointers, none are meant to be absolute laws, rules or regulations. If one turns such things into dogma then that is merely the error of that individual, the tendency for such misinterpretation to be paraded as truth and taught to others (in it's skewed state) is again dependent on human error. If you get enough people to follow an erroneous view, then it is merely the manifest macrocosm naturally reflecting the initial misunderstanding of the microcosm. The original teachings however, are never adulterated or stained within this chain of ignorance. For the founding message or tenets are only ever what they're made to be, those who clearly understand them will benefit, and those who misunderstand will obviously deviate. It's only natural for this to happen. The attachment to the resultant dogma is again the error of the individual or group, those with higher capacity will naturally see through this mishap, and the higher teachings are there for them. The full spectrum of the teachings naturally reflects the spectrum of the human condition in it's many psychological and intellectual facets.

As for being a "buddhist", none are that. But the title or label is there and there's no need to suppress it in my opinion. Those who don't clearly perceive the fundamental message may attach to this label, identify with it and call themselves a "buddhist", and yes that may serve as an obstructive shortcoming. At the same time, others may implement the label and (because they exhibit right view) will rise above delusion and see the title as an ornament of their clear apprehension of the dharma. Either way, the label is again solely what it is made to be and harbors no authority or nature of it's own. Only that which is given to it by the mind of the individual and it will rightly reflect said designation (and founding perception). Those who know better will never fall victim to dogmatic views, the fundamental truth which transcends dogma is always present and there to be found, it's only ever obscured by one's own ignorance. Again (just as in the discussion on islam) the issue is never in the objective structure itself, but lies in the collective proclivity to pervert any subsequent ignorance derived from humanity's natural tendency to seek discipline, structure and authority. And there's nothing wrong with discipline, structure and authority, the problems arise from wrong identification with these things. There will always be the full spectrum, from wisdom to ignorance and all of the potential outcomes involved. The varying systems of belief or spiritual disciplines which exist today are reflections of a collective state of mind, not only of the individual systems but their interaction with other systems as well. It is the play of

duality and it's only ever mankind's ignorance (or wisdom for that matter) which shines through. Luckily for us the dharma is meant to cut through any potential ignorance (and it is a incredible tool to do so), but that doesn't guarantee protection against the tendency for ignorance to flourish where the ground is fertile.

I find the original teachings to speak clearly and light the path unerringly. It is the clouded mind which cannot see the way.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 5:08 AM
Title: Re: Goodbye from me!
Content:
krodha wrote:
Damn what?! I'll keep my fingers crossed you come back soon... shame to see you go I enjoy your contributions to the discussions on here.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 4:38 AM
Title: Re: Some practice-related questions
Content:
Sherlock said:
Someone posted about vajra sister who is a neuroscientist doing some scans of the brain while practising meditation in the Dzogchen way which showed a reduction in activity of the prefrontal cortex and also quoted some texts saying the feeling is like lifting a hat off your head. I often feel like this during practice and afterwards, is this what ChNN calls "presence"? Vidya/instant presence I think I feel only in some momentary flashes while doing guruyoga.

krodha wrote:
I'm sure there can be greater and lesser degrees of genuine insight, but one of the qualities of a true recognition experience is overwhelming certainty beyond the need for secondary confirmation or validation.

Sherlock said:
Has anyone had any experiences of really learning something in a dream of clarity? Rinpoche is Rinpoche but any of us unrealized practitioners received any teachings in dreams? Can you PM me about this if you don't feel like posting this in public?

Thanks

krodha wrote:
The more your mind is on the teachings the more you'll have dharma themed dreams. Dreams of clarity are an altogether different animal though, product of higher levels of realization and stability. I'm fairly certain you have to be at the point where you're

remaining conscious in the dream state the majority of the time to experience dreams of clarity. I read somewhere that I took one teacher 7 years of abiding in the natural state to start remaining lucid in his sleep. All depends on the individual though.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 7:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ekajati, Rahula and Dorje Legpa are the 3 principal "protectors" according to ChNN, Ekajati being the main. Perhaps their association together as the triad is unique to the lineage, I'm not sure. I have a thangka with only the 3 of them on it so it must not be that uncommon. Each controls certain beings of the 8 classes though.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:33 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
mint said:
Will the e-mails stop when my DC membership ends next January?

krodha wrote:
They will never stop. It never sleeps.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mna4bEWL0zE

You could probably just have them automatically forward to a designated folder of your choice in your email, then they won't be in your inbox.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 5:17 AM
Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana
Content:
Astus said:
I'm not sure which one is the case, but it seems the question is either said incorrectly by me, or I don't see the answers' relevance to it, or its meaning has eluded those who have kindly replied. So now I try from a slightly different perspective.

Let's say that the alayavijnana is simply a theoretical supposition, a convenient

explanation about how memory, mind and karma works. The seeds are simply our unquestioned views we follow all the time. Once seen through, it's all gone. Unfortunately, this makes the whole argument for alayavijnana quite weak.

krodha wrote:
But those unquestioned views generally remain unquestioned for the majority of people. Some are so deeply engrained that the truth remains elusive even when questioned and analyzed repeatedly. Seeing through that veil isn't so easy, and that veil of presuppositions actually manifests as perceptions which appear to be inherent aspects of experience to the untrained eye. Granted once a perception is seen for what it is it does lose it's luster, but some perceptions are so reified through habitual tendencies that their effect can remain indefinitely. It's a veil or a cloud and it serves to block and inhibit true knowledge, doesn't mean it's a physical or mental thing, but it's an abstraction composed of a variety of interlinking causes no doubt.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Have you ever "looked inside" the mind of a Billionaire?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Money rules everything, many of us have been reduced to hamsters running on a wheel, chasing paychecks to get by.

kirtu said:
Some of us live in primitive societies where we may starve in the streets. Securing resources is necessary.

Kirt

krodha wrote:
But of course, how one relates to securing those resources is where the problem lies. In many societies it's been set up so you have to play the game if you desire the amenities and standards we've been conditioned to require. And there's nothing wrong with that, most people would rather live comfortably, myself included. But do we see it for what it is? As a game? Do we treat money like the convention it is? Or are we caught up in the game, swept away by it and thoroughly identify with it?

Bill Hicks puts it well:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZkhR8suCF4

Mr. Hicks clearly had some profound realizations himself...

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PAJPdenxVlw

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Have you ever "looked inside" the mind of a Billionaire?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Money rules everything, many of us have been reduced to hamsters running on a wheel

Lhug-Pa said:
"Cash Rules Everything Around Me, CREAM, get the money, dollar-dollar bill y'all."

krodha wrote:
Ha funny thing my friend went to that bodhi tree book store in LA (when me and him were first getting into the dharma) and GZA was in there buying Zen books (RZA and GZA are big time zen practitioners). Being a Wu-Tang fan he took it as some type of sign that his newfound interest in the dharma was the right path.

And now he's a Rosicrucian practitioner. Head first dzogchen, come out Rosicrucian, go figure... Whatever makes him happy and gets the job done though, it's all good to me, I get to hear about interesting Rosicrucian stuff from him now.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Have you ever "looked inside" the mind of a Billionaire?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Well, yes sure of course. If you're "divorced" from what you're supposed to be earning ($In American dollars$)-I guess you move on and do something else.

krodha wrote:
What are you supposed to be earning? I wasn't advocating moving onto something else, just saying that money is merely a symbol which lacks innate value, so a billionaire is really no different than anyone else. Putting a billionaire on a pedestal is ignorant. It surely happens this day in age, but only due to the subconscious compulsion to equate money with true wealth and value. Money rules everything, many of us have been reduced to hamsters running on a wheel, chasing paychecks to get by. Within that structure, monetary abundance is associated with freedom from that rat race. So we exalt those (the rich) who have escaped the bondage of slavery enduced by money, and most aspire for that pseudo-freedom themselves. In truth, however, the wealthy haven't

escaped from suffering, they've only done so symbolically by winning some degree of financial freedom and are therefore liberated from the false structure of financial burden. Money has no value apart from that which is assigned to it. Money has value because we all collectively agree that it does, the whole structure exists solely within the mind. So winning monetary abundance means that one has conquered the system enforced by the collective mind of man. It isn't true freedom, you see many of the world's "rich" people still suffering, depression, loss etc. True freedom is won by seeing through the game, disavowing it and not allowing oneself to be governed by it. And the truest liberation is the freedom won through true knowledge.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 3:47 PM
Title: Re: Have you ever "looked inside" the mind of a Billionaire?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Just wondering, have you ever "looked inside" the mind a Billionaire?..

krodha wrote:
First come to know your own mind, and then you'll know the mind of the billionaire and the mind of the person without a dime to their name. When you understand yourself you understand everyone else, emotions, reactivity, nuances, projections, behaviors are universal and the same for everyone. The functioning of the mind is like a science, when you thoroughly understand the structure of the science then you see it playing out in everyone you meet. Ignorance of oneself means ignorance of all, knowledge of oneself means knowledge of all. The billionaire's mind is no different than yours. And in truth the billionaire is no more wealthy than the person without a dime to their name.

Never forget that one may indeed know the price of everything, yet the value of nothing. Your wealth is not your value. True wealth has nothing to do with money.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 27th, 2012 at 2:43 PM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
deepbluehum said:
That's nice and beautiful bla bla bla. But that won't change Islam's history of invading peaceful nations,

krodha wrote:
Nothing which hasn't been done by countless other nations or groups identifying with particular ideologies.

deepbluehum said:
slaughtering their children and kidnapping and raping their women to transform the society into Islamic nation.

krodha wrote:
Nothing which hasn't been done by countless other nations or groups identifying with particular ideologies.

deepbluehum said:
Nothing about my touchy feelies can change that. Next you are going to celebrate the virtues of communism. Islam and communism are the culprits of destruction against Buddha dharma too. I hope they are destroyed together.

krodha wrote:
No virtues have been celebrated thus far to warrant further celebration of any ideology (be it communism or any other). It has nothing to do with celebrating virtues. It comes down to identification with thought and attachment to belief. If you think Islam or communism could possibly destroy the dharma then you've mistook the dharma for a belief system yourself. You don't understand that by wishing for the demise of Islam or communism you're only contributing to the belief identified prejudice you claim to be rejecting. Feeding the fires of separation and sewing the seeds of hate and war all in the name of peace. That isn't what the Buddha taught. By eradicating Islam or communism you merely replace one ideology with another and the ignorance persists. The conflict is within the mind and must be resolved within the mind. It's a psychological crisis. You downplay addressing the problem within because you don't understand (don't seem to at least), and that's ok, if I was to wholeheartedly reject your message I would be falling victim to the same delusion. So please continue with your prejudiced discrimination and hold an entire belief system accountable for the actions of radical subsidiary factions and rouge extremists. It's unsound logic in my eyes but to each their own.

That being said I understand you're an opinionated person and there's nothing wrong with that, we all are in our own ways. So no contention here, I just don't agree, but sometimes agreeing to disagree is the best route.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 27th, 2012 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Jacob said:
Hm, could anyone explain me what's the function of serkyem practice?

krodha wrote:
Random but recently a friend of mine started working for the show "ghost hunters" and she does on location work so she's in these haunted areas with them. She was telling me some of the ways they contact and appease these spirits and one of the ways is to make an offering of fruit or some other food. She said they can't offer anything packaged because depending on the era the spirits are from they wouldn't understand packaged food but she said they make an offering at every location, usually fresh fruit. And supposedly this goes over quite well with whatever beings they're in contact with. Made

me think of serkyem, since it essentially is a loose form of serkyem (though I doubt they call on enlightened beings and local guardians to be present).

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: Not Accepting, Not Rejecting
Content:
MalaBeads said:
Thanks to you both. I get it. Just more work to be done.

krodha wrote:
Notice that experience is fresh and new every single moment, all qualities which constitute (and serve to create) this present moment simply appear alone to themselves. "I experience this" is simply a thought which appears to no one and points to nothing. There is a subtle flow always immediately present, so so subtle, if you try to apprehend it you've already done too much. I know it's a cliche in these teachings but in truth everything is already spontaneously accomplished, there is truly nothing to do. Just as Fa Dao said, accepting/rejecting presupposes (and serves to create/sustain) a separate entity, existing apart from experience (where no such entity exists). This is why dzogchen isn't a causal vehicle, it's perfectly accomplished since the very beginning, "you" cannot attain it, or "get it". It's like those zen sayings "You cannot grasp it; Nor can you get rid of it. In not being able to get it, you get it. When you speak, it is silent; When you are silent, it speaks". To accept or reject something there first has to be a quality or "thing" to accept/reject and one to do the accepting and rejecting. Acceptance and rejection appear to happen, yet it's only illusory. Everything simply seemingly "happens". When you rest presently(which is the only way one can), there's never been a moment prior to this, there will never be a moment after this, nothing has to be done to attain one's true nature, you simply have to recognize it. This inconceivable, indescribable, inexplicable conscious presence IS the reality-field in it's entirety. Your "being" is experience itself, yet you are not, and experience is likewise unestablished.

Take a dream for example, in the dream, you as the dream character are merely a conglomerate of dream qualities, an image, thoughts in the dream, sensations, yet none of these appearances truly creates a truly existing entity, just an appearance in the dream. The same appearances likewise create the dream-environment and dream-world, yet no world is truly created, just an appearance in the dream. And in fact the dream itself IS these appearances. This present experience is no different and in fact appears the same way. You are this timelessly present field of potentiality, and everything appearing is of one taste just as all dream appearances are of the dream. Just like the dream, in this present experience the body is an image appearing nowhere and belonging to no one, thoughts are appearances pointing to nothing and belonging to no one, sensations simply arise, nothing is felt, no one feels, nothing is seen, no one sees, nothing is heard, no one hears.

It's incredible that it's actuality is such utter simplicity yet at the same time attempting

to describe it is nearly impossible.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Not Accepting, Not Rejecting
Content:
Simon E. said:
Aversion arises....attraction arises. They pass.

krodha wrote:
This is only tentatively true, an arising (and the act of passing) would require an abiding background to gauge those distinctions against, there should be no arising/abiding/passing if one is genuinely resting in the natural state.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:
deepbluehum said:
I feel like I shouldn't leave this hanging. I'll try to be reserved. For example, tanha doesn't mean desire. It means urge. Avijja doesn't mean ignorance. It means unawares.

krodha wrote:
"The second of the noble truths is about the cause of suffering, and this in sanskrit is called 'tṛṣna'. Tṛṣna is related to our word 'thirst', it's very often translated 'desire', better perhaps is 'craving', 'clinging', 'grasping', or even to use our modern psychological word 'blocking'. When for example, somebody is blocked and dithers and hesitates and doesn't know what to do, he is in the strictest buddhist sense, attached, he's stuck. But a buddha can't be stuck, he cannot be phased, he always flows just as water always flows even if you dam it, the river just keeps on getting higher and higher until it flows over the dam, it's unstoppable. Now buddha said duḥkha comes from tṛṣna, 'you all suffer because you cling to the world, and you don't recognize that the world is anitya and anātman'."
- Alan Watts

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Buddha Magic?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
like Clairvoyance?..And psychokinetic mental powers?

krodha wrote:
Five siddhis of Yoga and meditation

In the Bhagavata Purana, the five siddhis of Yoga and meditation are described as below:

tri-kāla-jñatvam: knowing the past, present and future
advandvam: tolerance of heat, cold and other dualities
para citta ādi abhijñatā: knowing the minds of others and so on
agni arka ambu viṣa ādīnām pratiṣṭambhaḥ: checking the influence of fire, sun, water, poison, and so on
aparājayah: remaining unconquered by others

Eight Primary Siddhis
There is the concept of the Ashta Siddhi (eight siddhis) in Hinduism. These are:

Aṇimā: reducing one's body even to the size of an atom
Mahima: expanding one's body to an infinitely large size
Garima: becoming infinitely heavy
Laghima: becoming almost weightless
Prāpti: having unrestricted access to all places
Prākāmya: realizing whatever one desires
Iṣṭva: possessing absolute lordship
Vaśtva: the power to subjugate all

Ten secondary siddhis
In the Bhagavata Purana, Lord Krishna describes the ten secondary siddhis as:

anūrmi-mattvam: Being undisturbed by hunger, thirst, and other bodily disturbances
dūra-śravaṇa: Hearing things far away
dūra-darśanam: Seeing things far away
manaḥ-javah: Moving the body wherever thought goes (teleportation)
kāma-rūpam: Assuming any form desired
para-kāya praveśanam: Entering the bodies of others
sva-chanda mṛtyuh: Dying when one desires
devānām saha krīḍā anudarśanam: Witnessing and participating in the pastimes of the gods
yathā saṅkalpa saṁsiddhiḥ: Perfect accomplishment of one's determination
ājñā apratihatā gatiḥ: Orders or commands being unimpeded

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siddhi

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 3:30 PM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Ask yourself, if Islam were to disappear from the face of the Earth, would the world be a better place, or no difference?

krodha wrote:
Not at all, no difference. The poison isn't in the belief system, it's in how individuals relate to the belief system. How people relate to themselves and the world is the issue. Attachment and aversion is where the problem lies, all separation and disputes are predicated on attachment/aversion. It's a sickness of the mind, not a sickness of the belief system. Even you and I discussing this now are subtly creating our little division, you take one side, I take another and the contrasting views create conflict on a small scale (even though we're obviously being cordial towards each other). Now take this little debate and super size it to the level of different cultures debating religious views, land rights etc... there's always two sides to every story. Islam cannot be an issue without someone having an issue with Islam, it's a projection of the self into the other. We are only ever fighting ourselves, (but because we are victims of our own projections) it stays on a subconscious level. Muslims are no different than you or I, they are merely a human being accepting and rejecting things, just as you/me accept or reject them. Islam is not the threat, we, who would reject and demonize Islam are the threat to ourselves, we create the enemy by rejecting it, and then we say "wouldn't the world be a better place without Islam?" While the muslim is saying the exact same thing about those who fight against them. You cannot kill a religion, you cannot kill an idea, the war is an endless war, because you yourself create the enemy through your own attachments. The war is within yourself, you say "I am this", "they are that", but they are only ever what you make them, there is no objective truth, your perceptions are only ever projections of yourself.

“Peace comes from within. Do not seek it without.”
- Siddhārtha Gautama

"Be the change that you wish to see in the world"
- Mahatma Gandhi

“The world as we have created it is a process of our thinking. It cannot be changed without changing our thinking.”
- Albert Einstein

“Everyone thinks of changing the world, but no one thinks of changing himself.”
- Leo Tolstoy

“Those who cannot change their minds cannot change anything.”
- George Bernard Shaw

“I wanted to change the world. But I have found that the only thing one can be sure of changing is oneself.”
- Aldous Huxley

“Change the way you look at things and the things you look at change.”
- Wayne W. Dyer

“Let him who would move the world first move himself.”

- Socrates

“Change your thoughts and you change your world.”
- Norman Vincent Peale

“When we attempt to exercise power or control over someone else, we cannot avoid giving that person the very same power or control over us.”
- Alan Watts

“Purity or impurity depends on oneself,
No one can purify another.”
- Siddhārtha Gautama

“True change is within; leave the outside as it is.”
- Dalai Lama XIV

“With our thoughts we make the world.”
- Siddhārtha Gautama

deepbluehum said:
What about Buddha-dharma? Without Buddhism, the world would be uninhabitable.

krodha wrote:
Without kindness and compassion the world would be uninhabitable, kindness and compassion belong to no ideology or label.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 9:09 AM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
deepbluehum said:
I understand the argument. I don't agree it applies in the case of Sikhism or Islam for that matter where violence and war are not tangential to the story but formative of it.

krodha wrote:
War and violence are not formative characteristics of the Sikh or Muslim religions. Unfortunately nowadays with the war campaign going on in the middle east, regions where violence is prominent are culturally islamic, but Islam itself is a peaceful religion. It's all a matter of perception, there's probably some individuals in afghanistan saying the same thing about western culture and judeo-Christian religions. Both sides are right and wrong in their respective ways. Violence doesn't stem from the religion itself but from certain individuals/groups involved with said religion. We wonder why those regions are violent, given the mind state of most people nowadays if your country was being occupied by an outside force the people of your country would most likely be violent too (Tibet being an exception to this example).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 8:25 AM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Guru Gobind Singh transformed a yogi religion into a soldier religion. The soldier and warfare mentality is deeply ingrained there. If you become a sikh and get involved in Gurudwara activities, you cannot avoid it. If you just want to go for lungar, they will serve lunch and then you can go. That's very nice. But if you become sikh, violence and feuding in Gurudwaras is a huge massive widespread problem. These are not isolated cases. You can find weapons caches in the Gurudwara. Some might say this is only the work of the Jats. It is true the Jats are a particularly rambunctious subcaste, but they totally dominate the Sikh culture and in any event exemplify Guru Gobind Singh's ethos to the highest degree.

krodha wrote:
Right but the religion itself doesn't propagate violence. And there are other sikh sects and Sikh practitioners who aren't violent. The violence related to the gurudwara activities is the result of conditioning and groupthink. Just like Islamic extremists who engage in violent activity, Islam itself is a beautiful religion, the few bad apples who are jihadists don't speak for the whole. It would be like saying "there's been over 200 murders in Oakland this year, everyone who lives in Oakland is a murderer."

deepbluehum said:
Any way, Dzogchen is the religion of the dancing dakinis. Dzogchen is completely different from sikhism, thankfully.

krodha wrote:
Undoubtably.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 7:36 AM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
deepbluehum said:
I have seen many shootings at Gurudwaras between feuding Sikhs. They can be a rather violent bunch. Sikhism doesn't resemble Dzogchen at all.

krodha wrote:
Those certain persons (who may have been practitioners of sikhism) were violent. The violence stems from an issue on the level of the psyche, nothing to do with Sikhism or any other religion, race, sex, creed.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 6:45 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Tara said:
Looks like we are drifting (metaphorically) any further gibberish *slaps own wrists* I mean posts will be removed without further notice.

"Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol - What does it mean?"

Regards,

krodha wrote:
No need to slap your own wrist (metaphorically, literally or actually), gibberish is a sound assessment(I'm fluent) Wes and I will behave and get back to discussing rainbow colored thigles.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ke5Mr5eCF2U

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ok so how do detectives or law enforcement fit into this?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Law enforcement! Wes, I love you man and I'm glad you post on here (so forgive me), but have you perhaps taken a hit of some high powered sh*t in the past half hour or so? Because upon re-evaluating the discussion that has transpired here today, the inquiring mind may come to the conclusion that you're higher than a giraffe's ding dong right now. But, could be wrong.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Is that a reference to that tree metaphor I posted last week? Are you speaking metaphorically? If you're not I'm thoroughly confused! If you're being literal I don't know what that has to do with the topic, but that is cool you have gardening and tree landscaping type skills, I can mow a lawn but that's about it.

Wesley1982 said:
It would be alot like trimming a tree for a Buddha to meditate underneath in the shade. (the sun comes out and it gets hot)

krodha wrote:
Well if it's shade you want you need not trim my friend, the shade is always there, just need to find the right place to sit. Ha I covered the metaphorical and literal with that one, I still don't know which one we're employing at the moment. We're certainly going out on a limb though, perhaps we're barking up the wrong tree but if topics like these help you to branch out and get to the root of things I'm all for it. Getting out of the woods is the most important thing (all puns and metaphors intended).

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0W6JgnCFezo

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
By the way, I have access to tree trimming & cutting equipment. I don't know how you would trim & cut palm,coconut, or malaysian trees.

What I do is cut the branches so they grow back out and get real lush.

krodha wrote:
Is that a reference to that tree metaphor I posted last week? Are you speaking metaphorically? If you're not I'm thoroughly confused! If you're being literal I don't know what that has to do with the topic, but that is cool you have gardening and tree landscaping type skills, I can mow a lawn but that's about it.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 23rd, 2012 at 1:17 AM
Title: Re: Is the Sikh religion influenced by (even based on) Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Interesting that after Nanak's initial realization he was silent for some time and then his first words were "there is no Hindu, there is no Muslim".

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 22nd, 2012 at 2:09 PM
Title: Re: Is sex considered vulgar to Buddhists?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"When you enter this pure path,
Unsuitable things which otherwise would be eliminated -
Even the five passions and the five heinous crimes -
are wonderfully the same.
Nothing, not even sex, is abandoned."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 21st, 2012 at 1:04 PM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Right, well more than dozen Dallas/Ft. Worth pastors would probably tell you that this idea or concept called "God" will fill that emptiness.

krodha wrote:
And they would be offering a temporary solution, tantamount to doping someone with an opiate. Again, emptiness in buddhism is a different emptiness, but the empty void that those pastors would be addressing (the emptiness inside oneself that humanity scrambles to fill in any way possible), cannot be filled by god or anything else. That void is the result of identifying with an abstraction. The abstraction (individual) feels inherently incomplete and seeks wholeness through various means, because the individual is itself a concept (completely illusory). How can you complete or fill a concept? You can't touch, throw, roll, bounce a concept. God, being a concept itself, cannot fill or complete another concept. Anything "external" that one grasps to fill the void, will always fail to fill the void, experiences, religion, drugs, alcohol, sex, relationships etc... all are temporary fixes (some better than others). They are a) transient and b) an abstraction predicated on another abstraction. Dharma practiced correctly will nullify the void by revealing the unreality of the void.

Apologies for being preachy but those pastors (though they mean well and I commend their efforts) unwittingly deceive others. Glad you see that "god" is an idea or concept, it surely is.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 2:53 PM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
I don't know how someone could be so self-conscious of having to take a shit.

krodha wrote:
My mentor actually went out of his way to teach me(and my friend) that sitting on the toilet is the perfect time to practice. He said "what else are you doing? Shitting? Sound some A's do some guru yoga and dedicate the merit before you get up". There was another time when some poor kid asked him for an interview and he told the kid that he'd only do the interview during his morning shit. So the next morning the kid showed up bright and early and my mentor made the kid buy him coffee, and then they both just sat there. The kid tried to start the interview but my mentor refused and made the kid wait til nature called. When it was time they both made their way to the bathroom and kid filmed the interview while my mentor sat on the toilet, to this day he's still searching for the kid so he can get a copy of the interview.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 11:07 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:

Dronma said:
Maybe "others" do not even exist.....

Sally Gross said:
Oh heavens ... a Cartesian turn ... Descartes' evil demon who persuades the unwary into solipsism ...

Rene Descartes said:
I will suppose, then, not that Deity, who is sovereignly good and the fountain of truth, but that some malignant demon, who is at once exceedingly potent and deceitful, has employed all his artifice to deceive me; t will suppose that the sky, the air, the earth, colors, figures, sounds, and all external things, are nothing better than the illusions of dreams, by means of which this being has laid snares for my credulity; I will consider myself as without hands, eyes, flesh, blood, or any of the senses, and as falsely believing that I am possessed of these; I will continue resolutely fixed in this belief, and if indeed by this means it be not in my power to arrive at the knowledge of truth, I shall at

least do what is in my power, viz., [suspend my judgment], and guard with settled purpose against giving my assent to what is false, and being imposed upon by this deceiver, whatever be his power and artifice.

Descartes, Meditations on First Philosophy, Meditation 1, paragraph 12.

Sally Gross said:
It is actually a good exercise to think through this. Whether it is a meditation in the Dharmic sense is another question; but ChNNR does advise us to integrate, and if one has studied Western philosophy, that too can surely be integrated.

krodha wrote:
You're right, only the unwary are persuaded into solipsism, but the emptiness of others doesn't necessarily imply a solipsistic view. Dronma is right in suggesting that self-liberation would naturally be complemented by the liberation of other. Solipsism would require a mind (or consciousness) to act as a substratum or container, the accurate view of emptiness and clarity (in union) is a safeguard against erroneous notions of a substratum and therefore negates a solipsistic view.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
uan said:
stop thinking about "universal suffering from the "magical illusion" we think of as reality?" What does that even mean? Those words don't mean anything. Even in a non-buddhist sense they are so so incredibly vague as to mean whatever anyone wants them to mean, so essentially they mean nothing.

krodha wrote:
"Origination, endurance and destruction as well
Are said to be just like
A dream, a magical illusion,
And a city of ethereal spirits."
- Nāgārjuna

Some obviously thought about it quite a bit.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 2:49 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
I think if people are suffering from this "illusion" I would want to treat and possibly cure it.

krodha wrote:
This is actually precisely how Buddha Śākyamuni approached the issue, the four noble truths are essentially a prescription for an illness. The first, stating the name of the illness. The second being the cause of the illness. The third stating that a cure is possible. And the fourth, the means to cure oneself.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2012 at 8:06 PM
Title: Re: Asked to join Christian Prayer; Need Advice Please
Content:
krodha wrote:
I say go to the service, do the prayers they do, smile and enjoy it... there's no harm in any of it. True dharma speaks through all things

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2012 at 6:31 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Nope. You ask that because other magic related spiritual traditions incorporate the elements in their practices and teachings? In the dzogchen symbol the colors represent the elements but they also represent the 5 lights. The lights become the elements when under the influence of ignorance. Which is essentially not recognizing that the 5 lights are ones own display. Nothing to do with magic, though reality itself is said to be essentially equivalent to a magical illusion.

Wesley1982 said:
In your opinion, do we all suffer from this "magical illusion" of reality? Was it the Buddha who could see things as they really are?..

krodha wrote:
We suffer when we don't understand the true nature of reality and get caught up in delusion. 99.9999% are caught in delusion, the small few who see things are they really are, are buddhas. The Buddha (Śākyamuni) was one buddha, his teaching is what buddhism is based on, but there were myriads of buddhas before him, and there will be (and have been) myriads of buddhas after him. They all teach the dharma which is simply the truth of this "magical illusion" we call reality. When the dharma is translated into ideas and concepts it appears to be a philosophy, but when the dharma is truly actualized in one's experience it is simply the true state of being (beyond ideas and concepts) which removes the plague of suffering. We suffer because we don't understand, the dharma is the means to understand, and when we finally understand we are free.

"The dimension of apparitional being is pure and total presence....
there is no benefitting beings apart from pure and total presence.
All the buddhas of the three times(past, present, future), do not exist apart from this pure and total presence.
The buddhas of the past have seen and recognized their own minds to be this uncontrived state.
The present buddhas, recognizing their own uncontrived minds to be uncontrived, even now are bringing about the welfare of beings.
The buddhas who will come in the future, will not teach that this self-arising pure fact of awareness was previously contrived.
This present uncontrived state of contemplation comes from staying on the uncontrived path."
- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2012 at 3:09 AM
Title: Re: Explanation of the Dzogchen symbol ~ What does it mean?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Does it represent magical properties?

krodha wrote:
Nope. You ask that because other magic related spiritual traditions incorporate the elements in their practices and teachings? In the dzogchen symbol the colors represent the elements but they also represent the 5 lights. The lights become the elements when under the influence of ignorance. Which is essentially not recognizing that the 5 lights are ones own display. Nothing to do with magic, though reality itself is said to be essentially equivalent to a magical illusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:47 AM
Title: Re: Small Problem with DC Webcasts
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Yes, I can hear a small volume with a hearing aid. Is Mandarin the official language of the Chinese?..

I can watch the DC webcasts but generally need a modern English "translation."

asunthatneversets said:
Everything he's saying is in english (just with an accent), except for the lungs he gives for the certain practices which are in tibetan (and are the mantras for the practice), during those just be present, they are transmissions to do those practices.

Some of the terminology he uses is also in the context of the teaching he's giving, and can be hard to decipher if you're not familiar with the full spectrum of practices and yānas. The more you listen the easier it will become to understand.

Wesley1982 said:
That's not how the hearing problem works.

I hear the voices and sounds but what is being said is not clear - so deciphering is involved in what the other person is saying.

krodha wrote:
Oh ok, I didn't realize you were talking about the hearing issue, my little brother has the same type of thing, he usually lip reads to supplement his listening so I know how that goes. I'm not sure what the best option for that would be during live webcasts but if you're a member of the community I know there's access to archived video so you could go back and re-listen part by part. There may be transcriptions too, I'm not really sure.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 5:12 AM
Title: Re: Small Problem with DC Webcasts
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Yes, I can hear a small volume with a hearing aid. Is Mandarin the official language of the Chinese?..

I can watch the DC webcasts but generally need a modern English "translation."

krodha wrote:
Everything he's saying is in english (just with an accent), except for the lungs he gives for the certain practices which are in tibetan (and are the mantras for the practice), during those just be present, they are transmissions to do those practices.

Some of the terminology he uses is also in the context of the teaching he's giving, and can be hard to decipher if you're not familiar with the full spectrum of practices and yānas. The more you listen the easier it will become to understand.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro
Content:
heart said:
Depends on what you mean by independent, Dzogchen is always presented as a part of Vajrayana. "I am Manjusrimitra, who have attained the siddhi of Yamantaka." Anyway, nothing in this world is independent.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
But the siddhi of Yamāntaka means something very specific, beyond ideas of what Vajrayāna is (and notions of Dzogchen too for that matter). Yamāntaka is the terminator of death and he conquers death by seeing the unreality of birth, so the siddhi of Yamāntaka is the direct realization of unborn non-dual perfection. Both birth and death are ideas, predicated on the existence of a subject. That is why you see Yamāntaka trampling images of the buddha and other deities, he's passed beyond clinging to them and abides freely in the simplicity of the natural state. The illusory manifestation of attachment and aversion is the ignorance that binds us. Mañjuśrīmitra, by discovering his true nature has passed beyond attachment (or aversion) to methods, ideas, concepts, they no longer govern his actions, they're merely ornaments. So I don't think that Mañjuśrīmitra is implying that his realization is fused with Vajrayāna, or that Dzogchen is inseparable from Vajrayāna.

Alan Watts discusses the iconography of Yamāntaka in this lecture on death:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ioO-Pw_lxbI

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: Dependent Origination and Lhundrup
Content:
Sherab said:
Horizontal aspect of DO manifests as causal chain and when examine, points to impermanence of all phenomena.
Vertical aspect of DO when examine, points to sunyata.

In Dzogpa Chenpo, lhundrup is more fundamental than DO. Because of lhundrup, there is DO.

What do you think?

krodha wrote:
I recall the other discussion on dependent origination where these concepts of horizontal and vertical D.O. came up. Did you come up with this distinction? Upon re-reading that other conversation after the fact it seems I misunderstood the distinction between these notions. What aspects of dependent origination do "horizontal" and "vertical" represent? Can you please thoroughly explain these distinctions if they are going to be such a fundamental piece of this thread? Thanks

Is Horizontal D.O. essentially something like Candrakīrti's sevenfold reasoning with the chariot?

Aren't both essentially pointing at śūnyatā?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:41 AM
Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connection
Content:
krodha wrote:
"I like your Christ, I do not like your Christians. Your Christians are so unlike your Christ." - Mahatma Gandhi

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 7:59 AM
Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connection
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
And Gregkavarnos has mentioned that the Greek Orthodox Christians have teachings on Rainbow Body; which wouldn't surprise me, as I think that the Greek Orthodox, Eastern Orthodox, Ethiopian and Egyptian Coptic Christianity, etc. are all much closer to the teachings of the original Gnostics and Essenes.

Whereas Roman Catholicism and Protestantism are generally more of a deviation from the original teachings. Not to say that these latter two have not ever produced genuine Saints....

krodha wrote:
Interesting, he briefly mentions the Protestant deviation in that talk. The roman catholics do have some interesting symbolism and iconography though, the vatican has a huge statue of a pinecone with two peacocks on either side in it's courtyard. Some believe the pinecone represents the pineal gland(endocrine gland associated with the third eye and transcendent wisdom) and also draw similarities between that imagery and the Buddha's bumpy pinecone looking head/hair. The peacock feather is symbolically used in dzogchen as well. Some also say the peacock eyes in the feathers represent the thigles in thogal practice. The pope also has a pinecone on the end of his staff he carries. Greg post some info on the Greek Orthodox rainbow body if you can!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 7:05 AM
Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connection
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's from the last 15 minutes or so of the presentation (link below) he did on the

similarities between the rainbow body of light and the resurrection in Christianity. What I wrote above is just a loose transcription of the latter portion of his talk. He has other presentations online too (I haven't checked out yet personally) and I'm sure they're just as good.

http://noetic.org/library/audio-lectures/the-rainbow-body-phenomenon-with-father-francis-ti/

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
In that case, if I go to certain people and start asking about them about the difference between fiction and non-fiction - what's real and not real you are going to arrive at different conclusions?..

asunthatneversets said:
It's not intellectual.

Wesley1982 said:
Wouldn't the intellectual part be one of the functions of the dharma?..

krodha wrote:
Yes but the actual essence cannot be apprehended with the intellect, only pointed to. So discussing what is considered fiction or non-fiction with someone really has no value when it comes to the fiction of our ignorance vs. the non-fiction of liberation. The natural state actually transcends all notions including fiction and non-fiction. It also transcends the four extremes of (1)existence, (2)nonexistence, (3)both existence/nonexistence, and (4)neither existence/nonexistence. So in other words attempting to truly understand it with our ideas and concepts is impossible. You have to know it innately, like you know you're alive right now.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: Who should attend DC webcast?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Re: Who should attend DC webcast?
I'll attend though I'd rather be there in person and practice sitting.

krodha wrote:
Well it's happening right now!
http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 4:14 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
In that case, if I go to certain people and start asking about them about the difference between fiction and non-fiction - what's real and not real you are going to arrive at different conclusions?..

krodha wrote:
It's not intellectual.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
a) So its about realizing the true nature of yourself in your natural state of existence? Something like that.

krodha wrote:
It's more like; this experience of being a separately existing physical human being, living in a physical world, suffering and so on, is due to the fact that we actually misunderstand the nature of this "reality". We take it to be something it isn't, and due to that error, we suffer. So dzogchen says this error is an illusion of our own making. We create this error through ignorance of the true state of ourselves and experience itself. The dharma as a whole is a means to experientially discover the illusion (first hand), and through seeing the illusion for what it is, it's immediately disabled. Some teachings are more direct than others, but no matter which method you employ, in the end, the direct discovery that it's an illusion is liberation.

So let's say (as a metaphor) that the ignorance(which obscures one's true nature) is a tree. In the leaves/branches of the tree are all sorts of things, just as in life there are all sorts of happenings and experiences. However we usually metaphorically always live our lives in the branches of the tree(ignorance) and because of that we suffer. Other aspects of the buddhadharma also say that the tree is equal to ignorance, but in some cases they appear to teach that one needs to begin dismantling the tree(ignorance) by sawing off it's branches one by one. Some teach that you need to get to the root of the tree(ignorance) and sever it there, but their directions to get to the root aren't so clear. In dzogchen the teacher begins by directly showing you the root, and he says "now here is your saw, when you cut through this root, the whole of ignorance will wither and die, begin sawing".

And the funny thing is that even the notion of sawing through the root is too much, the

guru actually attempts to show you the illusory nature of both the tree(ignorance), and "the one who would do the sawing" right off the bat. But for some sawing at the root is needed, and that is appropriate. For others, sawing off the branches one by one is needed, and that is also appropriate. And still for others, plucking the leaves off one by one is needed, and that is appropriate. Some methods are quicker than the others, but ultimately they're all means to the same end. It all comes down to understanding the nature of the tree(ignorance), and understanding the quickest way to remove it. The fastest way is seeing that both you and the tree are illusory, but only a rare individual perceives that right away. Most have some work to do, and that's completely appropriate and perfectly ok, (we have to work within our respective circumstances). Though in that instance one needs to decide whether they want to pluck leaves, or saw at the root.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 3:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro
Content:
krodha wrote:
Really, we have to put ngöndro in the context of it's purpose. It's surely a product of it's environment, it comes from a culture where dharma is at the forefront and a cornerstone of the society as a whole (instead of being a voluntary extra-curricular activity). In Tibet, Bhutan, Nepal etc... when children came to a certain age they were most likely put in a monastery for education and the dharma was (and still is) obviously a part of that education. So a lot of kids who could probably otherwise care less about the dharma were put into these programs. For some it would be tantamount to your parents shipping you off to military school or something, you go and do it, but do you really want to be there? Most likely not. So as these individuals climb the ladder and get closer and closer to the higher teachings, to keep people away who aren't fully dedicated, an arduous practice like ngöndro was put in place to essentially say "well if you want this, show me how much you want it". Obviously the people who really truly cared and wanted the highest teachings (for the right reasons) would definitely go through ngöndro. Others who didn't care as much would look at it and say "100,000 prostrations? 100,000 vajrasattva mantras? No thanks!" And they would go off to do other things. So it's a safety net, to ensure that only those who are mature enough, and those who are sincere and genuinely care are receiving the high teachings. Because at the same time, we all know that dzogchen has elements which actually turn the lower yānas on their heads. There's elements which respectfully negate aspects of the lower teachings, such as causality, morality and so on and so forth. In the hands of an immature individual it's a dangerous thing to have and can spawn a rebellious attitude, nihilism etc. So in short ngöndro is a product of it's environment. In the west - since the dharma is essentially something that an individual has to seek out and find for themselves (instead of growing up around it) - those who take interest in the higher teachings are more often than not already ripe for it. By seeking out atiyoga and taking an interest in it (in a culture where not everyone learns of the dharma), one is essentially already equivalent to one who would voluntarily go through ngöndro to receive these precious teachings (in a culture where everyone is taught the dharma).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 6:45 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also be mindful of the conceptual projections we place over phenomena. Watch the compulsive habit of labeling, good, bad, right, wrong, "I like this", "I don't like that" etc... Learn to experience without the judging and ultimately see how concepts and ideas are responsible for constructing ourselves/our world (the totality of experience) in it's entirety. The more you do this the easier it will become, just allow thoughts and other phenomena to flow and self-liberate. Don't chase or pursue fabrications of conceptualizing/day dreaming. After some time you'll begin to lose the boundaries between you and experience itself.

And then with the mindfulness like Sally mentioned, you'll begin to cultivate the aspects of your nature which are imperative for discovering that nature. Just maintain that flow, if you get caught up in thought bring yourself back. Don't be too tense, just relax and flow, see how everything is a spontaneous play.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 3:08 AM
Title: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connection
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm not saying any of this is true, but it's interesting nevertheless!

Father Francis Tiso, (who does a lot of thorough investigation on the rainbow body phenomena) has gathered some interesting information from gnostic materials and aesthetic literature such as the nag hammadi codices and drawn some conclusions between them and the Bönpo and Buddhist Dzogchen practices. The older Christian practices are still widely unknown, Father Francis says that if we limit ourselves to what is written in the new testament then we really don't get a clear picture of what the practices of that time were. This is because a lot of the teachings were passed down in an oral tradition. For example; how would one celebrate the eucarist? If you don't know how it was done by the apostles or accept a 3rd or 4th century text as normative, you would have to go back and search for examples of Jesus celebrating the eucarist. And what happens is you end up saying the words of institution and accompany it with some other prayers, but that is not the living tradition. Scripture was not written as a complete manual of how to do rituals, or sacraments, or meditation. So we are left curious about these practices which are largely a mystery to us today. Even in the gnostic literature or the nag hammadi texts, it is frustrating because they do make references to ceremonies, rituals, prayer practices, meditation practices, even mantra practices but they only mention them or elude to them without an in depth instruction on how to do them. So Father Francis took what he could from these gnostic materials (such as the nag

hammadi codices or Merkabah) and has attempted to draw some links. Because literature like the nag hammadi codices were preserved by a community of christian monks, the texts were considered useful for whatever they were doing in their own meditational practices and were held in safe keeping for a reason. Father Francis goes on to discuss the figure of Evagrius Ponticus who became a deacon in Constantinople, got into some trouble with the lady of the court and then went to Jerusalem to become a monk under the training of Melania the Elder and Tyrannius Rufinus who had established what can be considered equivalent to a mystery school. They trained Evagrius who was already a very profound theologian. Anyways he went on to write a few books, one by the name of The Praktikos, which is essentially śamatha and vipaśyanā christian style (practice examining thoughts etc). Another being The Gnostikos which essentially advises the student on how to find a suitable teacher or guru. The last notable being Kephalaia Gnostica which are his chapters on sacred knowledge or intuitive knowledge. The Kephalaia Gnostica consists of 6 chapters, with 90 paragraphs in each chapter, in this book Evagrius takes you from the beginning of the path, through relationships with the teacher, through a very demanding column system with 540 columns to meditate on which leads to the point of attaining what is tantamount to the nondual state. The very first line in the book is "There is nothing over against the primal good, because it is in it's essence that it's good, and nothing could be contrary to that essence", essentially saying that we and what you'd call "god" really have to be a unity. So you see a monk which passes from radical renunciation, to an incredible embrace of all phenomena. Sounds a little causal for dzogchen, but may be some definite similarities between this and other buddhist tantric/contemplative practices.

Father Francis Tiso also attempts to make some further connections. Some of which are studied by a Belgian (who's name I couldn't decipher) who wrote a book called "The Formless Light" which was a compilation of Nestorian Christian writings from the areas of Iraq, Qatar and Iran in the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th centuries. Which is a bridge period between Evagrius and the rise of Dzogchen in the Dunhuang manuscripts of northern tibet from the 8th century. The monks who wrote these writings are kicked out of the Nestorian Church because some of their ideas are considered too radical. So Father Francis inquires, where did they go? He goes on to say that there are definite differences between the Dzogchen practices of the Bönpo/Nyingmapa and all the other tantric practices. The Bön and Nyingma say that Dzogchen is the highest practice, and maintain that it comes from the west from someone they call Garab Dorje. Father Francis goes on to describe Garab Dorje's history and draws some comparisons between his story and that of Jesus. Garab Dorje's mother was a nun and a queen at the same time. She is embarrassed by her pregnancy which is miraculous. Garab Dorje dies and rises again as a "good zombie" or Ro-lang (which are usually spooky but Garab Dorje is considered a benevolent Ro-lang) and various other unnamed similarities which Father Francis claims are in the biography of Garab Dorje. There indeed are all the stories of Jesus going to Kashmir but he claims this could be a much more reliable story. Could it be that Garab Dorje was a monk who was escaping from his Nestorian bishop? Or perhaps a community of monks who said alright, we're going to have to go out on our own, and began to insert themselves into the Vajrayāna world in order to live and keep their practices alive (which they knew brought them to the highest nondual realization)?

Father Francis says he knows it would really blow the paradigms of the dzogchen practitioners if they somehow found out that their wonderful Vajrayāna practices actually came from Christian Egypt in the 4th century, but he says there are some interesting and definite correlations.

http://www.francistiso.com

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
But charging $10,000 for a teaching is ludicrous, that isn't right IMO.

Malcolm said:
Bob was referring to a voluntary donation made to a Lama in order to sponser a teaching.

M

krodha wrote:
Oh ok, that a generous donation!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers
Content:
krodha wrote:
I didn't mean literally telling someone to f*ck off, I wasn't advocating vitriolic behavior or suggesting that anyone conduct themselves in a disrespectful manner. There's just no need to bother with shark-like teachers squeezing money out of their students for every little thing. Not sure if your togal example is actually true... But charging $10,000 for a teaching is ludicrous, that isn't right IMO. I would seriously question the motives of such a teacher. We all know there's vultures out there who will take advantage of people if given the chance, well individuals involved in the dharma community aren't excluded. Even though it's a noble teaching which is meant to bring out the best in all of us, doesn't mean it always does. Humanity's dark side lurks in the shadows and preys on the innocent and it always will. And I don't say that to sound pessimistic because I'm an incredibly optimistic person, I'm merely being realistic, not all that glitters is gold.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 11:32 PM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:

a) Is the Tibetan dzogchen community a nomadic & travelling group?..

asunthatneversets said:
The lineages/traditions which kept the dzogchen teaching alive have been both nomadic and institutional. The original religion of tibet is Bön which yes was practiced by nomadic tribesmen (and non-nomadic I'm sure). Bön predates buddhism by 1,500 years, I believe? It was founded by Tonpa Shenrab. Bönpo dzogchen is essentially the same as buddhist dzogchen (and vice versa).

Bon was practised in Zhang Zhung kingdoms which were situated near Oddhiyana / Urgyen. Why do you think that Buddhist Dzogchen is the same as Bon Dzogchen?

Dzogchen has also been passed down in the buddhist tradition, mainly in the Nyingma school of Tibetan buddhism. I believe Vimalimitra received the dzogchen teachings from Shri Singha(student of Mañjuśrīmitra) and brought them to Tibet, where they were joined with Padmasambhava's and Vairocana's teachings to create the Nyingma school (consisting of Vimalimitra's Vima Nyingtig, Padmasambhava's Khandro Nyingtig and Vairocana's Vairo Nyingtig).

Dzogchen was also practiced by wandering yogi's who belonged to neither the Bön tradition nor Buddhist tradition and the Dzogchen teaching itself is said to have originated in the kingdom of Oḍḍiyāna (which is generally considered to be close to what is present day Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan).

To what tradition did those wandering Yogis belong or from whom did they got their Teachings?
I cannot agree with your statement that Dzogchen did originate in Oddhiyana / Urgyen. Garab Dorje would have lived about 58. Zhang Zhung is much older, so their Dzogchen would be older than that from Urgyen.
(I'm not scholar so if I'm off someone please correct me!)

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
a) Is the Tibetan dzogchen community a nomadic & travelling group?..

krodha wrote:
The lineages/traditions which kept the dzogchen teaching alive have been both nomadic and institutional. The original religion of tibet is Bön which yes was practiced by nomadic tribesmen (and non-nomadic I'm sure). Bön predates buddhism by 1,500 years, I believe? It was founded by Tonpa Shenrab. Bönpo dzogchen is essentially the same as buddhist dzogchen (and vice versa).

Dzogchen has also been passed down in the buddhist tradition, mainly in the Nyingma

school of Tibetan buddhism. I believe Vimalimitra received the dzogchen teachings from Shri Singha(student of Mañjuśrīmitra) and brought them to Tibet, where they were joined with Padmasambhava's and Vairocana's teachings to create the Nyingma school (consisting of Vimalimitra's Vima Nyingtig, Padmasambhava's Khandro Nyingtig and Vairocana's Vairo Nyingtig).

Dzogchen was also practiced by wandering yogi's who belonged to neither the Bön tradition nor Buddhist tradition and the Dzogchen teaching itself is said to have originated in the kingdom of Oḍḍiyāna (which is generally considered to be close to what is present day Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan).

(I'm not scholar so if I'm off someone please correct me!)

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 8:49 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:

Wesley1982 said:
I'm much more familiar with Christian practice than being a traditional Dzogchen follower.

krodha wrote:
You can also continue your Christian practices and even integrate them with dzogchen practice. There's no such thing as a "traditional dzogchen follower" you don't adopt a belief system or convert to a new tradition. And actually if you end up with something new that you didn't have prior to starting dzogchen practice (besides a new and profound knowledge of your own nature and an overall sense of well-being) then you're doing it wrong. Dzogchen simply points to something you've always been (and always had) which was only seemingly obscured. In dzogchen you dis-cover your innate completeness. You re-member your true nature. You re-collect your primordial perfection. Jesus can come along for the ride, he probably discovered the same thing.

Tiny baby infant Jesus in his golden fleece diapers.
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5A0-u85aAYg

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen

Content:
krodha wrote:
You don't need to donate anything. If you want to that's great but spending money isn't a requirement. The community isn't there to get money out of people. You don't even necessarily have to be a member of the community, it's just nice because it has it's perks with access to archived teachings and you can also have access to restricted webcasts. But it's not necessary, I'm not a member of the community... But I have friends nearby who are so I have the option to go to their spots to catch closed teachings. If I didn't have that option I'd probably become a member, but I choose to give back by purchasing rinpoche's books from my local ling. Either way just know that spending money isn't a requirement and if you stumble into a community where they're trying to charge you money for every little thing and for teachings tell them to f*ck off. There's a lot of scammers out there who prey on people's devotion to the dharma, and they're the lowest of the low.

Even in circumstances where it seems unavoidable like attending a retreat in person, retreats can cost money. But most reasonable teachers will have a sliding scale for their retreats, if you can't afford it then they'll ask what you're comfortable spending, or they'll simply ask for a donation of whatever size you feel is appropriate for your circumstances. There's also the option of volunteering to help set up or clean up and that usually gets you in for free. I'll say this: if a community or teacher turns you away because you can't pay the full amount then they don't have your best interest in mind and they're looking out for their pockets. A true teacher will work with your financial circumstances, because bottom line... They want you to become realized so you can benefit beings.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 3:18 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
a) How do you help overcome what may seem strange,foreign,or unfamiliar to you?..

krodha wrote:
How else? Learn about it so it becomes familiar to you.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:05 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
And what would constitute a legitimate guru suggestion from jesus? Perhaps he's already showing you.

Wesley1982 said:
If that is true - then I could turn the home office into a place of devotion to studies and ritual meditation.

krodha wrote:
But of course. Lots of people do. Let wherever you are and wherever you go be your place of devotion to studies and ritual meditation. For example, one of the goals of dzogchen is to get to the point where you can effortlessly remain in the natural state at all times, even during sleep.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 9:43 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Maybe I'll ask Jesus and follow him to whichever Lama/Guru is best for me.

krodha wrote:
And what would constitute a legitimate guru suggestion from jesus? Perhaps he's already showing you.

What are you drawn to? What speaks to you? You seem interested in dzogchen, why not hear what it's about from a realized master? There's no commitment, many individuals receive teachings from multiple masters. It's not a blood in blood out type thing.

The only thing that truly creates a heart connection is when/if you choose to receive direct introduction. The teacher who gives you introduction will then always be your root teacher. But that isn't a blood in blood out type thing either.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"
Content:
xylem said:
i once post a question to some dharma friends: "ok, so the lama is a buddha, and the buddha is omniscient, right? so if i ask my lama how many species of otters there are in the world, he or she will know?" it was interesting watching dharma friends scramble to cement up any uncomfortable logical implications. that type of attitude isn't helpful.

-xy

Kelwin said:
Yup, I've been asking people the same question. Well, without the otters Not many practitioners, of all kinds of different spiritual traditions, seem to have a good answer to this. And it's pretty damn fundamental to the whole thing we're doing, and to the way we

should relate to our teachers.

krodha wrote:
The omniscience or "all-knowing" of a buddha isn't a kind of endless intellectual encyclopedia of knowledge, but I can see how this notion arises. In our relative condition we usually do associate a high degree of "knowledge" with a vast learned intellectual-rolodex capable of producing an accurate (account or) answer to any inquiry presented. This idea is born of a cultural proclivity to associate the term "knowledge" with the intellect, so "all-knowing" naturally gives most individuals the impression of intellectually knowing everything. And thus the reasoning unfolds as you suggested; "well if this person is omniscient they should be able to tell me what I ate for breakfast on March 13th of last year" and so on and so forth.

Granted there are indeed stories of meditation masters acquiring siddhis allowing them to read minds, sense things from afar etc... but these are merely relative powers which don't necessarily have anything to do with buddhahood. So these ideas of grandiose intellectual prowess are not what the knowledge of a buddha implies, and to impose these fabricated and limited notions (of what omniscience is) upon a true wisdom-holder really only becomes a disservice to oneself.

The mind wants to put wisdom in a box and attempt to grasp it's unlimited nature. And on one level this is ok, concepts are one of most proficient tools we have to communicate our ideas and that's a beautiful thing. But this beautiful capability can also become a double edged sword if we let our pre-conceived notions and presuppositions get the best of us, when that happens we become victims of our conditioning.

The all-knowing of a buddha is an intimate knowledge of what-is, through being inseparable from what-is. For a buddha, experience is whole and totally unfragmented, devoid of spacial relations between a subject and surrounding objects. Even though the intellect can still be implemented, the intellect itself is suffused with the totality and appears as a mere play of the natural state. Just as you presently know your own body by being that body, in buddhahood the vast expanse of non-arising timeless unborn perfection is known the same way. Even though it hasn't fully flowered to it's full potential, your present experience actually tips it's hat at being that way right now. An easy way to see this is by taking notice that in our relative condition, an object or experience's "being" is inseparable from your knowing of it. Remove the imputed designations of knower and known, and it begins to be subtly apparent how innate knowledge governs reality. The problem is that we get carried away by our dualistic imputing, carried away by the illusion of time and believing that moments sequence consecutively. The dharma is meant to cut through these self-made obscurations to reveal naked simplicity. Empty yet powerful, luminous, clear and unobstructed. Apparent yet unestablished, timeless, complete and perfect.

Edit: One other way this notion arises is with statements which resemble "there is nothing that a buddha does not know". Again, we usually give this to the intellect and all happenings/events within our concepts of time and space etc. But in truth a statement

of that nature is pointing to the fact that a buddha, knows only what is seemingly present in the apparent here-and-now of experience (which they are inseparable from). So "there is nothing that a buddha does not know" means, presently what-is (in this timeless immediacy), is all that is, and all that is, is the unestablished non-dual wisdom of the natural state itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
- Medicine Buddha Dharma - and a very broad,general introduction to the basics of Buddhism. Probably an orthodox Tibetan tradition.

krodha wrote:
All of which is compatible (and can be integrated) with dzogchen practice. And doing so won't compromise the integrity of the original practices at all

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:35 PM
Title: Re: 'The Wheel of Existence'
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also known as "The Wheel Of Life"... Bhavacakra.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 10:00 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:
krodha wrote:
This thread is officially NSFW.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 8:59 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Illusion, it's all illusory.

Wesley1982 said:
If the idea "i" of the self is illusory, isn't a house still a house and a car a car and a tree still a tree?..

krodha wrote:
They are illusory as well. Of course if that stays on the level of the intellect then it's no better than believing things truly exist, it's a truth to be experienced and actualized. Nothing is what you take it to be. Everything is your own display, not you as "Wesley", but your primordial nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 8:01 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
a) So . .What is the Dzogchen response to the "I" of self-imputed existence?..

krodha wrote:
Illusion, it's all illusory.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 4:44 AM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
So it is not "new-age" but hundreds of years old from Tibetan traditions?..

krodha wrote:
Garab Dorje who is considered by most to be the first human teacher of dzogchen lived circa 55 CE, but some believe there were human teachers before him. Dzogchen is also said to have always existed, but that statement is meant to reflect the timeless aspect of the natural state, and that the nature of mind is essentially "all that is" (though it transcends the four extremes). Dzogchen is far from new-age, but "new agers" do commonly misinterpret it's message as mirroring their own teachings.

Garab Dorje
Mañjuśrīmitra
Shri Singha
Vairotsana
Vimalimitra
Padmasambhava

Are the originators.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

uan said:
really? very linear concept. I guess we only have this one life then the flame goes out forever.

asunthatneversets said:
All concepts are linear.

greentreee said:
concepts are of mind,
as we move through precious time.
what's back there, is fine.

krodha wrote:
True. And for the record, concepts are wonderful… however the difference between a linear concept vs. a very linear concept is purely conceptual

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

uan said:
really? very linear concept. I guess we only have this one life then the flame goes out forever.

krodha wrote:
All concepts are linear.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:27 AM
Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Compassion is a natural expression because all reference points are empty. It's impossible to pass judgement without a point of reference. Just like a mirror, or the surface of a lake both reflect without bias. The natural state is unobstructed and is completely perfect just as it is.

jnanasutra said:
This only address the Dharmakaya, or purity. The Kayas and Vidya are naturally formed in the basis as the energy of the basis. Compassion is not merely the state free from all

reference points.

krodha wrote:
I never propagated a mere state free of reference points. The kayas are all complementary aspects of the same wisdom.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:53 AM
Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta
Content:
krodha wrote:
Compassion is a natural expression because all reference points are empty. It's impossible to pass judgement without a point of reference. Just like a mirror, or the surface of a lake both reflect without bias. The natural state is unobstructed and is completely perfect just as it is.

That being said, we should still seek to exhibit noble conduct in the relative condition. The very first time I met my mentor he taught me "Inwardly conduct yourself with presence and awareness, outwardly conduct yourself with kindness and compassion."

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 12:01 AM
Title: Re: Anyone else bored to tears with this Dzogchen forum lately?
Content:
krodha wrote:
This board ebbs and flows, and I'm sure what may seem boring to some is very exciting to others out there, afterall one person's trash is another person's treasure. Peaks and troughs, everything balances out in the end (or if one views it from the right vantage point).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 5:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"
Content:
Karma Dorje said:
... In fact, those that argue this are arguing that Dzogchen is perhaps the unifying factor behind ALL religious experience, not merely that of Buddhism, are the ones that end up

greeted with pitchforks and torches.

To me this has been a really eye-opening experience of the power of conditioning.

krodha wrote:
I'd say it's the unifying factor behind experience in general. It's one's natural state, simply the true state of this mystery called life. Some recognize it, while most do not. There's various methods to recognize it, but those methods aren't it. To me it's fairly cut and dry, you either recognize the natural state, or you don't. If you have recognized it, rest in that knowledge. If you haven't, there are various methods and means to do so (some more appropriate and excelled than others), but those methods and means are not it. The methods simply allow for recognition to happen, that which is recognized is always present (and always has been), it knows no limitation, not even notions of sentient and non-sentient. It cannot be produced or generated, it cannot be attained or acquired. The buddhadharma is beautiful and a wonderful method, but Buddhism is merely a means to recognize it. When you land on the shore you don't heave your boat over your shoulder and take it with you.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:37 PM
Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
1) What is exactly is Dzogchen?..

krodha wrote:
Glad to see you inquiring about dzogchen. It's a beautiful teaching. Hope you pursue your interest... Teachers like Chögyal Namkhai Norbu have communities set up so that you can receive teachings and stay connected to the community/him through webcasts etc... (I know you've said having access to a teacher/community has been an issue for you due to your location).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Dharma Wheel Etiquette Tips
Content:
duckfiasco said:
Don't get too attached to views and opinion. One of the most wonderful things about a place like this with people knowingly on the same path is the possibility to see things in a new way.

krodha wrote:
Good advice, and when disagreements arise the flawless exit strategy is to agree to disagree. Respect everyone's view even if it contrasts yours. For example Mr. Kavarnos and I have agreed to disagree a few times and it's a great thing, I think he's a wonderful

person. Celebrate diversity.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Anyone read this? I haven't read this personally, but there's a book called
"Small Boat, Great Mountain: Theravādan Reflections On The Natural Great Perfection"
by Amaro Bhikkhu.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 2:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Dronma said:
Yes, there are different orders of the colors. The one which we use during the
Purification of the 5 Elements at the beginning of every practice is taken by Kriya Tantra
as Rinpoche has explained many times, i.e. blue, green, white, red, yellow.
The correct order of the colors for Ati Guru Yoga is the following, starting from inside to
outside: blue, green, red, yellow, white.

asunthatneversets said:
Yellow is on the outside, earth rests on water.

Dronma said:
I am sorry, but it is not!
Please, check it again....

krodha wrote:
"Earth rests on water, water rests on wind (or "air"),
And wind rests on space;
But space itself does not rest on
These elements of air, water and earth.

Just so, our psycho-physical components, sensory elements, and sensory faculties
Rest on our karmic actions and emotional distortions,
While our karmic actions and emotional distortions themselves always rest
On our distorted psychic activity.

This distorted psychic activity
Rests on the purity of our mind,
Yet the nature of mind itself

Does not rest on any of these phenomena."
- Uttara-tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 2:22 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Thanks man..I knew that they represented the 5 elements, was just curious as to why I have seen so many different ones...they all had the 5 colors just not in the same order. Thought there might have been a reason why they were in different orders.

Dronma said:
Yes, there are different orders of the colors. The one which we use during the Purification of the 5 Elements at the beginning of every practice is taken by Kriya Tantra as Rinpoche has explained many times, i.e. blue, green, white, red, yellow.
The correct order of the colors for Ati Guru Yoga is the following, starting from inside to outside: blue, green, red, yellow, white.

krodha wrote:
Yellow is on the outside, earth rests on water.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Something I have been meaning to ask about for a while about the white A and thigle. I have noticed the color scheme is different in many of them. Does it matter what order the 5 colors are in when going out from the A? If so what is the symbolism/meaning? Thanks

krodha wrote:
They represent the 5 lights or 5 elements resting on ones primordial nature. They're supposed to go (from the inside out) Ones primordial nature(White A), space(blue), green(air), red(fire), white(water) and yellow(earth). And you see Rinpoche wearing mostly yellow lately which helps his earth element stay grounded in the face of all his health issues in the past years. He also wears red for energy, you won't see him wearing many other colors.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 2:24 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:

cloudburst said:
No-one ever said "Truly produced."
I invited you to consult Madhyamaka masters as to whether or not there is dependent or relative production, you clearly did not bother.
That's no problem, I will demonstrate how it is for the benefit of those who read carefully.

Buddha, Nagarjuna, Chandrakirti all affirm dependent production and reject essential or "true" production. Here are some quotations for those who want to know what the actual masters say...

krodha wrote:
Ah yes, the actual masters... not that hodgepodge filth cited prior to this!

cloudburst said:
Buddha says in the Anavatapta-nagaraja-pariprccha sutra...
Whatever is produced from conditions is not produced; it is not intrinsically produced.
Whatever depends upon conditions, I consider empty;
One who knows emptiness is diligent.

and in the Lankavatara...
Mahamati, thinking that they are not produced intrinsically, I said
that all phenomena are not produced

in his Sixty Stanzas, Nagarjuna says
The supreme knower of reality
Said that dependent production is not production

and commenting on that Chandrakirti says
When you see dependent arising, you do not see things as intrinsically existing. This is becasue the dependently produced is not intrinsically produced, like a reflection.

in the Avatara Chandrakirti says
Because things are not produced
Causelessly, or from causes such as a divine creator,
Or from self, other, or both self and other
They are produced dependently So. That's done.
They are produced dependently.

krodha wrote:
And as Nāgārjuna said above: dependent production is not production.

"The wonder of it! This marvelous, astounding event/reality (Dharma):
From that which involves no origination, everything originates;
and in that very origination, there is no origination!
The wonder of it!
In it's very enduring, there is no enduring!
The wonder of it!

In it's very cessation, there is no cessation!"
- Guhyagarbha Tantra

cloudburst said:
Here is an inconsistency in your view- first of all, let's leave aside that if questioned, you will in all likelihood claim not to have a view, while at the same time talking about your view and its inconsistency or lack thereof.

krodha wrote:
That is quite an odd thing to propose!

cloudburst said:
You say that
asunthatneversets said:
'there is nothing to accept or reject' means to reject the appearance of relative laws and so on would be an unnecessary (and futile/foolish) activity.

cloudburst said:
which means you accept the appearance of relative laws.

krodha wrote:
Certainly.

cloudburst said:
Even though you want to say that not rejecting does not mean accepting,

krodha wrote:
Not rejecting would naturally imply acceptance.

cloudburst said:
this is just sophistry, as you do accept that the laws of gravity function. Granted, you accept it conventionally, but as you correctly say, there is no acceptance or rejection, and nothing to accept or reject ultimately, so that's as accepting as acceptance gets.

krodha wrote:
I can accept that!

cloudburst said:
You want to get rid of the law of the excluded middle, but you still want to give reasons to back up your points and claim that
asunthatneversets said:
For the sake of communication we accept these conventionalities

cloudburst said:
while at the same time claiming
asunthatneversets said:
There is nothing to accept or reject.

krodha wrote:
I have no interest in getting rid of the law of the excluded middle, it serves it's purpose where it's applicable (which is most cases). And yes, this subject matter can appear quite paradoxical at times.

cloudburst said:
So, how's that? There are your own words. "there is nothing to accept or reject" and "....we accept..." you claim that there is nothing to accept, yet you accept many things.

krodha wrote:
Yes it is quite extraordinary! The mind creates countless designations which give rise to countless aspects of experience, yet these aspects are inseparable from the root concepts which create them. When experience is filtered this way it actually appears to take on those attributes, and if we're not privy to the game we will actually think these characteristics are really there. It can no doubt seem confusing and paradoxical. I do not deny that I appear to accept and reject.

cloudburst said:
Does that really not seem inconsistent to you? If not, I guess I have to ask if you know what the word 'consistent' means.

krodha wrote:
It certainly appears inconsistent. There is nothing to accept and reject, yet acceptance and rejection appear to happen. Acceptance and rejection are the cornerstone of ignorance and a product of delusion. I still stand by my initial statement.

cloudburst said:
By the way, earlier in this thread Malcolm claimed that Madhyamakas reject logic. I challenged that assertion and asked for citations.
None were provided. I suppose one of the freedoms that one enjoys while not accepting or rejecting is that one need not accept that a failure to back up one's claims makes those claims seem a matter of uninformed opinion.

krodha wrote:
Seems you two are in the process of working that out right now.

cloudburst said:
it's more than just using words, to accept conventionalities, though, isn't it? Valid conventionalities mean something. If you transgress that meaning, you are demonstrably wrong.

krodha wrote:
The words are the conventionalities aren't they? Yes they imply a meaning, point to ideations, notions, etc... not sure if they themselves mean something, although they are commonly accepted to mean something and therefore by default I suppose one would appear to be demonstrably wrong by transgressing said meaning.

cloudburst said:
The 'position of the world' that Buddha et al say they will stay with is not just any position that is propounded, but valid positions. For example, although most believe in a creator god, Madhyamikas reject this, they do not "go with the position of the world" on nonsense, do they? They only do so when the position is unassailable, and is contradicted by neither another worldly cognition or an ultimate one.

krodha wrote:
Right.

cloudburst said:
Chandrakirti says
Unskilled in ultimate and conventional truths you sometimes apply analytical standards inappropriately and destroy the conventional.
Because we are skilled in positing conventional truths, we stay with the world's position and we use it's conventional standards overturn the standards that you set so as to eliminate the category of conventionalities. Like the elders of the world we drive out only you deviate from the traditional standards of the world we do not drive out conventionalities

krodha wrote:
"By examining relative truth, establish absolute truth;
Within absolute truth, see how relative truth arises.
Where the two truths are inseparable, beyond intellect,
is the state of simplicity."
- Dilgo Khyenste Rinpoche

cloudburst said:
Unless you want to be taken seriously by thinking people. And you do want that, I can tell by your writing.

krodha wrote:
I do... so very badly. It's a burning desire like the fires of hell.

cloudburst said:
If you tuned up your investigation you would see that all is not equally illusory, becasue you would learn to understand and utilize the system of the Madhyamikas

Chandrkirti says Some dependently arisen things- such as reflections and echoes - are false and appear to be false even to be ignorant.
Some things -blue and other forms as well as minds, feelings etc.- appear to be true.
The final nature of things does not appear in any way to those who are ignorant.
Therefore that nature and whatever is false even conventionally are not conventional truths

krodha wrote:

Yes, that would indeed be common sense, there certainly appears to be levels and gradients of illusion, rights and wrongs and all sorts of designations within avidyā.

cloudburst said:
so we can see that there are correct, or valid conventional truths (of course ultimately these are falsities, but conventionally, they are valid)
and some things that are just false. If you think carefully, you will see that this also refutes the notion that things are literally illusions, as Chandrakiti juxtaposes reflections and echoes (two of twelve similes that appear in the sutras including "like an illusion," see Samadhiraja sutra for more....) with forms, feelings, etc, clearly differentiating things that are false conventionally and conventional truths, (which are false from the point of view of the ultimate)

krodha wrote:
"Like mistakenly seeing a rope as a snake,
with these varied appearances
we perceive them as what they are not,
giving rise to the duality of externality and internality,
i.e. the material environments and life forms therein.

However, upon scrutiny only the rope itself is found -
These environments and life forms are primordially empty,
as the ultimate only seems to have such concrete form
within the dissimulating process of the conventional.

The perception of a snake is phenomenologically true in terms of our seeing it as so,
but seeing the rope instead is authentically true;
analogically, it is like the appearance of a bird on a promontory:
The nature of these two truths is that
this transitory world is merely conventional dissimulation,
which the authentic reality has no relationship to -
In the expanse of emptiness
everything is free within it's essence."
- Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra

cloudburst said:
Mipham says To engage the mind that ascertains without error
The nature of the two truths,
You should supremely establish the good eye
Of the two stainless valid cognitions

Cahndrakirti says We therefore posit that the world knows objects with four valid cognitions

So you should know that Prasangikas do accept valid cogitions (and thus logic, of course!)
Let's look at some of these valid conventions.....

Chandrakriti's commmentary on Aryadeva's 400
Incorrect position :
Aryadeva means that compounded phenomena lack production because this analysis refutes all forms of production.
Reply: In that case the production of compounded phenomena would not be like a magicians illusion rather we would make it understood using examples such as the son of a barren woman. Wary of the absurd implication that dependent arisings would not exist we avoid such comparisons. Instead we compare the production of things to a magicians illusion and so forth, examples that do not contradict dependent arising

Here production is likened to a Magician's illusion. Chandrakirti "compares" the production of things to a magician's illusion. If everything actually were a magician's illusion, who is the magician? If you say "you are!" or "the mind!" then you make my point for me, as this is obviously metaphor.

Chandra's 400 commentary
What is the meaning of dependent arising? It means the absence of intrinsic existence; it means no intrinsically existent production; it means the arising of effects whose nature is similar to a magicians illusion, a mirage a reflection, a phantom city and emanation or a dream ; it means emptiness and selfless

"Whose nature is similar." Similar. Simile. It's a simile. Things are similar to a magician's illusion. The illusion is a simile.... things are like an illusion, like a water bubble, like a city of ghosts....
Your bed is not a city of ghosts. Your computer is not a water bubble. Your being schooled by Chandrakirti is not an illusion. It is like an illusion.....
You can understand quotations that say things are illusions in the same way, sometimes masters drop the qualifier when the meaning has been clearly established by context. Look into it. The Lanakavatara quotation above (...thinking that they are not produced intrinsically, I said that all phenomena are not produced.") is a fine example of this.

krodha wrote:
So what are we disagreeing on again?

asunthatneversets said:
so striving for the clarity of thought is a futility married to an illusion...

cloudburst said:
I'm sure you, or at least others, can see how this attitude reflects itself in your thinking.
Why do you think Buddha gave thousands of discourses that were unbelievably precise?
Why did Nagarjuna takes such pains to refute objections?
Why did Chandrakirti comment on these so extensively?
Why did Longchenepa and Jamgon Kongtrul write thousands of pages of text full of intellectual rigor?
It was to clarify, and it is a beautiful thing.

krodha wrote:
It certainly is a beautiful thing.

cloudburst said:
I think many of the things you say may be accepted (while of course not being accepted or rejected) on the dzogchen forum,

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LKpnZ7cwWuY

cloudburst said:
but in discussions that are explicitly Buddhist, you will be challenged and refuted.

krodha wrote:
And refuted!

cloudburst said:
I personally think you have not put much time into studying classical Buddhism. There's not necessarily a fault in that, don't get me wrong, but it leaves your discussion limited.....

krodha wrote:
Ok I'll take it into consideration! Valiant effort in your response by the way!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 8:28 AM
Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?
Content:
retrofuturist said:
Greetings,
Taking up the invitation to clarify a few points from a Theravada point of view...

xabir said:
No, what you described as the goal of Theravada is not in fact the goal of Theravada, but stream entry, the first stage (out of four) along the path to liberation....

krodha wrote:
Thanks for clarifying! Much appreciated

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:30 AM
Title: Re: Buddha on Romantic Relationships - Personal Empirical Observ
Content:
Andrew108 said:
Yes true my desire to attain liberation is mere words. Running after goals like liberation just makes me tired.
O.k true story time. Friend wanted to do 3 year retreat. Friend had a girlfriend. Girlfriend got pregnant before friend started retreat. Friend decided to do retreat. Friend left girlfriend to bring up baby by herself. Friend has rejected baby because of buddhist conditioning and his desire to attain liberation. Friend does lots of retreat. Still hasn't gained liberation. Baby misses having an involved father.
So look and you can see that the messy world of relationships can be valuable for your practice. Why? Above all why? If you hold on to concepts about a person then you are not on the path. If you are able to breakdown your constructed view of a person and what they are like and everyday see them in a fresh way then you are self-liberating concepts about that person and you are doing something yogic - you are on the path. You are practicing by looking at the illusory nature of the person you are attracted to. Baby is doing well because you don't hold onto concept 'baby'. Girlfriend or husband are doing well because you don't hold on to the decisions you've made about what they are really like. Everyday is a fresh opportunity to practice understanding the illusory nature of the appearance of family and friends and at the same time you are able to love. It's great.
But if you want to wear the coat of quotes and condition yourself then that's your business - may be there will be some value in that.

krodha wrote:
That's wild. Your friend exhibits a grave misunderstanding of the teaching there. I agree with you on your view of relationships.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:02 AM
Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm fairly certain that dzogchen starts where Theravāda seeks to finish. In Theravāda one works towards having a genuine experiential understanding of nirvana, however that experience is usually non-abiding. So in Theravāda buddhahood is known, and the residual effects have lasting implications, but after awhile afflicted perception re-emerges (I'm sure not in all cases). So it's essentially a genuine flash of insight which establishes the true knowledge of realization but that flash more often than not is just that (a temporary glimpse).

In dzogchen the guru seeks to introduce the student to that flash of insight right away. And then from there the student cultivates that view so that it flowers into perfect and fully abiding buddhahood (affliction never re-emerges). In Theravāda the student works

towards having that flash of insight and in dzogchen the master directly introduces it immediately.

Another thing being that Theravāda clearly has aspects of renunciation, in that certain qualities and aspects of experience are seen as obstacles and are avoided. Dzogchen integrates everything without establishing a duality between good/bad, right/wrong (when it comes to the essential view). Dzogchen only differentiates between ignorance (Avidyā/ma-rigpa) and wisdom (Vidyā/rigpa).

Shamatha and vipaśyanā are both shared practices for nurturing correct view.

If I'm off-base at all retrofuturist please correct me

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 5:51 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I'd wear one of those hats.... I almost bought one a lady was selling at a little tibetan shop last year. I have a friend who wears those little disc things with the straps they're wearing, I forget what they're called... he has a Guru Rinpoche one and a Samantabhadra one... stylin' and wylin'.

Lhug-Pa said:
You should have seen the Tibetan hat that I rocked for a couple of winters. I can't even find one in a Google image search, but the tassles on each side stood up instead of hanging down, it was ridiculous.

The new style: Bubble-goose coats and Wallabee Clarks or Timberland boots with mad different styles of Himalayan hats.

krodha wrote:
Thugged out.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4gCU5uplB4A

What about this dude.

Throat singing growl into a OM AH HUNG in the beginning, rapping/singing... he puts on a good show even though the audience looks halfway horrified.
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =

document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nnCYx2fswQQ

Savagely

Mr. G's about to put this on lockdown for 3 incalculable eons.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I'd wear one of those hats.... I almost bought one a lady was selling at a little tibetan shop last year. I have a friend who wears those little disc things with the straps they're wearing, I forget what they're called... he has a Guru Rinpoche one and a Samantabhadra one... stylin' and wylin'.

Dronma said:
Well, you just gave me inspiration....
Maybe I'll go out totally naked with sandals on my feet (Greek style), a Damaru on the one hand and a Bell on the other, a big Purba hanging on my belt (yes, naked with a belt and sandals!), and a HUGE Christian Cross as a pendant.....

krodha wrote:
I just go out dressed like this:

...no big deal.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 3:42 AM
Title: Dzogchen, Buddhism and culture
Content:
Dronma said:
Of course, I shall not go out in the streets be dressed like that either:

krodha wrote:
I'd wear one of those hats.... I almost bought one a lady was selling at a little tibetan shop last year. I have a friend who wears those little disc things with the straps they're wearing, I forget what they're called... he has a Guru Rinpoche one and a Samantabhadra one... stylin' and wylin'.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 3:12 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
(Edit: I guess this whole back and forth between muni and I has been a misunderstanding, I unfortunately have a difficult time understanding her. We had been agreeing and I misinterpreted it as something else... so... I have apologized and nevermind all of this.... carry on you institutional buddhism yea-sayers and naysayers!)

muni said:
Sorry, adding concepts brings no clarity in misunderstanding.

krodha wrote:
For some, a concept or an idea may be exactly the right thing they need to push them into the right view. Some may have spent years meditating wrong, or years misunderstanding the right view to maintain. And then upon hearing something, or reading something they may suddenly gain a flash of genuine insight which corrects their view. Not to label it a phase; but I too spent some time denying concepts and ideas... "this and that is just a concept", "this and that is just an idea", I can remember my mentor just laughing at me, he didn't push me because he knew it was just a phase, and he said all he could do was hope that it passed quickly. It's called clinging to the absolute.

"All discursive thoughts are emptiness,
and the observer of emptiness is discursive thought.
Emptiness does not destroy discursive thought,
and discursive thought does not obstruct emptiness."
- Jamyang Dorje

"To cling to a concrete reality is to be as dumb as an ox;
but clinging to emptines is even dumber."
- Saraha

"When I began, mountains were mountains and rivers were rivers; when I penetrated deeply, mountains were no longer mountains and rivers were no longer rivers; and when I had finished, mountains were again mountains and rivers again rivers."
- Old Zen Proverb

"When an ordinary person realizes it,
she is a sage.
When a sage realizes it,
he is an ordinary person."

muni said:

Dzogchen is master-student.

krodha wrote:
And a master-student knows no limitations.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 12:59 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
muni said:
"Samsara is the tendency to find fault with others". Naropa

"In the sky, there is no distinction of east and west; people create distinctions out of their own minds and then believe them to be true".
Buddha

"Equanimity means feeling neither hatred for enemies nor attachment to loved ones, but instead, feeling love and compassion for all beings equally".

asunthatneversets said:
While you, yourself, are finding fault with others for finding fault with others.

muni said:
I see that is about the dog tail. Please it is exactly that what keeps it going on: the object-subject confusion which cannot maintain nondual contemplation. Me and you separation.

Sorry dear, no wrong "you". It is only my mistake.

krodha wrote:
I have a hard time understanding what you are saying most of the time, but as far as this thread goes, I was merely calling bullsh*t on jnanasutra for exhibiting the same behavior he was condemning, and now you're pretending to be above judgement while judging others for their judgements. These are the subtle games the mind plays. It subconsciously projects itself. I never claimed to be perfect, but I am aware of my projections and am fully conscious of my mudslinging.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 11:55 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
muni said:
"Samsara is the tendency to find fault with others". Naropa

"In the sky, there is no distinction of east and west; people create distinctions out of

their own minds and then believe them to be true".
Buddha

"Equanimity means feeling neither hatred for enemies nor attachment to loved ones, but instead, feeling love and compassion for all beings equally".

krodha wrote:
While you, yourself, are finding fault with others for finding fault with others.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
[You are speaking from the POV of mind as well. And there's nothing wrong with that, so don't pretend there is.

Realize that mind is the only instrument you have to gauge, measure and judge. Every expression of acceptance or rejection is mind, even rejecting the sharing of ideas. You do not reside beyond mind.

muni said:
The dog is free to chase behind its tail without rejecting or accepting its tail.

krodha wrote:
My parents dog tries to sneak around and eat cat sh*t out of the litter box whenever he can get away with it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:35 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
jnanasutra said:
you people are nuts! seeing Dharmata doesn't even require much effort. Everyone is blah, blah, blah with ideas. so much mind...
conditioned by "buddhist" ideals, relax.

Simon E. said:
I would just like to make it clear that I would disassociate myself from this kind of attitude.
That does not speak for me.

jnanasutra said:

from pov of mind, sounds about right

krodha wrote:
jnanasutra, notice that the statements:

"you people are nuts! seeing Dharmata doesn't even require much effort. Everyone is blah, blah, blah with ideas. so much mind...
conditioned by "buddhist" ideals, relax."

And

"I would just like to make it clear that I would disassociate myself from this kind of attitude.
That does not speak for me."

Are both essentially saying the same thing.

You are speaking from the POV of mind as well. And there's nothing wrong with that, so don't pretend there is.

Realize that mind is the only instrument you have to gauge, measure and judge. Every expression of acceptance or rejection is mind, even rejecting the sharing of ideas. You do not reside beyond mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 10:30 PM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
What I don't understand is, if we are agreeing that the body isn't real, that it is merely an appearance or expression of the natural state; then why must it be destroyed for a chance of liberation to present itself? I'm not saying that there isn't a process which takes place in fully reducing appearances to their natural state, but the success of the process is surely predicated on correct view.

Paul said:
As in the Sogyal Rinpoche & Padmasambhava quote I posted and as pointed out by Malcolm in the thread I linked to, the dualistic mind is wind-contaminated tsal.
The Vajramala states very plainly:

The characteristic of the the element of air (vayu)
is the vayu (air) pervading the six cakras,
always present in the dharmacakra,
called pra?a since it pervades migrating beings"

And:

The wheel of vayu is explained to be pra?a.

And apropos of the Kalacakra citation in the last post it states:

Depending on upper or lower,
the major vayus, pra?a and apana are located.

Pra?a vayu is furthere defined in this text:

From the traces of the all-basis consciousness
arises the stream of consciousness;
the affliction [consciousness] is the pra?a vayu.

So at least in Buddhist texts these things are very precisely defined.
So discursive, dualistic thought is the movement of the element of wind interefering with tsal. There are good explanations of this in various other texts that I can point you to if you're interested. As far as I understand reducing this disturbance is the reason that yantra yoga, tummo, vajra recitation, karmamudra, togal's breathing methods etc. etc. exist as training methods. They put the winds and channels into the optimal, quiet state. Even the sitting in the 7 points of Vairochana is designed to have an effect on winds.

krodha wrote:
Which is the same thing I just said.

Paul said:
All you need to consider is the difference between these two situations:

a Dzogchen/Mahamudra practitioner that has recognised rigpa, but has to keep re-recognising the view to progress - which is nearly everyone who's ever done these practices

vs

a person who has died and whose elements have completely dissolved, where if they recognise the nature of mind for an intant in the bardo of dharmata, it's complete enlightenment with no falling back

As you mention: If rigpa is true and stable there shouldn't be any chance of being "kicked out" of it by anything. But how and why would rigpa not be completely stable at the time of first seeing it? Why wouldn't it be a permanant recognition, like it is in the bardo of dharmata? An unstable recognition is clearly the case for the vast majority of people who practice in their lives, so there must be a reason for this instability.

krodha wrote:
Proliferation of habitual tendencies.

Paul said:
So it's my understanding that the functions of the element of wind within a person's channels that is responsible for all these problems as it acts to de-stabilise the recognition of rigpa.

krodha wrote:
Ignorance is responsible.

Paul said:
And this is the crucial difference between a person with a body and person in the bardo of dharmata. If you tame wind whilst you have a body, you tame the mind and rigpa becomes easier to recognise.

krodha wrote:
Taming the mind is all well and good but it can become a distraction in and of itself. And it can lead to attachment to the calm state if one doesn't posses decisive discrimination. Truly, there's no more of a guarantee that one will recognize rigpa with a quiet mind vs. a mind in movement. If one remains in the temporary witness position, resting in awareness, thought just moves along. That awareness isn't rigpa, but it's the starting point, and remains unobstructed by thought, the important thing is realizing that you ARE a thought.

Paul said:
If there is a situation where it naturally dissolves (ie at death) then there's no barrier to rigpa if the practitioner knows that it's their own nature. In one moment of recognising in that situation and they become buddhas.

krodha wrote:
There's no barrier now either, apart from ignorance of course. There's no guarantee one will recognize rigpa in the bardo... I wouldn't put all my eggs in that basket. It is the last resort.

Paul said:
Now although our experience of things changes, the essence of things being unreal does not - I absolutely 100% agree with you on that. All I'd addo to it is that from the perspective of practice - rather than an objective, absolute point of view - is that the elements are an illusion, but how strong that illusion is is dependent on illusory circumstances based on illusory elements. If this were not the case, then there would be zero difference between the experience of this life and the experience of the bardo of dharmata with respect to the ease of becoming completely liberated.

krodha wrote:
The absolute point of view is that there's avidyā and vidyā. Yes the solidity of the illusion directly reflects the solidity of avidyā. But for avidyā to decrease one must intimately know the face of vidyā through direct introduction or a flash of genuine insight, otherwise the path is founded on hope and conjecture. I cannot rely on the bardo. Go with the attitude that liberation will happen before the end of this life, for the benefit of

all, and don't settle for anything less.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 7:52 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
Paul said:
If someone hasn't completely got rid of the ignorance that sees the five lights as the five elements, then they're going to experience matter. What I posted, and why I posted it, was to show the way the body - specifically the winds and channels - have an effect on the mind. When they are temporarily destroyed, the mind has a chance for liberation in the bardo of dharmata - as there's no possibility at that point to be kicked out of rigpa by ones own wind, then it's permanent buddhahood. If we have a body, then we are almost certainly not going to remain in rigpa and we have to rely on trekcho and togal to achieve rainbow body or transference body by gradually eliminating the ignorance that reifies the elements. Like the Guru Rinpoche quote: at present our mind is encased in a net, the net of the "wind of karma." And the "wind of karma" is encased itself in a net, the net of our physical body

krodha wrote:
Mind and body are intermittent states, it's not only the winds and channels which have an effect on the mind, but vice versa is also true. What I don't understand is, if we are agreeing that the body isn't real, that it is merely an appearance or expression of the natural state; then why must it be destroyed for a chance of liberation to present itself? I'm not saying that there isn't a process which takes place in fully reducing appearances to their natural state, but the success of the process is surely predicated on correct view. If rigpa is true and stable there shouldn't be any chance of being "kicked out" of it by anything. Sure the greasing of the channels and the alignment of the winds helps to produce an energetic equanimity which aids in remaining undistracted. Discursive thought is an expression of wind after all, and stabilizing these factors helps to stabilize focus, but genuine rigpa (once it's ascertained) is unassailable whether the mind is running a hundred miles an hour or is completely silent.

The ignorance which reifies the elements is one's own discursive thought which serves to impute (and create) "things" which are in truth are primordially absent. Trekchö and tögal are the cultivation and result of correct view. The net that the mind is encased in is the mind itself objectified as projections erroneously taken to be inherent aspects of experience. Again the "wind of karma" or "subtle energy of karma" (as Zurchhung Sheyrab Dragpa put it in that quote posted above) refers to conceptualization that invests sensory appearances with reality as objective persons, places, things, time etc. The "wind of karma" a.k.a. conceptualization (discursive thought) becomes further entrapped by conceiving itself to be a subjective entity which spans time and then identifies with the appearances which constitute "the body". And thus the field of experience is fragmented into a subject-object dichotomy and the habitual reification of this dichotomy engrains it into the very makeup of reality.

Paul said:
None of this at all implies that the body etc. etc. is real - but it certainly appears and has particular functions, such as those of the internal winds etc. that form the deluded mind. So our physical body does put a brake on our realisation unless we can learn to work with it in various ways.

krodha wrote:
Yes it certainly does appear and appears to have functions, that cannot be denied. But again, the internal winds and deluded mind are intermittent aspects and complement each other. The winds delegate the movement of thought, and thought conceptualizes a mind and winds etc. The physical body is an idea, it cannot put a brake on realization, only the mind does that depending on how entrenched it is in it's own delusion. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't work with the body I'm not denying that either.

Paul said:
It is describing the experience of death. It's taken from a chapter on the experience of the collapse of the elements into one another and how that then turns into the experience of the bardo of dharmata. And that's the experience of anyone who's not completely finished with illusion - and it's safe to say I've certainly got a bit to get rid of.

krodha wrote:
I've seen it interpreted both ways. I'm sure it's safe to say all of our paths require refining, respectively.

Paul said:
Have you read this thread? You might find it interesting:
https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=3979 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

krodha wrote:
I haven't I'll check it out, thanks

Paul said:
But anyway,

krodha wrote:
All of this is relevant IMO

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Please, let's keep the bickering constructive, because otherwise the moderators are gonna shut this shop down and all of this is far too entertaining for that to happen!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:35 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'm still not sure why this would imply any type of materiality. Everything you've highlighted in bold is describing the nature of your experience right now in this very moment, it doesn't come to fruition at the moment of some physical death. Unless of course, the mind allows that to become a reality by continuing to proliferate the plagued web of it's own imputed ignorance.

Paul said:
When we are at last freed from the body that has defined and dominated our understanding of ourselves for so long, the karmic vision of one life is completely exhausted, but any karma that might be created in the future has not yet begun to crystallize. So what happens in death is that there is a "gap" or space that is fertile with vast possibility; it is a moment of tremendous, pregnant power where the only thing that matters, or could matter, is how exactly our mind is. Stripped of a physical body, mind stands naked, revealed startlingly for what it has always been: the architect of our reality.

krodha wrote:
If you can die right now, this very moment, by realizing that you were never born to begin with, then the body is freed into the expanse of the natural state. Karmic vision (compounded and manifold dualistic perception) is completely exhausted, any karma which could be potentially produced and established through the re-emergence of ignorance has yet to crystallize. There is a "gap" or space created by seeing one's true nature, fertile with vast possibility, it is a moment of tremendous pregnant power where the only thing that matters, or could matter, is recognizing exactly how our mind is, so that one can remain in that view. Stripped of any notion of a physical body, mind stands naked, revealed startlingly for what it has always been: the architect of our reality, for it had always been the deciding factor which established the erroneous notions of bondage and physicality which plagued our perception.

Paul said:
So if, at the moment of death, we have already a stable realization of the nature of mind, in one instant we can purify all our karma. And if we continue that stable recognition, we will actually be able to end our karma altogether, by entering the expanse of the primordial purity of the nature of mind, and attaining liberation. Padmasambhava explained this:

krodha wrote:
So if, at the moment of directly actualizing the emptiness of self and other, we have already a stable realization of the nature of mind, in one instant we can purify all our karma. And if we continue in that stable recognition, we will actually be able to end our karma altogether, by abiding in the expanse of the primordial purity of the nature of

mind (which has always been present since beginningless time), and attaining liberation.

Paul said:
Why is it, you might wonder, that during the bardo state you can find stability by merely recognizing the nature of mind for a single instant? The answer is this: at present our mind* is encased in a net, the net of the "wind of karma." And the "wind of karma" is encased itself in a net, the net of our physical body The result is that we have no independence or freedom.

krodha wrote:
Why is it, you might wonder, that during this in-between "gap" state you can find stability by merely recognizing the nature of mind for a single instant? The answer is this: at present our mind is encased in a net (of it's own creation), the net of the "wind of karma" (a.k.a. conceptualization that invests sensory appearances with reality). The "wind of karma" has encased itself in an imputed net, which has subsequently given rise to another net - an apparent physical body. The result (of being carried away by this interconnected web of ignorance) is that we have no independence or freedom.

"The term 'consciousness' (nam-par shey-pa) refers to the unimpeded avenue for apparent sense objects to proliferate in one's perceptions. The term 'subtle energy of karma' (lay kyi lung) refers to conceptualization that invests these sensory appearances with reality. The entire spectrum of samsara is thoroughly established from the synchronicity of these subtler and coarser aspects of consciousness based on conceptual mind."
- Zurchhung Sheyrab Dragpa

Paul said:
But as soon as our body has separated into mind and matter, in the gap before it has been encased once again in the net of a future body, the mind, along with its magical display, has no concrete, material support. For as long as it lacks such a material basis, we are independent—and we can recognise.

krodha wrote:
But as soon as the body has been seen to be empty, in the gap (of clear seeing: rig pa) before it (primordial awareness) has been encased once again in the net of a future body (ignorance), the mind, along with it's magical display (body/world/universe/time/space/etc.), has no concrete, material support. For as long as it lacks such a(-n imputed) material basis, we are independent (primordially unborn) - and we can recognize (this magical display to be our own, and abide in it's fullness).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 7:48 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Oh ok, I'm still not sure about the term "materialistic" what attracts you to that term?

Paul said:
Dzogchens unique approach to what matter is, ie the quasi-panpsychism type view that Malcolm has been explaining for some time with his quotes from the Dzogchen tantras. Also, from a practical point of view, that the winds, channels and drops have a profound influence on our mind and ability to experience rigpa (which is the kind of thing that made me start this thread)
sounded like you were implying that we're stuck with these gross physical bodies which are almost cage-like to the point that they're a burden to work with. Such a suggestion would give the wrong impression to those seeking to establish correct view in my opinion.
I have read and also had it explained to me that the body can be something of an impediment to realisation because of its nature - something that isn't a problem in the bardo, where the body is of a different, subtle nature - hence one of the side effects being that the mind is much clearer there. I will look for some more info in my books, recordings and notes - that'll take time, though.

krodha wrote:
"I (Dudjom Lingpa) still think that my body is not merely a sensory appearance, for surely it came from my parents, who were it's cause and condition."

He (Longchenpa) said, "If you think that your body came from your father and mother, then what are the beginning and end of these parents? What are their source, their location, their final destination? Tell me!"

I answered, "I think that they exist, but I am not aware of what they are. It seems to me that a physical body without parents is not possible."

He retorted, "Consider this. Who are the parents of the body in a dream, in the bardo, and in the hell realms?" With that, I arrived at the decision that this body has never existed, being simply a sensory appearance....

..."...Furthermore, it is not valid to hold that any sensory appearances exist, assigning them to some hierarchy of higher versus lower, outer versus inner."

To this I responded, "My guru, then to what decision should I come? To what level of experience should I hold? I ask you, sublime guru, show me."

The guru replied, "At no time throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes has there ever been actual birth. There has never been actual death, only the transformation of sensory appearances, like the shift from the dream state to the waking state. All sensations - seen, heard, smelled, tasted (etc.) ...are merely the mind being conscious of it's own projections (rang-nang), without their ever having even a hair's tip of existence as something else."

...."Throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes, there has never been any actual experience of transition or going from one state to another, or any actual experience of being located in some other place. This is analogous to the images in a dream."

..."It is an enormous flaw not to understand that what manifests as the body is empty, and instead to invest it with truth. This flaw is the consuming demon (za-dre), since the power of the efforts you make for the sake of the body eats away at the fruit of omniscience. It is the murderous executioner (shi-shed), since it provides the link from one cycle to the next in samsara, causing the appearances of birth and death to manifest. It is what cuts the life force (srog-chod), since for the sake of the body you are driven to seek happiness from clothing and so forth, and so you sever the lifeline of liberation with the fixation on attachment and aversion that perpetuates hope and fear. It is also what steals the breath (ug-len), since it robs you of the breath of lasting happiness. Therefore, all those who fixate on the apparent objects of the six modes of consciousness (tsog-drug) are like deer perceiving a mirage to be water and chasing after it, when not even an iota of an essence has ever existed."

- Dudjom Lingpa speaking to Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 7:13 PM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:

Paul said:
As described by Malcolm over a long time, and as can be seen from that quote by Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche, Dzogchen is very materialistic.

asunthatneversets said:
Not at all. The solidity of one's experience is congruent to the solidity of one's ignorance.

Paul said:
What I meant is that it's materialistic in the sense it's not Cartesian or idealist, quite different to a lot of other Buddhist views - but it's very clearly not at all realist. You seem to think I have a weird realist view of things, which I don't.

krodha wrote:
Oh ok, I'm still not sure about the term "materialistic" what attracts you to that term? I don't think you have a weird realist view, I try to avoid putting people into boxes like that. Maybe it was the way you worded what you said, but it sounded like you were implying

that we're stuck with these gross physical bodies which are almost cage-like to the point that they're a burden to work with. Such a suggestion would give the wrong impression to those seeking to establish correct view in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 5:44 PM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
Clarence said:
It just seems like materialism from my POV. How can being intimately linked or how can realization be dependent on the body be anything other than materialism? I guess I don't understand how that works. If Rigpa is dependent on the body, then if the body is gone, what happens to Rigpa?

Paul said:
As described by Malcolm over a long time, and as can be seen from that quote by Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche, Dzogchen is very materialistic.

krodha wrote:
Not at all. The solidity of one's experience is congruent to the solidity of one's ignorance.

Paul said:
If a person does not have any kind of experience with Dzogchen, when they die they don't recognise rigpa and their dualistic mind creates a new subtle material body that continues through the bardo. They then gain a new body in one of the six realms.

krodha wrote:
The dualistic mind has created this present body as well. This body is a product of ignorance.

Paul said:
If they recognise the display of the bardo of dharmata to be their own display, they are liberated. Being liberated in the bardo is much easier as rigpa is much easier to recognise because of the nature of the body - it doesn't 'weigh you down' as much as a gross physical body with its channels and winds. Practices like togal and yangti etc. use the body to overcome this limitation, though. This is why most practitioners who gain liberation do it in the bardo, not while they have a human body.

krodha wrote:
Physicality is a misnomer, this body is no more physical than a body in a dream or bardo. It's an appearance like a dream... All limitations are self-inflicted due to habitual tendencies. Thogal and yangti remove doubt/conditioning, what appears to be the transmutation of solid matter into the natural state is merely the removal of ignorance.

Paul said:
I really recommend reading through all of Malcolm's posts on this issue to clarify things.

krodha wrote:
I do too but I'm not sure if a materialist view is being propagated. I don't discount the fact that gross physicality is unbelievably compelling and seems 100% real but investigate this belief. The body in a dream can also seem very real and subject to compelling experiences.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:12 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The awareness in Dzogchen is different since it is not a manifestation of brain-based or nervous system activity. It's outside of time. Any awareness in our nervous system or brain is temporal and conditioned. When spontaneous presence (lhundrub) is talked of, one of it's qualities is that it is seen as unborn and outside of a temporal realization. I have had lots of doubts about this issue, but seem to have cleared them up at the moment. One great textural source for overcoming doubts is Longchenpa. Amazing Longchen Rabjam quotes from the 'Cutting Through the Three Times' by Garab Dorje (in the section discussing spontaneous presence):

''What is meaningful about awakened mind is that it is unborn.
It's unborn nature is spontaneously present.
The unborn essence is indeterminate.
What is meaningful about what is unborn is that it does not come into existence,
So the unborn, since it has never come into existence, is free of any time frame with beginning or end.'' p186 The precious Treasury of The Way of Abiding.

asunthatneversets said:
The awareness in Dzogchen is not different, it is this very awareness (although awareness isn't an accurate word in my opinion). The problem is that we misunderstand the nature of this awareness and mistakenly take it to be something it isn't. There isn't a brain-based awareness and then another separate one which has yet to be attained, if that was the case then buddhahood would be temporal (since it was something gained it could also be lost). Buddhahood is innate and atemporal just as this presence is innate and atemporal, neither are subject to cause and effect. The idea that there is anything existing (including an awareness) which is temporal is a product of misunderstanding. Lhungrub is an innate and natural quality/attribute of this present wakefulness, and the removal of ignorance only allows it to shine in it's fullness.

Nothing ever separates us from unoriginated simplicity,
so vows and discipline are redundant;
the essence is always spontaneously present,
so any effort to find it is always superfluous;

self-sprung awareness has never been obscured,
so gnostic awareness cannot be generated;
everybody already lives on my level,
so there is no place to reach through purification....
- Samantabhadra

greentreee said:
first off, regarding the samatabhadra quote, what is it's source?

krodha wrote:
Keith Dowman's translation of Longchen Rabjam's Treasury Of Natural Perfection, although I don't know if this excerpt is part of the original text, Dowman added it in the commentary to make a point regarding the innate completeness of the great perfection.

greentreee said:
next, i think the translation has a minor flaw...where? so far i can see is in it's incompleteness.

krodha wrote:
This is the text, it is accurate in what I was attempting to convey, complete or incomplete.

The pure mind, the ubiquitous essence -
it is spontaneously, originally, perfect;
so strenuous engagement with the ten techniques
is unnecessary, superfluous.

My nature is like elemental space
(that all-applicable simile):
we exist in pure space, so we need not strive for it;
we exist as pure space, so space is all our striving;
and all-creating space transcends any exertion.
Pure mind, the ubiquitous essence, is like that,
so transcending all cognitive activity
I am inscrutable and cannot be cultivated.
All the ten techniques are likewise transcended,
so nothing can be done to affect me.
Those who try to approach me on a causal path,
desirous of catching a glimpse of my face,
seeking me through the ten techniques,
fall straight to earth like a tenderfoot sky-walker,
tumbling down due to deliberate effort.

I, the supreme source, I am the revelation,
and transcend every sphere of activity,
so a view of me cannot be cultivated,
and the ten techniques are meaningless.

If you still think that the ten techniques have purpose,
look at me, and finding nothing to see,
taking no view, remain at that zero-point.
Nothing ever separates us from unoriginated simplicity,
so vows and discipline are redundant;
the essence is always spontaneously present,
so any effort to find it is always superfluous;
self-sprung awareness has never been obscured,
so gnostic awareness cannot be generated;
everybody already lives on my level,
so there is no place to reach through purification;
I embrace all and everything,
so there can be no path that leads to me;
I am forever incapable of dualization,
so there is never anything to be labeled 'subtle';
my form embraces everything,
so there has never been any 'duality';
I am self-sprung awareness from the very beginning,
so I can never be nailed down;
since I am the heart of total presence,
there is no other source of secret precepts.
- Samantabhadra

greentreee said:
again "gnostic" isn't really a specific term either, since it pertains to "knowledge, particularly esoteric knowledge" , it has a definition but it's rooted in another language with terminology that may or may not obscure the original terms used to describe that which the translator attempted to, fill the void, so to speak. and yes i do consider dzogchen to be a form of esoteric buddhism.

krodha wrote:
Yes the term "gnostic" has been discussed on this forum, some agree with you that it doesn't accurately represent the intended meaning. I'm merely writing what is there.

greentreee said:
but to the other quoted text. there are two levels of awareness, according to the mind only school. there is the perceived and perceiving portions of our thought process. the perceiving can perceive the perceived, but teh perceived cannot perceive the perceiving. sort of like hind sight! you can't see what your seeing with what youve seen, you only see with what you see with, and the mind attempts to associate the objects and forms as they appear, and associations form. once the mind starts associating, then the perceived portion of the brain begins to work in conjunction with the perceiving. kind of like if you were to do something for the first time and there is no knowledge to rely on, but the second time around, the brain is using what it has already learned, which can be a good or bad thing, depending on the situation.

krodha wrote:

This isn't the mind only school. None of that applies.

greentreee said:
i'm not good at grammar but i think i got the tenses right! in essence i think what that means is that we can see what we've seen, but what we've seen can't see! ha, i'm going to start sounding like a crazy madhyamaka soon! i joke

krodha wrote:
I would not interpret it as meaning that, I don't think it's attempting to say that at all, but you're welcome to your opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:02 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
Andrew108 said:
The awareness in Dzogchen is different since it is not a manifestation of brain-based or nervous system activity. It's outside of time. Any awareness in our nervous system or brain is temporal and conditioned. When spontaneous presence (lhundrub) is talked of, one of it's qualities is that it is seen as unborn and outside of a temporal realization. I have had lots of doubts about this issue, but seem to have cleared them up at the moment. One great textural source for overcoming doubts is Longchenpa. Amazing Longchen Rabjam quotes from the 'Cutting Through the Three Times' by Garab Dorje (in the section discussing spontaneous presence):

''What is meaningful about awakened mind is that it is unborn.
It's unborn nature is spontaneously present.
The unborn essence is indeterminate.
What is meaningful about what is unborn is that it does not come into existence,
So the unborn, since it has never come into existence, is free of any time frame with beginning or end.'' p186 The precious Treasury of The Way of Abiding.

krodha wrote:
The awareness in Dzogchen is not different, it is this very awareness (although awareness isn't an accurate word in my opinion). The problem is that we misunderstand the nature of this awareness and mistakenly take it to be something it isn't. There isn't a brain-based awareness and then another separate one which has yet to be attained, if that was the case then buddhahood would be temporal (since it was something gained it could also be lost). Buddhahood is innate and atemporal just as this presence is innate and atemporal, neither are subject to cause and effect. The idea that there is anything existing (including an awareness) which is temporal is a product of misunderstanding. Lhungrub is an innate and natural quality/attribute of this present wakefulness, and the removal of ignorance only allows it to shine in it's fullness.

Nothing ever separates us from unoriginated simplicity,
so vows and discipline are redundant;

the essence is always spontaneously present,
so any effort to find it is always superfluous;
self-sprung awareness has never been obscured,
so gnostic awareness cannot be generated;
everybody already lives on my level,
so there is no place to reach through purification....
- Samantabhadra

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Finney said:
I'm looking ahead to the retreats over the next several months but can't figure out what some of them are about. Some I get the gist of (Samantabhadra, Garuda, Chenrezi, Longsal Longde, Chod, Zhitro), a couple I've been able to look up some info about (Jnanadhakini, Guru Dragphur) but there are still several that I know nothing about and can find no information on either. Can anyone help? Unfortunately, the list is longer than I'd like but any little bits of info (or pointers to where I can find info) would be most helpful.

The list:
Longsal Teaching "Jyodba Ronyom"
"Dzogchen Nallug" Teaching
Man-ngag Tag-drol Gyud terma teaching
Longsal Atií Nadzer
Longsal Atii Gongpa Gojyed
Longsal Atii Lam-gyi Ngondro
Longsal Atii Gongpa ngotrod teaching

Thanks!
Finn

krodha wrote:
Honestly there's probably no way you'll find anything on the longsal/terma teachings apart from purchasing the longsal books and/or receiving the teachings from Rinpoche... None of it's intended to be (nor should it be) public knowledge or publicly accessible. Good for you for being so interested in the teachings though!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 8:26 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
krodha wrote:
This lady Jill Bolte had a stroke which essentially shut down her brain... her ability to

move, her speech, memory etc... but the most interesting part was that due to the location of the burst blood vessel in her left hemisphere she lost her sense of self-awareness too. She said that the left hemisphere was the most damaged and during her recovery the part that told her she was a separate individual remained shut off for some time. She couldn't tell the difference between her and her surroundings and felt like everything was an extension of herself.

"I am the life-force power of the universe. I am the life-force power of the 50 trillion beautiful molecular geniuses that make up my form, at one with all that is."
- Jill Bolte Taylor

She spoke about her experience at TED:
http://www.ted.com/talks/jill_bolte_taylor_s_powerful_stroke_of_insight.html

This thread also reminded me of a radio interview I listened to a couple weeks ago with a Neil Slade who researches the amygdala. He does exercises which stimulate the amygdala by doing visualizations of a feather tickling that area (which reminded me of the visualizations done in buddhism which I'm sure also stimulate this area). He claimed to have a ton of ways to stimulate these areas of the brain, (he didn't share too much because he was obviously trying to sell his book, but) I'd bet most of them resemble buddhist/vajrayana/dzogchen practices. He spoke of a friend who uses a tuning fork tuned to a specific frequency that is held to the temple which also stimulates the amygdala (which made me think of the sounding of mantras which I'm sure also vibrate and stimulate these areas of the brain). The stimulation over time seems to produce the same "popping" or "releasing" effect Paul spoke of which leads to what Slade called "sense of enlightenment" experiences.

"Having spoken with a number of successful people in various fields, Slade has determined that there are many ways to stimulate the amygdala. He recalled a conversation with Steven Snyder, a piano tuner who has worked with the biggest recording studios in New York City. Snyder told Slade that he activates his amygdala by striking a tuning fork and placing it to the side of his head where that part of the brain is located. Ultimately, Slade said, consistent stimulation of the amygdala over time can result in a phenomenon called "popping the frontal lobe," something he experienced six years after he began his research. Slade described it as akin to a sense of enlightenment and marveled that "it's the best feeling that you've ever had."

Link to the radio interview I heard:
http://www.coasttocoastam.com/show/2012/05/07

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:42 AM
Title: Re: real question
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
Also, the exoteric aspect of "monotheistic" religions is actually mono-idolatry. They

simply worship one invisible idol and call it "God". Not to say that invisible-to-the-physical-senses noumena don't exist. Nevertheless, to take a single invisible—whether existent or non-existent—noumenon and give it attributes of The Absolute, is mono-idolatry.

Wesley1982 said:
God isn't an idol. (I know it gets real complicated)

krodha wrote:
God is an idea, it has to be believed in. Any concept that the mind relates to (which can be accepted or rejected) is an idol. Christianity is highly involved in idol worshipping, though it loves to pretend it isn't. You'll disagree because you identify with the belief system in question, and in order to validate it, a label of idol worshipping must be denied at all costs. You have to protect it because it cannot protect itself... It can't protect itself because it's a concept/idea which only has as much power as it receives from those who believe in it.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
What's the context of the Karmapa's statement? Is he speaking of actual nyams of bliss? Or of the peacefulness of equanimity that arises as a result of correct view?

Paul said:
It's from his rebirth prediction letter.

krodha wrote:
I'd say the Karmapa is addressing the inherent joyfulness which is synonymous with ones natural state, being that the letter is so brief and that the next line is "the dharmadhātu is without center or edge" it would seem odd for that opening line to address something (considered) as mundane as a nyam.

But that doesn't mean we can't discuss the physiology of energetic movements in the body and their relation to blissful feelings. It's an interesting topic for sure.

In my opinion, western medicine has fallen so far from the mark with it's "mechanical" view of the body and world, that I doubt it would even have a valid explanation for such phenomena.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 4:54 AM
Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology
Content:

Paul said:
Self-awareness is always bliss -16th Karmapa

Bliss is one of the three nyams that can happen to a Dzogchen or Mahamudra practitioner. Thinking about this, this seems to be a bit odd - it's not immediately apparent why this should be.

So what is the cause of this from
a) a western medical perspective (if indeed meditational bliss has ever been researched)
b) from a Dzogchen/Tibetan medicine point of view - is it related to winds entering the central channel?

Also, in relation to the movement of winds, it's my understanding that bliss can rectify 'damaged' channels in the subtle body, or rather is the by product of the correction of such problems. Is this basically what is going on in this situation?

krodha wrote:
What's the context of the Karmapa's statement? Is he speaking of actual nyams of bliss? Or of the peacefulness of equanimity that arises as a result of correct view?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Lhasa said:
Hi,
Would someone please point out the texts that apply to this current Longde retreat?

krodha wrote:
THE ROOT UPADESHA ON THE VAJRA BRIDGE OF LONGDE (Revised Edition?)
http://shangshung.org/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&cPath=74_75&products_id=535

LONGDE TEACHINGS - BASED ON THE ORIGINAL TEXTS BY VAIROCHANA AND DZIN DHARMABODHI
http://shangshung.org/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&cPath=74_75&products_id=262

THE ROOT UPADESHA ON THE VAJRA BRIDGE OF LONGDE
http://shangshung.org/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&cPath=74_75&products_id=279

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:51 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....

Content:
Andrew108 said:
The idea of not progressing is an obstacle. The idea that all progressing has been done is an obstacle. My intention is to progress and progress and progress and and .....glad I finally cleared this one up.

krodha wrote:
You're absolutely right, accepting (or rejecting) an idea that progression is meaningless (or meaningful) is surely an obstacle.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:08 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
"A fool deceived by magical illusion is like an animal
pursuing a mirage in his thirst for water;
expecting his delusive hopes to be realized,
trusting his dogma, he is trapped;
losing is way on the eight-fold gradation of intellect,
he fails to see the real meaning."
- Longchen Rabjam

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:04 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
Andrew108 said:
I've been reviewing this thread in light of the huge Dzogchen and Buddhism thread. During the Dzogchen and Buddhism thread I came round to the view that contrivance is really important. Contrived practice and the notion of progress plays really well with the Dzogchen view. Just to have Dzogchen by itself with no progress to be made or just to be interested in 'my primordial potentiality' seems impoverished and more like an obstacle. We need these conceptual practices and ideas of progress because otherwise we might get 'lost' in Dzogchen. It's not right to only want the essence of the teachings.

krodha wrote:
"The pure mind, the ubiquitous essence -
it is spontaneously, originally, perfect;
so strenuous engagement with the ten techniques
is unnecessary, superfluous.

...I am inscrutable and cannot be cultivated.
All the ten techniques are likewise transcended,

so nothing can be done to affect me.
Those who try to approach me on a causal path,
desirous of catching a glimpse of my face,
seeking me through the ten techniques,
fall straight to earth like a tenderfoot sky-walker,
tumbling down due to deliberate effort.

I, the supreme source, I am the revelation,
and transcend every sphere of activity,
so a view of me cannot be cultivated,
and the ten techniques are meaningless.
If you still think that the ten techniques have purpose,
look at me, and finding nothing to see,
taking no view, remain at that zero-point.
Nothing ever separates us from unoriginated simplicity,
so vows and discipline are redundant;
the essence is always spontaneously present,
so any effort to find it is always superfluous;
self-sprung awareness has never been obscured,
so gnostic awareness cannot be generated;
everybody already lives on my level,
so there is no place to reach through purification;
I embrace all and everything,
so there can be no path that leads to me;
I am forever incapable of dualization,
so there is never anything to be labeled 'subtle';
my form embraces everything,
so there has never been any 'duality';
I am self-sprung awareness from the very beginning,
so I can never be nailed down;
since I am the heart of total presence,
there is no other source of secret precepts."
- Samantabhadra

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 8:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
It actually is! That's him... Lama Drimed Norbu... He looks alot less Jewish with his hair tied back

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:
Mariusz said:
Have you found this master in non-Buddhism or non-Bon now in the world? It is necessary or not? Simply answer please.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:41 AM
Title: Re: Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Maybe there's an old photograph of Rinpoche somewhere that has Changchub Dorje in it... this is one of the oldest photos I've seen of ChNN:

I'm sure taking photos was probably a rare occasion but you never know there could be one out there somewhere.

Will said:
I know next to nothing about ChNN - which one is he in this photo - the bhikshu in the center?

krodha wrote:
I believe so (but I could be wrong).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje
Content:
Will said:
Thanks Sunny, I hope a photograph will turn up also.

krodha wrote:
Maybe there's an old photograph of Rinpoche somewhere that has Changchub Dorje in it... this is one of the oldest photos I've seen of ChNN:

I'm sure taking photos was probably a rare occasion but you never know there could be one out there somewhere.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 3:13 AM
Title: Re: how to stay awake during meditation?
Content:
Frank said:
how the hey now do you fall asleep in lotus or half? i mean i doze, but can't actually snooze.

krodha wrote:
The more you meditate the stronger your clarity will become, the strength of your awareness will increase. If you can, try being mindful throughout the day in all activities, remain relaxed but keep a sharp attention, try not to day dream... act like you're driving a car and have to remain aware of all that's going on around you. This will cultivate your mind's clarity, in time when you go to sit your stream of awareness will be unerring and unassailable, the dullness that causes you to tire won't be an issue.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:37 AM
Title: Re: Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and karma?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Earth rests on water, water rests on wind (or "air"),
and wind rests on space; but space itself does not rest on these elements of air, water, and earth.

Just so, our psycho-physical components, sensory elements, and sensory faculties rest on our karmic actions and emotional distortions,
while our karmic actions and emotional distortions themselves always rest on our distorted psychic activity.

This distorted psychic activity rests on the purity of our mind,
yet the nature of the mind itself does not rest on any of these phenomena."
- The Unsurpassed Continuity

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 3:02 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and karma?
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
Haha yep. Pema Rigdzin has been on fire lately.

And I laughed my ass off at your recent Eddie Murphy and OMG-Becky posts, BTW.

Anyway,

krodha wrote:
Ha glad my humor struck a chord, I was hoping at least a couple people smiled... And I agree lots of good posts on this board lately

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 1:45 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and karma?
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
A.k.a Mind series, space series and secret instructions

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 7:21 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and karma?
Content:

heart said:
No, it is definitely a interpretation that seems more grounded in common sense and psychology than any understanding of Dzogchen.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
So are you sponsoring the view that karma exists as a external/universal law? And that it indeed acts as a form of control in delegating moral justice and retribution based on one's actions? Following up on my question above; what is your view? Being that there was multiple facets of karma addressed, which aspect (or theme) are you so adamately and diametrically opposed to?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and karma?
Content:
krodha wrote:
There seems to be a few themes in the excerpt that could be interpreted as controversial... Which one is in question? The cosmic moral retribution? The absence of karma as an external, eternal, constant and universal law? The view that karma arises out of habituation? All of it?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Since the magical illusion of origination occurs within what has no origin, it is the ordinary confused mind that characterizes things as involving causality. What the ati approach reveals as the absence of causes or conditions makes eminently perfect sense, although it is unacceptable in lower approaches.

The intent and conduct of buddhas and ordinary sentient beings are not separate, so it is the ordinary confused mind that holds saṃsāra and nirvāṇa to be a duality. What the ati approach reveals as nondual makes eminently perfect sense, although it is unacceptable in lower approaches.

Given the freedom in which it is irrelevant whether or not one has realization, to believe that freedom comes about through realization is the enemy of equalness. What the ati approach reveals as a single state of equalness makes eminently perfect sense, although it is unacceptable in lower approaches.

To hold that one cannot realize the inexpressible without relying on specific means to characterize it is a fool's attitude. What the ati approach reveals as inseparability from the ultimate makes eminently perfect sense, although it is unacceptable in lower approaches.

Although great perfection is timeless and infinite, without fixed depth or extent, to claim that it is 'unfathomable' is a fool's attitude. What the ati approach reveals as a boundless, unique state makes eminently perfect sense, although it is unacceptable in lower approaches."

- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:
mzaur said:
Then you haven't understood the essence of Dharma. Emptiness is the insight which liberates, not a meaningless concept. Ramana Maharshi would would cling to the Self and sink into a vegetative state for weeks so that his disciples would have to feed him and wipe his butt. Are you saying Maharshi lacked direct experience? He had plenty of it.

Karma Dorje said:
This ranks with the most foolish things I have read on this forum. Ramana experienced nirvikalpa samadhi for long stretches during his youth. This is not the "vegetative state" known as jada samadhi . Instead, this is exactly the same as bringing the winds into the central channel at the heart and remaining there. It is a state of deep realization. He did not have disciples at this time.. he was a simple sadhu living in a temple in Tiruvannamalai. Some of the other sadhus would look after him as he would get picked on by neighbourhood children.

When Ramanashram grew up around him, he constantly met with devotees and taught. There was no point during this period he spent weeks in nirvikalpa samadhi incapacitated.

Why put others down whom you have neither met nor understood? Surely that contravenes the bodhisattva intention (and basic human decency).

krodha wrote:
He also stated that sahaja samadhi is the true state which is unbroken and permanent.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 4:40 PM
Title: Re: how to stay awake during meditation?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Getting drowsy while meditating can happen for lots of reasons, could be a sign that you're too relaxed, finding that balance is key. If you get tired then intensify your focus, if you're too tense then ease up. Make sure you're choosing times during the day/night which are conducive for staying awake. Keep your eyes open, if you get tired then try focusing on an object and pretend you're going to pierce right through it with your gaze. If that doesn't work get up and walk around for a bit, do some stretches etc... A warm room could put you to sleep so a moderate to cool environment works best. Perhaps try to meditate away from areas you usually associate with sleep/rest.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 6:31 AM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Andrew108 said:

If there's still a horse and cart then what has been let go of? Certainty is the point were letting go just feels uncontrived. For a lot of madhyamakans certainty is the realization and they test that in all sorts of strange situations.

krodha wrote:
Not horse and cart, "horse and rider" is a metaphor used to describe the (sometimes extremely) subtle subject-object dance that occurs on the path. A big way it manifests is as ego and non-ego and dichotomies of that nature. Anywhere there is a rider controlling the process(horse) the view has been missed, it's a subtle duality. So this goes back to that "progress" thread where even the idea that letting-go can be uncontrived still suggests that there is indeed letting-go to do (which there is, don't get me wrong), but it is the nature of the process (and how it's related to) that either binds or liberates. And the true certainty comes with the first glimpse of realization, which is anattā, that certainty is unshakable, unassailable and solid as a rock.

"Meditation is not foremost, realization is foremost;
If realization is not entered with confidence,
The meditator is merely meditating on a conceptual state,
The seeker is seeking with an afflicted clinging."
- kun tu bzang po che ba la rang gnas pa

"If you think you have a lower self (or an ego) to get rid of, and then you fight against it, nothing strengthens the delusion that it exists more than that. So this tremendous schizophrenia in human beings of thinking that they are rider and horse, soul in command of body, or will in command of passions... wresting with them, all that kind of split thinking simply aggravates the problem, and we get more and more split. So we have all sorts of people engaged in an interior conflict which they will never ever resolve. Because the true self; you either know it or you don't. If you do know it, then you know it's the only one and the other (so-called lower self) ceases to be a problem. It becomes something like a mirage, and you don't go around hitting at mirages with a stick or trying to put reigns on them. You just know they're mirages and you walk straight through them."
- Alan Watts

Andrew108 said:
It's as much a radical path as institutionalized Dzogchen. We are often mesmerized by quite deeply hidden impulses and these need to be cut through in order for recognition to come about. All of this you know. If you think ghosts somehow exist outside you then perhaps you are not cutting these impulses? I'm surprised you take ghosts to be something external since you demonstrate a really fine understanding of the dharma.

krodha wrote:
I don't take ghosts to be any sort of phenomena like that (external/internal or objective/subjective), that was the main point of my post. Because they are projections (projection meaning an emanation of ignorance a.k.a. conventionally imputed falsehood)... my interest was in how/why does the emanation seem to possess such conventional characteristics? That was my curiosity, (if you want to say it's in the realm

of the conventional that is fine by me, I'd say the conventional is implicit being that we're using language to discuss it). I suppose the behavioral characteristics of ghosts are answered for in the same way that other sentient beings likewise appear to exhibit behavior. Ghosts end up being equally just as much a "cognitive error / nexus of affliction" (as Malcolm so eloquently put it) as any other sentient beings are.

Andrew108 said:
For me Madhyamaka has been synonymous with Dzogchen and Mahamudra simply because thats the system under which my real nature was pointed out. So I have this attachment to the consequences of Madhyamaka and I don't see it as dry philosophy at all. If I was going to hold a view it would be that for me Dzogchen is Madyamaka upadesha but as you know Malcolm has pointed out that there are many people who get Dzogchen without having to go through Madyamaka certainty first. But now I can accept that.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't say mādhyamaka is synonymous with mahāmudrā/dzogchen they have quite the different flavors. I don't see mādhyamaka as dry philosophy either, it's a fantastic system if properly applied. Mādhyamaka is a very hands-on system of accounting for imputed dualities/dichotomies by means of directly seeing their interdependency. Dzogchen/Mahāmudrā is a process of remaining in the view(tawa) of realization at all times, which then more-or-less spontaneously flowers on it's own accord... the view acts as the basis, process and end-result all at once.

Andrew108 said:
I mentioned I lived in Thailand. I lived in an old wooden teak house. There were snakes in the garden and apparently friends saw a ghost of a young girl there. I lived there for 2 years happily. The snakes didn't bother me and I never saw a ghost. When I talk of Thailand I'm just using a convention. Monks (another convention) came in different guises. I have no doubt that I met stream enterers and their wisdom and realization shone out. I still sometimes hope to go back and do retreat there. In many ways I see them as having more of a taste for liberation then obviously me or the other people that post here including Malcolm.
I need to practice some more so I'm trying to step away from making useless posts on this forum. But I thought I would share some thoughts with you as if we were talking face-to-face.

krodha wrote:
Stream entrants do have the view of certainty. That is the theme of that kun tu bzang po che ba la rang gnas pa quote I posted above; that unless one has had that initial glimpse of realization one is essentially searching for a light switch in the dark. Dzogchen meditation is predicated on that initial glimpse and that is what the teacher seeks to reveal to the student in direct introduction. That glimpse then becomes the new basis of operation and it is then cultivated. There's nothing wrong with making useless posts I do it frequently.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 2:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
859 posts and 9714 views in one week! Quite the thread.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 1:12 AM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Luke said:
I do believe in ghosts, but sometimes unseen physical forces cause people to feel like they are in the presence of ghosts. Intense magnetic fields and infrasound (very low frequency sounds) are two such physical phenomenon that can cause these feelings. Magnetic fields and infrasound are stronger in some locations than in others.

krodha wrote:
This helmet "The Shakti Helmet" or "God Helmet" is said to be able to invoke or reproduce those feelings/effects as well. Interesting stuff.

THE GOD HELMET (Koren Helmet) Michael Persinger (Narrated by Morgan Freeman)
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y02UlkYjSi0

Paranormal State: The Shakti Helmet
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4-xYebOggZw

Dr. Persinger's God Helmet
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8YPOTaUyvA0

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 1:05 AM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Luke said:
Do you think you could record some scientific evidence about your encounter with ghosts? That would be very interesting!

krodha wrote:
Would be interesting, perhaps an EMF detector or something of the like would be able to corroborate these happenings.

There's 3 entities at my folks place too, a young girl whom I've seen in a twilight state while falling asleep, and my father has seen because she poked his back while he was in bed and when he turned over to look she giggled and floated into the corner where she vanished.

There's another that my brother calls "the tall man" who just observes and is quiet. My brother hasn't seen him but knows that he's there and intuitively knows his height for some reason. According to my brother he likes to stand in the kitchen doorway and at night the cats and dog will usually become very alert and stare at that location for minutes on end. I've seen him once out of the corner of my eye and he is tall. My 3 year old son has seen him and mistook him to be me, he told me he saw me in one of the rooms and I walked into the closet.

The scariest is an entity which only seems to be in my brothers old room, he's woken up twice to it. First time it was standing over his bed staring at him and he couldn't move (some type of sleep paralysis) and as soon as he was able to move his computer in the corner of the room turned on by itself. The second time he woke up and it was knelt by the edge of the bed waving its hands over his girlfriends head while she was sleeping, he was startled, lunged over and swung at it but it vanished. His girlfriend said she was having the most terrifying nightmares that night. My brother said it looks like Nosferatu, skinny pale face which comes to a point, eyes sunken-in to the point that they look like dark black empty holes, no hair, long boney pointy fingers. He said it was the same 'thing' both times he saw it. I've never seen it.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
I'm well aware of the emptiness of duration and location, emptiness of self and other (beyond the pale of intellectual constructs). I get that the expression is being imputed as a sensation which is further conceived to be fear and then posited to be "my" fear in

an erroneous chain of ignorance, yet it doesn't fail to be intriguing. Cutting through is not so much a contrived act of severing identification with certain aspects of ignorance (such as duration/location), but involves setting up correct view (and abiding in that) so that it sets itself right. Afterall how could I cut through ignorance?

Andrew108 said:
Cutting through is certainly not a contrived act - it's more like 'self-liberation' or letting go.

krodha wrote:
Even the act of letting go is a contrivance, it presupposes that there is one to do the 'letting go' and something to 'let go' of. A bit of the "horse and rider" problem which undoubtably foils the process. I'm not saying effort isn't required, but if it isn't skillfully done the initial cause of ignorance (misunderstanding) only persists.

Andrew108 said:
It's not about setting up a correct view and abiding in that and that's not what Madhyamaka is anyway.

krodha wrote:
It's what dzogchen is.

Malcolm said:
.....All that is necessary for liberation is direct introduction and subsequent diligence applying that introduction. Of course one can study anything and it can be helpful and useful to broadening one's understanding, so if you read my first post, you will see what I said.
M

Andrew108 said:
Are you really sure about this? I don't want to be argumentative but I think you are making an error here. Which Dzogchen practitioner has been liberated in this way?
So no prior study. First time meeting with ChNN. Getting the introduction. Doing the practice (we don't know how long for). Getting liberated. Benefiting beings.
Do you really think this happens?

krodha wrote:
Apart from this there is nothing whatsoever to clarify;
There is nothing whatsoever to establish;
Correctly view correctness itself.
By correctly seeing, you will be liberated.
- rten 'brel snying po

But you're right, mādhyamaka has a different flavor, though correct application should lead to the same view.

Andrew108 said:
It's more about natural self-liberation because you can't see anything arising. It's living in that fact of things seeming to be there but lacking any essence including fear, mothers, running, spirits, houses, anger, and so on..It's realizing equality in experience through self-liberation of that experience.

krodha wrote:
Which essentially is (or is akin to) correct view, wouldn't you agree?

Andrew108 said:
It's the same as giving up the idea of personality that is noted as a fetter in Therevada. Giving up this fetter - or allowing it to self-liberate is part of becoming a stream enterer.

krodha wrote:
Anattā is the catalyst and cause of stream entry (I'm sure you know), which is more of an instantaneous occurrence. I'm not sure if stream entry can happen gradually... the gradual aspect would seem to be the cultivation of right view. The cultivation allows the seed to grow which may lead to the dawning of anattā. Right view involves skillful means though, because again, giving up the idea of personality is the idea of personality attempting to give itself up. I suppose the fetters can be weakened with right view, but they certainly are instantly obliterated in anattā.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:35 PM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Afterall how could I cut through ignorance?

Wesley1982 said:
By recognizing the source of the ignorance.

krodha wrote:
That was meant to be rhetorical but yes you're right, the contradictory conundrum being that the very I which seeks to cut (through ignorance) is the cornerstone of ignorance itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 3:35 PM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Andrew108 said:
It manifests in the same way desire does. Desire and fear need specific locations. Also they both need the sense of duration. Cut the idea of 'duration' (objects seen or unseen

in time) and you cut the root of the idea of fear and desire - you cut the idea of location. It's basic ego-clinging. But talk with a teacher about it. My teacher was an expert Chod practitioner - chod is the practice of the prajnaparamita.

krodha wrote:
I'm well aware of the emptiness of duration and location, emptiness of self and other (beyond the pale of intellectual constructs). I get that the expression is being imputed as a sensation which is further conceived to be fear and then posited to be "my" fear in an erroneous chain of ignorance, yet it doesn't fail to be intriguing. Cutting through is not so much a contrived act of severing identification with certain aspects of ignorance (such as duration/location), but involves setting up correct view (and abiding in that) so that it sets itself right. Afterall how could I cut through ignorance?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:19 PM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Andrew108 said:
What you are experiencing is your own fear. So the only way to overcome that fear is to.....ask your teacher or put the teachings into practice.

krodha wrote:
Right that's what my inquiry was centered around; since it's a projection, why is it confined to that projected location? Why is it there sometimes (and very prevalent) and not present at all other times? Some nights it's not there at all. Sometimes I expect it and it's there. Sometimes I expect it and it's nowhere to be found. Sometimes don't expect it and it's there. There's been a couple times I've been able to jack my own energy up to such an extreme level that when it engages me I outshine it. So how are these projections able to manifest that way? It does manifest as fear yet the animalistic and territorial anger behind it is undeniable. It uses the energy like a bubble to push with. So I'm curious since it can't be other than a projection how such behavior is exhibited. It's actually not a problem really, it's fully confined to that area, if it was something in my experience all the time and causing lots of issues that'd be one thing. But since the projection is only associated with that area it's more intriguing than anything.

I get that it's only fear. It's just the behaviorial and circumstantial characteristics that are interesting.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:12 AM
Title: Re: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
I've seen that you've mentioned Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche before. Are you a member of the Dzogchen Community?

krodha wrote:
Not a member but Rinpoche is my root teacher and I partake in community practices etc...

Lhug-Pa said:
He has also said that Vajra Recitation is a powerful form of protection, although this might not work so well while running.

krodha wrote:
Seems doable while running, it can be done internally, thanks for the suggestion I'll experiment with it

Lhug-Pa said:
Do you feel that your energy is damaged or stolen at all by this entity?

krodha wrote:
There's no secondary effects, just the confrontation itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 7:56 AM
Title: Haunted Areas and Localized Entities, Ghosts, Energy
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've always had a natural proclivity for sensing presences (seen or unseen) ever since I was young and it's always intrigued me. There's been times in the past (prior to my relationship with the dharma) when it's really plagued my peace of mind. When I was old enough to live away from home it started to become increasingly apparent because it would always be conditional on where I was living at the time. The first two places I lived were ok, but the third a house in alameda I could not be there alone at night. The fourth place was fine I could be there alone at anytime no problem. The fifth was an apartment in southern California which was horrendous, one of the most heavy and evil presences I've ever felt, I could not sleep there at night and would have to stay awake until the morning when I could finally sleep. The janitor at that apartment even said he hated to go in there to clean and would do it as fast possible. The next place back in san francisco was absolutely fine and that was the time I discovered the dharma.

Presently where I live is fine, my sensitivity has increased with meditation and I'll have entities come into my room at night but they don't bother me I just know they're there. Same anytime a person comes into my room, if I'm sleeping I'll immediately awake.

I do go running at night probably 4 or 5 nights a week and there is an entity which lives in the creek near my place. It's incredibly intense and powerful, seems very territorial. If I run directly on the sidewalk next to it, it will essentially blast me with intense energy which arises as profound fear I can feel throughout my body. There's been times when I've skipped running for awhile and after returning to it the first night back I'll be running

and not be paying attention to the creek where upon getting too close, with no expectation I will literally be almost knocked off my feet. So it isn't a consciously induced manifestation created through an accumulation of fear towards that area. And I feel that now that it knows that I know it's there it messes with me even more. Needless to say after months of this I just run in the middle of the street when I get to that spot. The same creek connects to the road a quarter mile down the road and this thing will manifest again there and engage me. Whatever it is it's extremely powerful.

Now getting to the point, I understand the emptiness of phenomena in relation to my pseudo subjective being. I usually am able to rationalize the emptiness of fear except for cases like this creek entity. I know that in chod it's said that these perceived negative entities are attached to our own continuum due to karmic debts etc... But what I don't understand is how are these projections confined to certain perceived areas? Why can't that energy in the creek leave the creek? Why is it so hostile? And what can be done to deal with energy/entities of that nature? If as I understand, it's an empty projection of mind, why is it localized to this certain area? I know that facing the fear and breaking down the projections like in chod is the correct route. Seeing the emptiness of the entity in relation to the fear. Emptiness of the fear in relation to deluded perception mistaken as "me". I've gotten to the point where integration has corrected most of these erroneous projections except for instances of direct hostile engagement like this creek thing. I rationalize that it's only a sensation interpreted as "fear" which is utterly empty, but that's easy to do when it's not breathing down my neck.

I'm sure others here must have instances/occurrences like this? Any advice? Suggestions? Personal stories?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 5:19 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm said:
But we should not kid ourselves into to believing that liberation is only possible according to our preconceptions.

Pero said:
What does it matter if we "kid ourselves" like that?

krodha wrote:
Because when we insist that we indeed know (what is true) with certainty, we close the door to other possibilities. It's impossible to know anything for sure, at best we can strongly believe we know, but if we say we are certain we aren't being truthful, and we're kidding ourselves. Admitting that we don't know for certain is the truth, and when we can admit that to ourselves we remain open. Open mind, open doors. Which can leave the door open to unclutch from identification with our thoughts which leads to the furthest plane where the realization can dawn that there was no one to know in the first place. And with that reference point (used to judge) nullified, the heart opens to true

compassion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 11:10 PM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
It isn't a bizarre theory, it's pretty self-evident if you look at it empirically. What you are directly experiencing is all that is, there is only this present moment which is the sum total of what is presently happening.

gregkavarnos said:
I repeat: just because YOU are not aware of it does not mean it does not exist. That's the gist of what I am saying. Now if you want to put the "YOU" in the centre of the universe and define all existence realtive to it, well that's YOUR problem not MINE.

krodha wrote:
Ah! Yes, however there's no "I" either(even though I surely seem to be saying that), I wasn't suggesting a solipsistic view at all.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:24 AM
Title: Re: mind/matter dichotomy
Content:
trevor said:
While we're at it...

Malcolm said:
A more important contradiction between sutra, tantra and Dzogchen is that the latter is a vehicle beyond cause and result, whereas both sutra and tantra are vehicles of cause and result.

trevor said:
Could you please explain this a bit more? It has something to do with accumulating merit and wisdom?

krodha wrote:
Malcolm put it like this when I went overboard last time (which I will in this post somewhat) but this is his brief and to the point explanation:
Malcolm said:
Buddhahood is an innate quality:

“Oh Vajradhara you must listen! Since buddhahood is unconditioned, there is no buddhahood through fabricated dharmas. The three kāyas of buddhahood are present as the kāya of prajñā. Since there are no material signs in the the kāya of prajñā, it is

unaffected by the consequences of karma. Since this impure deluded appearance arises as buddhahood, there is no need to purify karma and traces."
-- The Tantra of Buddhahood as an Intrinsic Attribute

krodha wrote:
Dzogchen isn't a causal vehicle because it is your true nature, present timelessly, completely unborn, unadulterated, unobstructed. Through misunderstanding, an individual is posited to exist and then under the guise of that ignorance the conceptual individual attempts to make it's way back to the truth of his/her own true nature. The lower vehicles give credence to this misconception and allow it to objectify the 'natural state' and causally work towards achieving this truth (in time) which is impossible. This is because the process is predicated on a misnomer (in relation to other misnomers), and being that the individual is such, the individual can attain nothing, and never will. Only upon the 'seeing-through' of the illusion does the truth become self-evident, and it is then seen that the truth was always and ever-present.

Dzogchen avoids this predicament by directly introducing the aspirant to his/her true nature, and from there the only (effortless) task is to remain in that knowledge(rig pa), which is simultaneously the base, path and fruit.

"This (Dzogpa Chenpo) is the only resultant yāna and it is the summit of all the yānas. Except for this one, other yānas are accompanied by accepting and rejecting, defending and negating, and are created by mind. They are the stairs (leading) to this yāna. All the different tenets, divisions of yānas and the paths and stages - by accomplishing the great confidence in this realization - will be perfected in the equalness state without efforts."
- Mipham Namgyal

"Dzogpa Chenpo is the fortress of view, it's paths and stages are completed instantly. It is not comparable to the lower yānas."
- Garab Dorje

"A qualm: Surely if everyone who exists acts without action then whatever practices are done in the lower eight paths must be without purpose?
The Dzogchen reply is that everything that is practiced in those paths is made up by thoughts, and their practitioners never achieve the stage of acting without action, without thoughts. Dzogchen never pursues them, but all their acheivements, like sambhogakāya or dharmakāya or purification of knowledge are naturally present in Dzogchen Buddhahood. The reason for this is that all existing things are like illusions coming from the natural state. Therefore there is not any misview, as everything is liberated into the natural state."
- Lopon Tenzin Namdak

"The actual essence, pristine rig pa,
cannot be improved upon, so virtue is profitless,
and it cannot be impaired, so vice is harmless;
in it's absence of karma there is no ripening of pleasure or pain;

in it's absence of judgement, no preference for samsara or nirvana;
in it's absence of articulation, it has no dimension;
in it's absence of past and future, rebirth is an empty notion;
who is there to transmigrate? And how to wander?
What is karma and how can it mature?
Contemplate the reality that is like the clear sky!

Constantly deconstructing, investigating keenly,
not even the slightest substance can be found;
and in the undivided moment of nondual perception
we abide in the natural state of perfection."
- Longchenpa

"The Great Perfection does not require analysis or cultivation. Rather, it is merely a matter of recognizing, as your own nature, this very wakefulness of natural knowing that is self-existing and spontaneously present throughout samsara and nirvana. This recognizing is unlike the rigid clinging of intellectual or conceptual meditation training - as in the lower vehicles, which involves hope and fear, permissions and prohibitions concerning what to accept and reject - that is like a deer being caught in a hunter's trap. It is also unlike the lower sections of tantra in which the practitioners of Secret Mantra, in all the gradual stages of the path, engage in mental effort and conceptual involvement, as in the practices of the development stage, completion stage, and so on, which all require mental discrimination. These perspectives may each have their individual view, meditation, and fruition, but they are entirely different from the Great Perfection's fresh essence of primordial pure awareness, which is unchanging throughout the three times.

So, unless you perfect the great strength of such awareness, you will not attain the kayas and wisdoms of ultimate fruition - the result having captured the natural state of awareness withing the basic space of primordial purity, which is the place of liberation of the entirety of samsara and nirvana. This difference, as vast as heaven, is therefore of utmost importance. According to the king of views, our Dzogchen tradition - whether expressions of thought movement occur, remain, or dissolve, the essence does not change but remains a fresh, basic state of naturalness. No matter the variety of samsaric or nirvanic displays that may arise, there is nothing else to be attained apart from or superior to the unchanging essence suffused with awareness, which transcends being liberated, even though the labels "buddha" or "fruition" may be given to it. Since this essence has never been tainted by confusion, it is free from the seeds for taking rebirth within the worlds comprised of the three realms, the six classes of beings, and the four modes of rebirth.

Consequently, both samsara and nirvana are merely words and mind-made labels that to not possess a shred of real existence, not even as much as an atom - just like the space in a container is not really separate [from that outside of it]. Through personal experience you must realize this actuality. Primordial purity (kadag) means that the basic nature of awareness belongs to neither samsara or nirvana, and therefore it's identity is primordially pure. No type of virtuous karmic cause and effect improves this

primordial purity, nor does any type of unvirtuous karmic cause and effect worsen it. In short, this wakefulness of self-existing knowing is not imporoved upon - not even one speck - by any amount of relative conceptual virtue belonging to the view, meditation, and conduct of the nine gradual vehicles. Also, it is not harmed in the slightest, even though one accumulates a tremendous amount of relative or superficial negative misdeeds, including the ten unvirtuous actions and the five actions with immediate consequences. This primordially pure identity of awareness can neither be improved nor harmed by anything whatsoever. All types of cause and effect from wholesome and unwholesome actions appear as expressions - just like the apparitions conjured by a magician. Realize that they are all unreal and empty, a magical display, and you will transcend the practices of cause and effect, which demand effort...."
- Drubwang Shakya Shri Jñāna

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
...coz you have you are day dreaming about a bizarre theory of non-existence without perception,

krodha wrote:
It isn't a bizarre theory, it's pretty self-evident if you look at it empirically. What you are directly experiencing is all that is, there is only this present moment which is the sum total of what is presently happening.

You can claim that something is happening elsewhere, that things exist without your perception, but you can never prove it, it's a story, a very believable story, but still only a story. I understand that what I'm saying sounds ridiculous and bizarre, but I assure you I am not some fool who is blindly adopting some extreme view without having investigated it thoroughly.

gregkavarnos said:
and the car runs over your ass and perception (via bodily feeling/sensation of intense pain) suddenly makes the car existent for you, well you may stop and think how silly your theory really is (if you are not dead).

krodha wrote:
Isn't that prime example of the car's absence in experience prior to the arising of the expressions which convey "car"(i.e. intense pain)? One can tentatively say the car is indeed composed of sensation(though sensation is a misnomer). So the appearance of those sensations in experience(which IS experience) then makes the "car" fully evident, however it is only ever experience itself.

gregkavarnos said:
Just because YOU do not perceive a phenomenon does not mean it does not exist. And

if, as you believe, existence is dependent on perception then all phenomena must exist because there is not a single phenomenon that the mind of an Omniscient One (a Buddha) is not aware of.

krodha wrote:
Right, you just said it yourself... there is not a single phenomenon that the mind of a buddha is not aware of (i.e. what is not presently occurring in awareness, is NOT). Existence isn't dependent on perception because both existence and perception themselves are misnomers. But again, tentatively yes, we can say that existence is dependent on perception(and vice versa for they are not two). Of course proper application of dependent origination would see the emptiness in both of those designations right away, being that they are inseparable.

gregkavarnos said:
So do phenomena exist or not then???

krodha wrote:
They certainly seem to

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Unless you are directly in the presence of the great wall , no great wall exists

kirtu said:
No not just - because we can actually go and find a structure labelled the GWC. It doesn't fade out of existence if it's out of sight.

krodha wrote:
True, within mind an entire process of planning to go, going, arriving etc.. seems to occur, however that doesn't change the undeniable fact that unless you are presently in front of the great wall, there is no great wall. Empirically, only what is directly occurring at this very moment can be validated.

It's our habitual tendencies which piece all of these components together to form the world and the "happening" we call life. However when carefully examined they don't truly paint the picture we assume they do.

kirtu said:
you played the inherently exists card - I did not and have not said at all that the GWC inherently exists (it doesn't). But it does exist relatively and physically independent of concepts before analysis (of course I just played the before analysis card).

krodha wrote:
It does not exist independently of concepts, and if something only exists relatively as a result of conception, then it cannot be said to truly exist at all. Physicality is a misnomer.

kirtu said:
The tsunami in the Indian Ocean didn't inherently exist either but it's devastation was quite real for thousands of relative beings.

krodha wrote:
These are words on a page which convey an idea. It's useful to consider this event as happening in the past so that one may anticipate a like event occurring in the future, but even at that, it is all projected ideation occurring in the immediacy, which seems to be painting a picture of past/future events (when in truth it is just a presently occurring expression of naturalness). No such event is evident in reality, which is this very timeless moment.

I don't reject the conventional reality of these happenings, but to confuse the conventional with the true nature of things is a mistake. The reality of the conventional is equivalent to an illusion or a dream, ultimately unreal.

kirtu said:
No the relative world is not about stories or beliefs (well, alot of it is - national myths, racial myths, etc.). But physical objects have real physical existence with real effects even if we don't know about them beforehand. Babies in Auschwitz without a concept of gas or a bullet or fire were nonetheless murdered by those relative forces.

krodha wrote:
Yes the mind pieces components together to form a such a picture.... there are no physical objects, no physical existence, no physical effects, no beforehand, no aftermath. However all of these things do seem to appear in mind and I don't reject that.

kirtu said:
The relative world does not disappear in samadhi. Concepts about the relative world can.

krodha wrote:
True samadhi is one's natural state, and being that the relative world is a product of ignorance it certainly does dissolve upon correct view. The relative world is solely a product of conception. Concepts don't describe or comment on pre-existent 'things'.... the 'things' arise from imputed concepts and are inseparable from them.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

krodha wrote:
...Moreover, in the context of establishing this view of the Luminous Heart Essence of the Great Perfection.... it is an extremely vital point not to intermingle this view with the "views of assumption" that belong to the nine gradual vehicles. This is because the emptiness or the views of the teachings and the practitioners of the other vehicles - from the shravakas up to that of Secret Mantra - are all exclusively established by means of analytical meditation.

The Great Perfection does not require analysis or cultivation. Rather, it is merely a matter of recognizing, as your own nature, this very wakefulness of natural knowing that is self-existing and spontaneously present throughout samsara and nirvana.

This recognizing is unlike the rigid clinging of intellectual or conceptual meditation training - as in the lower vehicles, which involves hope and fear, permissions and prohibitions concerning what to accept and reject - that is like a deer being caught in a hunter's trap. It is also unlike the lower sections of tantra in which the practitioners of Secret Mantra, in all the gradual stages of the path, engage in mental effort and conceptual involvement, as in the practices of the development stage, completion stage, and so on, which all require mental discrimination.

These perspectives may each have their individual view, meditation, and fruition, but they are entirely different from the Great Perfection's fresh essence of primordial pure awareness, which is unchanging throughout the three times.

So, unless you perfect the great strength of such awareness, you will not attain the kayas and wisdoms of ultimate fruition - the result having captured the natural state of awareness withing the basic space of primordial purity, which is the place of liberation of the entirety of samsara and nirvana. This difference, as vast as heaven, is therefore of utmost importance.

According to the king of views, our Dzogchen tradition - whether expressions of thought movement occur, remain, or dissolve, the essence does not change but remains a fresh, basic state of naturalness.

No matter the variety of samsaric or nirvanic displays that may arise, there is nothing else to be attained apart from or superior to the unchanging essence suffused with awareness, which transcends being liberated, even though the labels "buddha" or "fruition" may be given to it.

Since this essence has never been tainted by confusion, it is free from the seeds for taking rebirth within the worlds comprised of the three realms, the six classes of beings, and the four modes of rebirth.

Consequently, both samsara and nirvana are merely words and mind-made labels that to not possess a shred of real existence, not even as much as an atom - just like the space in a container is not really separate [from that outside of it]. Through personal experience you must realize this actuality.

Primordial purity (kadag) means that the basic nature of awareness belongs to neither samsara or nirvana, and therefore it's identity is primordially pure. No type of virtuous karmic cause and effect improves this primordial purity, nor does any type of unvirtuous karmic cause and effect worsen it.

In short, this wakefulness of self-existing knowing is not imporoved upon - not even one speck - by any amount of relative conceptual virtue belonging to the view, meditation, and conduct of the nine gradual vehicles. Also, it is not harmed in the slightest, even though one accumulates a tremendous amount of relative or superficial negative misdeeds, including the ten unvirtuous actions and the five actions with immediate consequences. This primordially pure identity of awareness can neither be improved nor harmed by anything whatsoever. All types of cause and effect from wholesome and unwholesome actions appear as expressions - just like the apparitions conjured by a magician. Realize that they are all unreal and empty, a magical display, and you will transcend the practices of cause and effect, which demand effort....

- Drubwang Shakya Shri Jñāna

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:
kirtu said:
But the physical GWC really exists whether you know about it or not.

Aemilius said:
1. Great Wall of China is an idea, you can't perceive it as such without knowing this idea.

kirtu said:
As I said the physical GWC exists to ordinary perception whether you know about it or not. You could take a person to the GWC (perhaps blindfolded) and they would perceive the structure without having to be told about it in advance.

In fact this happens frequently for little children.

krodha wrote:
Unless you are directly in the presence of the great wall, no great wall exists (and actually even in the presence of the great wall there is no such thing either). We accept a story that objects inherently exist "out there in the world" somewhere (separate from us) whether they are being perceived or not... but that is only a story that has been accepted. Accepted rather thoroughly albeit, to the point that I'm sure the suggestion of it's falsity would conjure vehement disapproval and would be considered ludicrous, but that just goes to show how deeply engrained delusion can become. The story is only a story. You can choose to believe the story... but the story will never escape belief. Only what is presently and directly occurring in experience IS. And that isn't even true

because the nature of direct experience is misconstrued even further, wrought with countless misnomers mistaken as inherent aspects/attributes. All separation is illusory.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:55 AM
Title: Batman Practices Togal
Content:
krodha wrote:
Took the following from the blog I found the batman info on, some of it may not be entirely accurate (or accurate at all).

"As we know, Batman is a man of many talents. Among his lesser know skills is a mastery of esoteric Tibetan meditation practices. Yes, Batman does tögal. His mastery of this technique is revealed in the R.I.P. series of comics, where he uses tögal to experience death, overcoming his last shred of fear. Pretty neat. For those of you who are unfamiliar with tögal (tib: ཐོད་རྒལ), it is a Dzokchen practice where a practitioner allows their pure nature to shine forth in the form of luminous Buddha images. Rather than being intentionally visualized, these forms appear spontaneously to a practitioner's visual consciousness. Last time I checked (and I'm hardly an expert on this), tögal is not usually presented as a rehearsal for dying.

But I'm getting ahead of myself. Before we dismiss the Dark Knight as an impostor, we should take a look at how he describes the practice he's doing. In Robin 175, we learn that the tögal ritual Batman performs (and it is consistently called a ritual, rather than a practice, but let's not get hung up on semantics) involves staying shut in a Nepali cave for forty-nine days. The goal, we are told, is to simulate death and rebirth. This does not give us much to go on, even though tögal can be performed in a sealed and darkened room, and forty-nine days is the traditional length for the period between death and re-birth.

For more detail, we need to turn to the opening pages of Batman 681. Here we find Bruce Wayne relaying his tögal experiences to a monk. "As I lay in the darkness," he says, "I began to experience vivid hallucinations of the past and present, even the future. But then I came to the end of even that. I found myself in a place that's not a place." "In tögal," the monk replies, "the initiate learns what the dead know. The self is peeled back to its black, radiant core."

Now we've got something to compare with traditional understandings of tögal. First off, we have visions. Check. So far so good. Then the visions stop. In traditional tögal, the final stage of the practice is when all of the visions collapse back in on themselves. Again, check. Finally, we learn that the point of the practice is to reveal the radiant core of the self. In traditional presentations, it is a person's pure, radiant nature that is the source of tögal's visionary experiences. So actually, we're not too far off here. I don't think many tögal practitioners would describe this radiant core as black, but then again this monk has just tried to murder Batman, so perhaps he was only referring to himself. Again then, check. If Bruce only stopped here, we could say that he actually does a

halfway decent job of sticking to themes found in real-world tögal.

Instead, however, Bruce brings things back to death. A few pages later, he reveals to the monk why he undertook the tögal ritual, “I wanted to taste the flavor of death. I wanted to know that I had experienced every eventuality.” Again, we’re back to the idea that tögal somehow simulates the death and re-birth process. Now, to be fair, texts such as the Bardo Tödröl (popularly known as The Tibetan Book of the Dead, a text which hails from the same practice tradition that gives us tögal) claim that after death, one experiences spontaneous visions of Buddhist deities. Further, these visions are projections of an individual’s radiant core, just as in tögal. So it might not be too far fetched to see tögal as something of a rehearsal for the events that occur during the death process.

Traditionally, however, tögal is not usually presented in this way. Instead, it is a practice for revealing the pure, radiant nature of everything someone experiences, with death being just one experience among many. This may not seem like much of a shift, but it goes to the heart of the practice. Tögal is a practice concerned with experiencing primordial purity in the present moment, rather than a means to prepare for a future event. For an accomplished practitioner of tögal, the death process should be just as radiant and pure as every other moment of their life. So, no, Batman doesn’t quite have his heart in the right place when he undertakes this practice.

Still, we have to give DC Comics’ writers some credit here. Despite not quite getting the overall intent of the practice, they came pretty close on lots of the details. Others they missed, such as the ‘Tibetan’ monastery that looks strikingly Japanese, or the cave that looks more like depictions of Jesus’ sepulcher than any Tibetan retreat cave I’ve ever seen. Clearly, however, someone on their staff was into researching obscure Tibetan practices, and we should applaud them for not just making things up, even if the final product is a little off.

Thanks to David Germano for bringing Batman’s tögal mastery to my attention."
http://thelostyak.com/category/books/

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: colored light
Content:
krodha wrote:
Due to a lack of cognizance of the One, original purity isn't self-recognized as it's own intrinsic reality, and thus appropriation takes place in the manner of a catalyst.

The objective support is the colored lights (of the Ground's lighting-up), and thus by virtue of the causes and conditions of the subtle factor of duality there comes to be the objectifications involved in the karmic processes of cyclic existence.

- Penetration of Sound Tantra | sgra thal 'gyur

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
I think bottom line is most of them only go as far as the ālaya (interpreted in the context of their own traditions of course). That coupled with being severed from the lineage makes it quite difficult. Most traditions reify a ground as a true existent. No other tradition does direct introduction, and not sure if they could given their self-inflicted shortcomings in that respect. Doesn't mean they cannot receive introduction and practice/benefit from it though.

Dechen Norbu said:
That's the point.

Astus said:
Interesting. Although the nature of mind in all different schools are understood to be universal, and it is something quite easy to see, there is this idea that only one specific school/lineage has the actual methods to comprehend it, while obviously the teachings are known to so many. It is all right that there is an independent group of Dzogchen practitioners who don't want to identify with Nyingma, Bon, or any other school. But this ignorance of other teachings can easily result in arrogance that there is not a single Buddhist outside the Dzogchen group who has a proper understanding of the teachings that are actually found in their own sutras, tantras and treatises.

krodha wrote:
I wasn't talking about other buddhist schools... Buddhism teaches the same thing from the ground up. Sutra teachings aim to deliver the same realization as dzogchen, some are just more direct and expedited than others obviously. When I said other traditions I meant other religions, and their self-inflicted shortcomings are the belief systems they champion in addition to the fact that most either aim for a substantiated nonduality or just straight up identify with belief. I never ever would be so arrogant/ignorant to suggest what it seems you interpreted me as suggesting. My apologies for not being more clear in my statement.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

But this could get into a debate about whether or not non-Dzogchen traditions in themselves could introduce to people that which is introduced (the Nature of Mind) in Dzogchen (a debate which has been done to death).

krodha wrote:
I think bottom line is most of them only go as far as the ālaya (interpreted in the context of their own traditions of course). That coupled with being severed from the lineage makes it quite difficult. Most traditions reify a ground as a true existent. No other tradition does direct introduction, and not sure if they could given their self-inflicted shortcomings in that respect. Doesn't mean they cannot receive introduction and practice/benefit from it though.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:34 AM
Title: Re: What do you think enlightenment is like?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'd say whatever you think it is, is exactly what it's not.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:18 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:

kirtu said:
But the physical GWC really exists whether you know about it or not.

Kirt

asunthatneversets said:
Does it? I might agree with mzaur on this one. Does anything exist beyond one's knowledge of it? Either conceptually or experientially? It's commonsensical to believe it does but if it's thoroughly investigated I'm not sure if the common view holds up.

kirtu said:
By "really exists" I mean that the physical world functions as commonly expected. In reality "it is not the way it seems but neither is it other". The "neither is it other" part is important. I could go further with examples: I stepped onto Greenland before I saw Greenland for example because it was so foggy, I landed in Hawaii before I saw the island I was landing at, people get ill and sometimes have no symptoms but nonetheless they die from those illnesses, etc.

Kirt

krodha wrote:
I'd interpret "it is not the way it seems but neither is it other" as stating that reality (or any other imputed designation) certainly isn't the way it seems to be, but being that it is a projection (an imputed appearance) and is only quantified in accordance with the originating concept it is inseparable from, as such it (as an object of knowledge) cannot appear in any other way... because apart from the knowledge of it(the concept or idea) there is nothing to be found. Which falls in line with the great wall being unfounded(unborn) apart from one's knowledge of it.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 6:04 AM
Title: Re: Does anyone have an experience of visions of the future?
Content:

mzaur said:
Great Wall of China is an idea. Of course it doesn't exist until you know about it.

kirtu said:
But the physical GWC really exists whether you know about it or not.

Kirt

krodha wrote:
Does it? I might agree with mzaur on this one. Does anything exist beyond one's knowledge of it? Either conceptually or experientially? It's commonsensical to believe it does but if it's thoroughly investigated I'm not sure if the common view holds up.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Issues with deficient teaching masked by the illogic of Zen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Sometimes those illogical statements are used to catch the student off guard, just like the implementation of loud yells, clapping, slapping, throwing objects, stomping feet etc... The student expects a "logical" answer in the form of a concept they can latch onto and instead the teacher points outside language and concepts to suchness itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 12:55 PM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
The physicality of our physical human nature is just one aspect.

krodha wrote:
All I can ask is that you remain open to the possibility that physicality is an illusion. I'd never ask you to believe that it's an illusion, because that would be the same as believing it's real... But keep an open mind.

Wesley1982 said:
[the basics] examine and study my own mind & look deep inside deep down in the mind and uproot the small problems clearing the mind which opens its way to meditation and the general dharma(s).

krodha wrote:
Meditation IS examining the mind and uprooting problems, there's no prerequisites to meditation except knowing how to do it right. And examining the mind is doing it right.

Investigate the "you" who is doing the investigation of the mind as well... Try this meditation exercise if you'd like, it's quite powerful: Inquire "who am I?" and look deep down, deep inside the one doing the investigating (the same way you're looking deep down deep inside the mind like you mentioned above). If any label or concept arises to describe the "I", ask "who is it that witnesses this label or concept?" you should naturally answer "I do" and then immediately ask "but who am I?". Keep that up until all answers are exhausted, and when no answer arises, look deeply into the nature of that silence.

I'm no teacher, and not trying to act like one so by all means disregard my suggestion if you want to... but do give it a shot if you feel inclined to do so!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Its also interesting to try and understand the mental reasoning behind certain prisoners who have a history of violence.

krodha wrote:
There's a big difference between attempting to theoretically understand the behavior of inmates, and then Buddha mind which is an inexpressible truth meant to be experienced. Buddha mind isn't a theory or an intellectual understanding.

If you hold tightly to your assumption that the world is a "physical" construct composed of matter you aren't going to get very far. It's best to let go of all presuppositions in this teaching and let the pointers work for themselves. Otherwise you poison the process with pre-conceived notions which block potential change. Look at Buddhism as unlearning all that you think you know, if you go into a process of unlearning firmly attached to what you think you know, you're damned to remain stagnant.

Being "open" will take you a long way in this. Watch that within yourself, prime example being your answer to my question about colors and shapes above, you completely disregarded it and just insisted on sticking to your usual reasoning (which is fine). But I saw that in your response, and I'm not about to press the issue if someone isn't even open to investigating their point of view. Pushing a point of view (or new idea) onto someone who isn't even interested is the quickest way to make someone clam up even further and refuse to listen. But that's ok, we all have to evolve on our own terms in these teachings. Just keep in mind that your normal perception (and point of view) is what Buddhism is meant to change so if you aren't open to that, and insist that what you think you know is correct, change cannot happen.

Some good advice is to remain open, keep an open mind. I personally seek to be proven wrong, I always want to adapt and progress. I never insist that I know, and when i see that I'm wrong or i'm shown a better way to view something i embrace it. I'm metaphorically always shedding my skin so I can grow. And that doesn't mean I just blindly accept anything that comes along that sounds better, I empirically investigate, investigation is the key. Don't even accept what I'm saying right now either, just consider being open to change, if you can do that the dharma will lead you places you never could have imagined.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
If we take a large metal cubit and pour concrete into it and let it dry for a few weeks then there is no consciousness in that concrete cubit.

krodha wrote:
Ok, well you seem to have your mind made up! And that is ok.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Wesley, I cordially challenge you to locate a world separate from consciousness.

Wesley1982 said:
The middle-center of a large concrete block? . . -or- the concrete + asphalt jungles we've created? . .

krodha wrote:
And how does the concrete block appear? Take the grey color, and the cube shape; do

those attributes exist separately from the seeing of them? Are the greyness and the visual shape qualities which can be accessed without vision?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 3:17 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Technically, you could go places and find people.

kirtu said:
Why only technically?

Kirt

Wesley1982 said:
From my POV the natural & physical world doesn't have any consciousness or intelligence other than certain people who are aware of your existence.

krodha wrote:
Wesley, I cordially challenge you to locate a world separate from consciousness.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 11:46 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
Andrew108 said:
For Magnus -
I see it more in terms of 'collapse' than 'continuation'. So in that sense I don't really see the progress but deal with the consequences of a collapse.
When the structure of a form is no longer seen or needed or established - then there is a collapse - a falling into itself. So often dualistic mind is assuming that within every form there is a structure - an essence or foundation. Maybe this is what dualistic mind is actually - this willingness to reify form by giving it a structural foundation where none exists.
Even if we see forms as 'mere appearance' we can still impute a structure to the 'mere appearance (this self looking at non-self as asunneversets pointed out). There is still an assumption that something (energy for example) is happening - that rainbows however illusory still have a 'something'. An assumption that meditation continues or the natural state continues and needs to continue.
So yeah collapse rather than progress and dealing with the consequences of all the bones being taken out of the body so to speak.

krodha wrote:
Also that the issue isn't whether or not form indeed has a structural foundation,

because to say form lacks structure still subtly presupposes an initial form to lack structure. So the imputation of form having no structure creates form by default. This is why it is said that in the supreme view form is not cut with the razor of emptiness. From the very beginning form is empty and vice versa. Which essentially means, directly see that form is a product of conceptual imputation, there never was form to begin with. Likewise there are no appearances because appearances must appear to something, also suggesting rising and falling before a subject. So it ends up not even being that the metaphorical bones are taken out of the body, but that the body never was the body, it was the natural state all along since beginningless time. Upon that realization progression is seen as inapplicable because it was predicated on a misconception.

Like building a beautiful house for oneself in a dream, laboring intensively pouring ones blood, sweat and tears into the project, finally finishing the house and being elated, living in it creating memories, maybe losing it to a fire and feeling that pain and disappointment, and you start to rebuild.... and then you wake up and discover you'd been fast asleep and dreaming the whole time.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 11:17 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen is unique because...

Namdrol said:
Buddhahood is an innate quality:

“Oh Vajradhara you must listen! Since buddhahood is unconditioned, there is no buddhahood through fabricated dharmas. The three kāyas of buddhahood are present as the kāya of prajñā. Since there are no material signs in the the kāya of prajñā, it is unaffected by the consequences of karma. Since this impure deluded appearance arises as buddhahood, there is no need to purify karma and traces.”
-- The Tantra of Buddhahood as an Intrinsic Attribute

krodha wrote:
True. Apologies if I made it sound otherwise, I wanted to portray it's immediate and direct nature without neglecting the seeming process that may unfold in some cases. But I guess that raises the question; If it isn't ascertained right away (so that one recognizes rig pa and remains in that knowledge) would the resultant path be considered dzogchen? Or does it automatically default to a different practice at that point, say mahayoga or anuyoga? Is ati fairly black and white in that respect? Because the progression would certainly be nullified in that case. That's an awesome quote by the way.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 9:17 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
In the self-study of my mind, I find myself searching for other intelligence and can't seem to find anything.

asunthatneversets said:
What other intelligence are you searching for? Or what is the nature of the other intelligence you are hoping to find?

Wesley1982 said:
There isn't anyone there outside of Internet, Phone or T.V. except God or the Great Buddha.

krodha wrote:
"There" as in realized or of sufficient realization to teach competently? Certainly... but I believe you mentioned that you are located in an area without much access to teachers or a community, is that what you mean? Have you tried seeing if there are any dharma-related groups in the area? Reading/study groups? Perhaps even a course on the dharma(or eastern religion/philosophy) at a local community college could be helpful in the time-being while you seek a qualified teacher. Granted those places wouldn't be guaranteed to have competent individuals who could truly answer questions with accuracy, but at least you could share some ideas and gain some insight. At the same time, the internet isn't a bad place to stay in the time being either, lots of access to videos, ebooks, other writings, perhaps there's communities on skype or another application like that. Just stick with it, everything will come together if you desire it to... I'm sure the resources are there somewhere even if it feels like you're searching for a needle in a haystack.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 8:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
Andrew108 said:
We all like attending teachings and planning for courses. We also like it when our teachers plan something 'advanced' for us to learn. I guess we like the idea of progress.
I'm wondering in a sincere way if we are not actually fooling ourselves?
If we accept the base as the path then who actually progresses? Isn't there a point when the lineage 'methods' get collected and conceptually held on to?
I'm not doubting the profundity of the methods, but could the wish to 'get' Dzogchen or to 'be' in Dzogchen not be something that obscures? Isn't the idea of 'progress' within Dzogchen or even the idea of a 'continuation' of realization falsely drawn? And in that sense an obscuration?

krodha wrote:
Notion of progression can be an obscuration, but literally doing nothing and not going down the path at all is guaranteed obscuration. The union of the base and the path is actually supposed to be a trifecta: base, path and fruit. The teacher introduces you to your innate natural state which is the basis, path and fruit. There is always the danger of conceptually grasping at methods, teachings, transmissions etc...

In the dharmakāya, Samantabhadra,
There is nobody called lama
And no scholar who teaches the doctrine of initiation.
In realizing your own mind as dharmakāya,
you obtain the initiations and oral transmissions of all the conquerors.
Grasping at transmission is just discursive thought.

But that is the nature of the beast. Some will get caught up, some will know how to traverse through these obstacles. The best advice I ever got was "don't get caught up in the bullshit", see the essence of the teaching and use the methods as methods, but stay the course.

In the end the wish to 'get it' does indeed obscure it, but that drive has to be present, there has to be the intention, the want and the desire. Dzogchen is unique because it is supposed to directly show you the goal right off the bat, so there is no doubt. Seeing the 'goal' and seeing that the goal indeed IS the base, path and fruit simultaneously is a practitioners greatest ally. But for some it isn't as apparent, or isn't recognized at all which makes it a hard path to follow.

Meditation is not foremost, realization is foremost;
If realization is not entered with confidence,
The meditator is merely meditating on a conceptual state,
The seeker is seeking with an afflicted clinging.
- kun tu bzang po che ba la rang gnas pa

Progress is a fallacy, but progress happens. You've seen the famous quote:

Suffering there certainly is, but no sufferer,
no doer, though certainly the deed is found.
peace is achieved, but no-one's appeased,
the way is walked, but no walker's to be found.
- Visuddhimagga XVI, 90

The buddha used to even play off of this truth in his didactic teachings with aspiring students: he would say suffering is caused by desire, go away and meditate and rid yourself of desire. If the students weren't quick witted they may spend days, months, years without realizing that they were indeed desiring not to desire. But for some... BOOM right then it would click and the futility of the path was seen, because they saw that there was no one to walk the path in the first place. Some however need to walk the path, and that is absolutely appropriate. Some get the futility of it but it hasn't fully

clicked so there is work to do, and that is absolutely appropriate. Some will strive for years and may actualize it, or may not, and that too is absolutely appropriate.

It becomes an obscuration when it isn't understood that the very self who desires to achieve the goal, is an illusion. The experiential realization that the self is indeed an illusion(and therefore the goal is illusory) is the goal itself. So in striving to 'get there' the process just continually unfolds, that is why the relative condition is depicted as the cycle of samsara, circular, without beginning or end. Or why it is the "shoreless ocean" of samsara... one cannot get to 'there' from 'here'. The very act of pursuing the goal is actually creating the goal, and one is essentially chasing their own tail. The more one struggles the tighter the noose becomes around their throat.

What has to happen; is the direct apperception that the entire process is predicated on misnomers and illusions. That the "I" or "me" who could achieve anything is merely an idea or a concept which is being related to another concept called liberation. So the pseudo-subject then objectifies liberation into time and believes that it can access this liberation if it performs the right way or learns the right things. Some get caught up in the objectifying and don't see the fundamental delusion taking place, and thus they search and search, and some even feel they have achieved something, collected ornaments of the teaching etc. It is pure delusion. There is no "I" and there is no liberation, and the direct knowledge of this truth IS liberation. Liberation is the discovery that there never was anyone in bondage to begin with.

However! That being said, this is often misconstrued as advocating complete non-action. And many misinterpret this as meaning that they are 'already liberated' in their present state of ignorance. That is not the case. As long as there is a feeling of being an individual, afflicted perception is present. There is no subject or object in the exalted state, and that isn't a conceptual absence of self, if you feel you know there is no self, that is the self which knows. The realization will be an innate discovery, 100% self-evident and beyond the need for any clarification or confirmation. It is this present wakefulness and it needs no cultivation, but it is not the fragmented manner this present wakefulness appears in due to afflicted dualistic grasping.

Apart from this there is nothing whatsoever to clarify;
There is nothing whatsoever to establish;
Correctly view correctness itself.
By correctly seeing, you will be liberated.
- rten 'brel snying po

If you understand one dharma, you will not be ignorant of any dharma.
- chos kyi rgyal po

If you analyze the selflessness of dharmas,
And meditate after that analysis,
This is the cause which results in the attainment of nirvāṇa.
No other cause will be a basis (i.e. you will not attain buddhahood).
- gting nge 'dzin rgyal po'i mdo

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 6:07 AM
Title: Re: How does guru yoga work?
Content:
krodha wrote:
You'll also hear a teacher like ChNN say there is no difference between the student or guru, there is only a difference because the student believes there is. In truth there is no separation. So in guru yoga, by becoming the guru... endowed with all enlightened qualities and manifesting as the guru in that moment, the practitioner can 1)begin to build that bridge and familiarity or 2)see that they are no different than the guru because by becoming the guru: "Joe blow" or "Mary smith" is no longer there.

Just like in deity yoga.. You do the mudras and feel the energy and movement of the yidam, you do the mantra and speech of the yidam, you visualize and see what the yidam sees, you hear the mantra and hear what the yidam hears... In that moment you indeed are the yidam. If those factors make you the yidam, then those factors still present in daily life make us "me" or "I". So the "I" is merely a construct of these factors. The deeper this is realized, emptiness of self gradually becomes more and more apparent(it also sometimes happens right away in a dramatic flash of insight). When this realization dawns, naturally the emptiness of the self implies the emptiness of other (if truly ascertained). In that place duality is seen to be false and (even if it is still the exalted union generated by the yidam) it is seen that "that place" is here and now.

And of course there's an energetic activation involved with these practices which delivers effects/results as well (in addition to many other beneficial aspects I'm sure).

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:35 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Chatral Rinpoche is a dzogchen master and is a big advocate of vegetarianism...

Namdrol said:
Frankly, eating grassfed meat is far better for the environment and ecosystems in the world than being a consumer of soy products. Soy is a very environmentally damaging crop (http://civileats.com/2009/01/27/a-vegan-reassesses-soy-a-health-and-environmental-perspective " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;). Grass fed cattle who are moved from fresh pasture to pasture actually sequester carbon and rebuild the local environment becase of the interaction between cattle and pasture. Joel Salatin writes in his recent The Sheer Ecstacy of Being a Lunatic Farmer (2010, Polyface):

krodha wrote:
I agree about the soy, no doubt... In addition to the environmental effects, soy in the

amounts that are consumed regularly nowadays (by those who turn to it as an alternative) is very dangerous as well it seems:

High levels of phytic acid in soy reduce assimilation of calcium, magnesium, copper, iron and zinc. Phytic acid in soy is not neutralized by ordinary preparation methods such as soaking, sprouting and long, slow cooking. High phytate diets have caused growth problems in children.

Trypsin inhibitors in soy interfere with protein digestion and may cause pancreatic disorders. In test animals soy containing trypsin inhibitors caused stunted growth.

Soy phytoestrogens disrupt endocrine function and have the potential to cause infertility and to promote breast cancer in adult women.

Soy phytoestrogens are potent antithyroid agents that cause hypothyroidism and may cause thyroid cancer. In infants, consumption of soy formula has been linked to autoimmune thyroid disease.

Vitamin B12 analogs in soy are not absorbed and actually increase the body's requirement for B12.

Soy foods increase the body's requirement for vitamin D.

Fragile proteins are denatured during high temperature processing to make soy protein isolate and textured vegetable protein.

Processing of soy protein results in the formation of toxic lysinoalanine and highly carcinogenic nitrosamines.

Free glutamic acid or MSG, a potent neurotoxin, is formed during soy food processing and additional amounts are added to many soy foods.

Soy foods contain high levels of aluminum which is toxic to the nervous system and the kidneys.

I personally go the almond milk/rice milk route instead, and stay away from soy products as much as possible, I've been vegetarian for 10 years now and have no desire to eat meat (probably ever again) but I would never persecute those who choose to. When I first started being involved with the DC I remember being told my diet choices were going to be an issue and that I should probably start eating meat. I didn't really understand it but remained open to the suggestion... presently I still haven't eaten meat and that hasn't caused an issue with the effects/insights/realizations the teaching has gave way to as far as I can tell. I still remain open to what ChNN suggests, and I respect everyone for doing what they would like to.

I definitely agree that taking a holier than thou attitude when it comes to diet is ridiculous. Also agree that even for those who claim to be living a vegetarian/vegan

lifestyle in the name of compassion are still subject to causing death/harm to animals... be it bugs on the windshield, stepping on bugs, wearing leather, using products associated with animal testing etc... but also that even in being a vegetarian in the consumption of plants, life is still being taken. Some may argue that plants aren't sentient beings but there's been discoveries regarding plant behavior which refute that view. Either way the effect we have on our environment and beings around us via direct or collateral damage is always inescapable.

I am very interested in this aspect of dzogchen regarding meat and compassion, do you know anywhere I could get more info on that? Or what is it which makes consumption of meat compassionate vs. avoidance of meat incompassionate?

Namdrol said:
Finally, in the end, being an eater of meat does not make one less capable of realizing the meaning of the teachings, and being a vegetarian does not make one more capable of realizing the teachings.

That is the bottom line.

N

krodha wrote:
Agreed.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 1:52 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
In the self-study of my mind, I find myself searching for other intelligence and can't seem to find anything.

krodha wrote:
What other intelligence are you searching for? Or what is the nature of the other intelligence you are hoping to find?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 12:49 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
krodha wrote:
Chatral Rinpoche is a dzogchen master and is a big advocate of vegetarianism...

from wikipedia:

"A lay yogi, he is also greatly concerned with maintaining strict discipline in the context of the Dzogchen view. He is especially well known for his advocacy of vegetarianism and his yearly practice of ransoming the lives of thousands of animals in India".

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 3:26 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
It certainly seems to.

cloudburst said:
exactly.

krodha wrote:
Well no, your point was that it DOES appear, and I agreed that it certainly SEEMS to appear, but does it appear? I would argue that it does not.

asunthatneversets said:
Again there seems to be an appearance, just as there seems to be the appearance of objects, just as there seems to be objects, all of which are misnomers. The seeming appearances(objects) are predicated on another seeming appearance(subject), an illusion predicated on an illusion does not truly produce an appearance,

cloudburst said:
see how you need to qualify here in order to make your point? It's because you know that you will have to admit that it does appear, albeit not truly. Is your computer appearing to you right now? The fact that "it seems to" is precisely what appearance means. No one is saying there is actually a computer from it's own side DOING the appearing, all (here) agree there is not. But is there an appearance of a computer?

krodha wrote:
My point is that all of these designations are misnomers in the end, including appearance. So why do you dance on appearance and not dance on objects or sensory perception.. it's all ignorance all the way down, it all appears at once depending on what is imputed upon it, none of it truly is.

I'll have to admit it does appear? Anything can appear (to be) within the ignorance, there appears to be objects, there appears to be sensory modalities, there appears to be internal/external. NONE of it is true, none of it is real. A computer from it's own side? What sides? Within the realm of ignorance the projection of a computer may appear, but nothing has appeared other than ignorance, on "it's" own side, or on any other side.

For the sake of communication we accept these conventionalities, why you think I reject them I don't understand, you are reading my words and I am typing them,

conventional language is obviously being employed to make a point.

asunthatneversets said:
it seems to appear just as there seemed to be a snake, however the snake never appeared it was illusory, likewise seeming appearances are illusions....

cloudburst said:
there seemed to be a snake means a snake appeared. There is no difference. There cannot seem to be a snake without the appearance of a snake. Is there a snake? no. does a snake appear do the deluded mind. Oh yes, otherwise, remembering that the snake here stands in for the non-existent objects of delusions, we simply would never get deluded. If an intrinsically tasty cake did not appear before the mind, how would we get attached?

If we simply must, we could say "the snake appeared it was illusory" but we can never say as you do " the snake never appeared it was illusory." If it is illusory, appear is all it can do.

krodha wrote:
An illusion appears, no snake, does the illusion resemble a snake? Possibly. Is there a snake? No. Likewise does it seem to appear to a mind? Yes. Does it appear to a mind? No.

asunthatneversets said:
the conventional imputation produces nothing other than illusion, there are no subsequent conventional appearances which can be deemed "like" illusions, because nothing has been established in any way. It is the child of a barren woman, or hair on a tortoise, wholly unreal, a figment of imagination(and not even that). Illusion and only illusion.

cloudburst said:
you need to review Buddha's teachings. Examples like 'a child of a barren woman' and being 'like an illusion' are used to explain very different things. It seems making clear discriminations is something you need to improve, and until you do, your formulations will lack clarity. I'm sure your mother would be disappointed to discover that you can't tell the difference between her and an illusion of her. Did you see Tupac at Cochella? Did you see Snoop? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ajkSx_EnAhI&feature=related

krodha wrote:
My formulations will lack clarity in your opinion, yes, judging what I am saying against your reference point you take to be a truth, and I can accept that.

What'd you say bout my momma?!

Although causes, conditions, and dependent arising are explained,
And gradual entry is spoken of,

These are provisional teachings for the ignorant.
In this spontaneously present dharma,
What would it be to train gradually?
Within it's nature beyond limits,
How could composite conceptions be seen?
There is not even the slightest of assertions.
At that time, mind is the sky.
Buddha and the objects of one's experience are one.
- Ye shes snang ba rgyan

The gates to all the branches of enlightenment,
The accoutrements, when meditated on, are like a moon in water.
They arise unstained and unobstructed,
But when meditated on, they are like childish objects of experience.
- Nam mkha' che

asunthatneversets said:
So the nature of appearances is the controversy, whether they are illusions, or if something is indeed produced via imputation which can be designated as "like an illusion".

cloudburst said:
Precisely. Consult Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti to discover whether or not there is production by imputation. Don't join the hotheads who read with a literal eye, look deeper!

krodha wrote:
You may be one of the hotheads my friend! Imputation produces ignorance, it is the seed which creates all duality, if you believe something is truly produced then I don't see how you can move past that self made limitation, if you feel you can then that is great, but in my eyes it is merely a barrier.

asunthatneversets said:
Which is what I will say when pressed regarding what?

cloudburst said:
see above.
you say "nothing to accept or reject.."
I press, pointing out that Madhyamikas reject essence continually.
You hurriedly point out that you mean "ultimately nothing to accept or reject."

krodha wrote:
Of course, you can accept and reject things all day until you're blue in the face, and some acceptance and rejection is needed to traverse the path of course, again it exists all at once on all levels mirroring the perception of the one doing the imputing. There is nothing to accept or reject, whether that is ultimately true, or just plain true, will be self

evident to whom it may concern when it is appropriate.

asunthatneversets said:
I'm not sure what the significance of my original statement including (or not including) "ultimately" is.

cloudburst said:
the significance is that if you say "ultimately, there is nothing to accept or reject," that is wisdom.
If you say there is nothing to accept or reject at all on any level, you are just lost. You MUST accept that gravity draws you to the earth, otherwise you will fall off something. Granted, it is just convention, and you might say that you only "seem" to fall off something, but that's good enough to land you in the hospital, isn't it?

krodha wrote:
I was discussing how acceptance and rejection pertain to correct view, not how acceptance and rejection pertain to gracefully falling off a building, 'there is nothing to accept or reject' means to reject the appearance of relative laws and so on would be an unnecessary (and futile/foolish) activity.

asunthatneversets said:
I'll say it again, accepting or rejecting anything (including the very act of acceptance and the very act of rejection themselves) is a product of delusion.

cloudburst said:
The thing you can really respect about Namdrol (this time, at least) or Andres Honore is that they say the discussion has no meaning for them and they think it is all delusion, and then they back it up by stopping. They walk their talk. If you think this is really all delusion, get out of here, go sit on you cushion and stare blankly off into space, refuse to accept anything do not reject anything, and make us all proud. When you attain the state of Samatabhadra, send help! (sun, I hope you understand I'm just playing, I know sometimes the tone of these things can seem a bit unfriendly...)

krodha wrote:
I enjoy the discussion, I like having inconsistencies in my view drawn out... though that has yet to happen in my opinion. I enjoy a challenge, I enjoy a little debate, I like to think and discuss things and engage with people. It's all in the name of fun. It is undoubtably all delusion, and why I or anyone would refuse to accept anything or reject anything makes no sense, you seem to misunderstand me. You aren't just playing, you wouldn't display or convey a tone of that manner if you didn't subtly or overtly mean it, don't patronize me. That being said, it is still a good time to me, no matter how you react in your own space, it is all well and good. It is a waste of time, but sometimes it's nice to waste time this way.

What this all comes down to is a fundamental difference in view. Just as Namdrol explained before:

Namdrol said:
This is primarily a result of Tsongkhapa's over-intellectualization of Madhyamaka and his inability to differentiate between Candrakirti's POV and Bhavaviveka's, and his ideological commitment to the superiority of Candrakiriti's presentation.

The idea that Candra's presentation is superior to Bhava's is not unique, but what is unique is Tsongkhapa's simulataneous commitment to the language of logic as a tool to explain Madhyamaka, and as a result we see strange formulations such as "Prasangikas" do not refute valid cognizers and so on, when in fact they clearly do. In point of fact, that Prasangikas who do not reject valid cognizers are only the followers of Tsongkhapa. The rest, from Candrakirti, to Jayananda, and so on, do refute them.

Also, Buddhist logic never made significant inroads into Chinese philosophy, so much of this talk about valid cognition and so on would sound foreign to a Chinese Buddhist. But because of the trenchant polemics in India between Buddhists and non-Buddhists, there was much discussion of valid cognition and what entailed, since the whole field of pramana was adopted by the Buddhists defensively.

However, during the time of Nagarjuna there was no well developed school of Buddhist logic, and so we see in texts like Vigrahavyavartani a thorough rejection of the whole notion of valid cognizers since in the end the notion of a valid cognition depends on notions of inherency. So naturally the Chinese were not that interested.

However, in response to non-Buddhsits,Vasubandhu began to articulate the first epistemological responses to non-Buddhist criticism, his disciple,Dignaga, forumulized the foundations and Buddhist pramana, Dharmakirit elaborated it, and the rest is history. Pramana came to be regarded as one of the Panca Vidya, the five sciences with its understandable impact on Tibetan Buddhism.

Of course in Dzogchen, the principle is not the two truths, but simple vidyā and avidyā. By comparison, there is only one truth in Dzogchen teachings, vidyā. The rest, falling under the heading of avidyā (ignorance) is fundamentally false —— for example, in the same way that a jaundiced man sees everything as yellow, those who suffering from the jaundice of ignorance never see things as they truly are.

krodha wrote:
Where you see appearances and so on and so forth cloudburst, i see avidyā, to give it any more rope than that would be to reify and impute further when it isn't necessary. That doesn't mean I don't eat cake, or walk down the street, but I don't reify these activities the same way you seem to.

asunthatneversets said:
Acceptance and rejection presuppose a subject existing in relation to objects which can indeed be accepted or rejected, it is not so,

cloudburst said:

it certainly is so! I am reading this, are you not writing it? If you disagree, this is nothing but a object of ridicule for clear-thinking people. Yes, yes, conventionally, seeming..... of course, but that's the only subject and object there can be. Just read your Chandrakirti, accept the conventional as advised and watch the clarity of your thinking improve exponentially.

krodha wrote:
I've never rejected the conventional, I just don't see the use of rolling around in it, creating and reifying constructs which are in truth misnomers. Reifying these designations too thoroughly gives power to the illusion (which in turn binds one to delusion). I don't need the clarity of my thinking to improve, it is like a child building a sand castle. The thinking belongs to no one for I am thought itself, projected onto that which I am not, and apart from the projection there is no me to be found(nor thought to be found)... so striving for the clarity of thought is a futility married to an illusion... the clarity belongs to something else altogether.

....Therefore, from the first instant (ksana) of [the continuum of] mind (citta), the subjective Being (atma-bhava) and all phenomena (sarva-dharma) are present.

From the cathectic-functioning of mentation (cinta) there proceeds the appearance of origination.

Yet no phenomena exists for either ordinary people or for enlightened Saints other than the continuum (santana) of their own mind (citta).

The whole diversity (vicitrata) that exists for the six types [of sentient beings] is just their own internal-contemplation (samadhi).

The mental-continuum (citta-santana) is without boundaries or extension; it is not one thing, nor supported by anything.

Since it has no boundaries, therefore every one of all the infinite realms of existence are one's own body (deha).

In that the infinite realms and the organic creatures [inhabiting those realms] appears as one's body,
it is impossible to define mind and the imprints (vasana) as either one or many.

Everything arises and disappears according to the law of [causally] interdependent co-creation (pratityasamutpada).

And yet, as with a burnt seed, since nothing can arise from nothing, cause and effect cannot actually exist.

Cause and effect, which is fundamental to "Existence" (bhava), is a conceptual discrimination occurring within the essence of Mind-itself, which appears as [both] cause and effect; and yet, since the two [i.e., cause and effect] do not exist as such,

creation and destruction [which are dependent on cause and effect] cannot exist either.

Since creation and destruction do not exist, self and other cannot exist; [from whence it follows] since there is no termination (samkrama), [the two extremes of] eternalism and nihilism do not exist either.

Therefore, it is established that the deceptive dualism of Samsara and Nirvana is actually a fiction.

Time (ksana, moment) and locality (sthana, the space or place of phenomena) are indeterminate; temporal duration is a uniquely simultaneous event (sama, unicity), and where the one [i.e., phenomena occupying space] does not occur, the other [i.e., time] does not occur.

Since they are a virtual production (upahita) and not actual (samyak), the vestigial-imprints (vasana) also do not factually exist, and since there then does not exist a sensum (caryavisaya), there can be no substratum (alaya) and no conscious perceiving (vijnapti).

Because there are no boundaries, a focus-of-attention (prabhana) and a locality (sthana), cannot exist. How then can conscious perceiving [i.e., the 'act' of consciousness] arise?

Therefore mind is separate from the alternatives of existence and nonexistence, and is neither one nor many.
In that the Enlightened state of the Blissful Ones is not [objectifiable], the deceit of appearance (abhasa) is like a magical apparition.

In the same way [as Enlightenment is not objectifiable], so also, immaculate Gnosis, and the pure continuum of goodness (kusala) that is the Source of Reality (dharmadhatu), are misconstrued as having an existence, and hence as being objectifiable [i.e., an object separate from consciousness].

But, since there is no such thing as an "absolute place" (Vajra-sthana) the nature of "locality" is all-the-same (sama, a perfect unicity).

And since the Supreme Vajra [i.e., ultimate Being, non-dual Gnosis] per se, [abiding in] the Dimension of Reality, is without boundaries, there can be no "time-moments" (ksana) whatsoever.

With all positive good-qualities (kusala), as the root (mula), no more existent than a reflection, then for certain, worldly knowledge (Jagadjnana) [as the branches] has no reality!....

- Mañjuśrīmitra

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 12:59 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
.... I cannot deny that the resultant emanations of ignorance become vast and perverse, but are they anything other than ignorance(avidyā)?

cloudburst said:
here the snake represents the inherently existent things we grasp at, so no it's not other than ignorance, the point here is that it DOES appear.

krodha wrote:
It certainly seems to.

asunthatneversets said:
The convention arises from imputation as we agreed on before, but does that truly birth an appropriated "thingness" to be deemed as anything warranting any title other than ignorance?

cloudburst said:
haha not sure what an "appropriated thingness" is, but I sense that what you are saying is equivalent to "inherently existent." If so, the answer would be no, of course not. Of course, something is produced conventionally, and we can correctly call it, say a cake, for example.

krodha wrote:
I would not have suggested inherent existence. Again there seems to be an appearance, just as there seems to be the appearance of objects, just as there seems to be objects, all of which are misnomers. The seeming appearances(objects) are predicated on another seeming appearance(subject), an illusion predicated on an illusion does not truly produce an appearance, it seems to appear just as there seemed to be a snake, however the snake never appeared it was illusory, likewise seeming appearances are illusions.... the conventional imputation produces nothing other than illusion, there are no subsequent conventional appearances which can be deemed "like" illusions, because nothing has been established in any way. It is the child of a barren woman, or hair on a tortoise, wholly unreal, a figment of imagination(and not even that). Illusion and only illusion.

asunthatneversets said:
Within the realm of conventional language I can't deny that the apparent population of persons, places, things do indeed seem to be, but upon thorough and proper investigation these same designations are found to be unreal, it's a slippery slope, and I'm sure it does just come down to differing views.

cloudburst said:
I think that anyone who would disagree with what you wrote there would be outside of

Buddhism, actually.

krodha wrote:
So the nature of appearances is the controversy, whether they are illusions, or if something is indeed produced via imputation which can be designated as "like an illusion".

asunthatneversets said:
Of course not, my point is meant to convey there is ultimately nothing to accept or reject.

cloudburst said:
This is a helpful example of how muddled and misleading it can be when things are not clearly qualified. When you say "accepting or rejecting anything...." it sounds like you are saying "accepting or rejecting anything.... when what you are actually saying is that " ultimately accepting or rejecting anything...." which is what you will say when pressed. I think your point is correct, nothing exsits ultimately.

krodha wrote:
Which is what I will say when pressed regarding what? Acceptance and rejection, attachment and aversion are the source of all apparent things. In the absence of acceptance and rejection there is nothing to be found, we agree on that, I'm not sure what the significance of my original statement including (or not including) "ultimately" is. I'll say it again, accepting or rejecting anything (including the very act of acceptance and the very act of rejection themselves) is a product of delusion. Acceptance and rejection presuppose a subject existing in relation to objects which can indeed be accepted or rejected, it is not so, again it is illusory. There is nothing to accept or reject.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 5:06 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
the snake never appears

cloudburst said:
then why do you become afraid? Is it not the appearance of a snake?

krodha wrote:
The fear is a product of ignorance no doubt, predicated on the erroneous dualistic notion of a subject/object dichotomy. Just as an appearance is byproduct of dualistic grasping. I cannot deny that the resultant emanations of ignorance become vast and perverse, but are they anything other than ignorance(avidyā)?

The Ground which exists in a primeval, natural flow

Has no existence outside of it's own oneness,
Yet it appears in seven distinct ways
When conceptually delineated
Under the bias of our distorted perception.

Though it appears in these seven ways,
Such appearance is only due to our non-recognition of it's oneness
Under the influence of the presencing process of it's single essence.

(i) In the Ground's being spontaneously present,
It appears as the nucleus comprising all variety.

(ii) In it's being indeterminate,
It appears with observable features involving the psyche's flickering movements.

(iii) In it's being determinate within it's own condition,
It appears devoid of transmutation caused by mental activity.

(iv) In it's being capable of transformation,
It appears to a mind's perception in accordance with the perceiver's actions.

(v) In it's being the essence of all that is possible,
It manifests as the intrinsic essence of whatever appears.

(vi) In it's being variegated,
It appears in the mode of individualized variety.

(vii) In it's being originally pure,
It appears as primordially stainless.

All of these appear in accordance with the perceiver's varying intellectual gradations and perspectives. While it's own condition remains originally pure throughout.

- excerpt from The Six Spheres/Sixfold Expanse Tantra (kLong Drug)

asunthatneversets said:
How is "awareness" any better than "mind"?

cloudburst said:
mind is such a loaded term, we are all using it in different ways. I was thinking perhaps using "awareness" will improve things. perhaps I am wrong here.

krodha wrote:
Well, you're not wrong, I only said that because (like your observation regarding the term "mind") I (also) view the term "awareness" as having become a loaded term nowadays... guilty of manifold implications which lead to erroneous views, but overall my comment was meant to elucidate that like "mind", "awareness" can be misinterpreted as reifying a

substantiated suchness relative to(or containing) phenomena. I agree that "mind" would be inappropriate, likewise "awareness" would be too, but then again it all depends on how these terms are related to and the context they appear in.

Designating appearances as the dharmakāya obscures me;
Designating whatever appears as mind obscures me;
Designating wisdom as mind obscures me.
- Samantabhadra

asunthatneversets said:
Denying the use of a phrase such as "with no existence" is also denying something (just as denying the cake is denying something). If he's a nihilist for denying the cake you would likewise be one for denying the denial of the cake.

cloudburst said:
I'm not convinced you are seeing this clearly, sun. If you deny the cake exists, you contravene worldly convention, as we are repeatedly exhorted by Madhyamikas not to do. Claiming a clause incorrectly represents the meaning of what it describes is something rather different.

krodha wrote:
I suppose I don't view the conventional as being an established entity (in any form), be it appearance etc... it is merely a convention. The convention arises from imputation as we agreed on before, but does that truly birth an appropriated "thingness" to be deemed as anything warranting any title other than ignorance? Within the realm of conventional language I can't deny that the apparent population of persons, places, things do indeed seem to be, but upon thorough and proper investigation these same designations are found to be unreal, it's a slippery slope, and I'm sure it does just come down to differing views.

The delusory appearances of conventional truth are a great lie.
When everything is brought into the condition of gnosis in the vast expanse,
The subject and object in flickering awareness, like a child's dance,
Are neutralized in the state of awareness transcending intellect.
- (Unsure where I originally pulled this quote from)

asunthatneversets said:
Accepting and rejecting anything, including acceptance and rejection themselves is still a product of delusion.

cloudburst said:
This reflects a lack of appropriate discrimination. would you attack madhyamikas for continuously rejecting an essence in things?

krodha wrote:
Of course not, my point is meant to convey there is ultimately nothing to accept or reject.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
cloudburst said:
The child of the barren woman represents a non-existent. But of course non-existents DO appear, you'll have to agree, otherwise how could Samsara appear? Why would Buddha teach about true appearance, the appearance of an object as truly existent? Non-existent things appear continuously to us.

krodha wrote:
Ok I'd have to respectfully disagree, how does a non-existent appear? A seeming error occurs, but that doesn't mean the subsequent erroneous misconception appears as anything other than an error. There was only ever a rope, the snake never appears, only an error of imputation which creates the illusion of a snake, which is only illusion. Samsara is the same way, it has never appeared as anything other than an error, you could argue that the error and samsara are synonymous, but within the error nothing is established other than ignorance, illusion, delusion(which is in truth likewise unestablished). The buddha taught certain things in order to create an accurate path to follow but it doesn't mean the elements of the teaching are existent. Nothing appears to anyone, only illusion/delusion which dissipates upon the establishment of correct knowledge.

conebeckham said:
Appearances, and specifically "form," appear to the visual consciousness, etc.

cloudburst said:
true.

krodha wrote:
I'd disagree with this as well, but I think my objection just comes down to differing view.

cloudburst said:
I would prefer to say that all conventions are the nature of awareness, some are mundane awarenesses, and some are exalted awarenesses, such as the wisdom realizing emptiness. I think I agree with what you are saying here, although I would quibble about using the term mind in this specialized way without clarifying, as of course objects of wisdom means objects of wisdom-mind, which is a type of mind, or awareness.

krodha wrote:
How is "awareness" any better than "mind"?

conebeckham said:
All such conventional experiences are illusions, with no existence,

cloudburst said:
Here you are, in trouble again. All such conventions, let's say a cake, are surely like illusions, but are not illusions of a cake. You simply can't say "with no existence" or you are a nihilist, at least verbally. There no difference between a 'cake with no existence' and a 'non-existent cake,' unless by 'existence' you mean a particular type of existence, ie essential existence. In that case, you should say so, otherwise you will confuse the issue tremendously.

krodha wrote:
The nihilist or eternalist aspects of the teaching address attachment to a view, which creates the illusion of someone who is attached. Saying the cake has no existence doesn't make one anything depending on how said observation is related to. Denying the use of a phrase such as "with no existence" is also denying something (just as denying the cake is denying something). If he's a nihilist for denying the cake you would likewise be one for denying the denial of the cake. It all comes down to how the view is related to, the true and accurate view stands alone. Accepting and rejecting anything, including acceptance and rejection themselves is still a product of delusion.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 8:24 AM
Title: Re: Tsong Khapa, form realm shamatha and emptiness
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
While we're at it....

Are the desire, form, and formless realms all in samsara?

Or is it only the desire realm that is in samsara?

The Deva Loka for example is in the desire realm right? And since the Deva Loka is the highest Loka of samsara, this would put the form and formless realms above samsara. So then why have I also read that the form and formless realms are also in samsara?

krodha wrote:
I always interpreted form realms to be tangible phenomena such as objects and such, and formless realms to be intangible phenomena such as experiences, emotions, thoughts etc... attachment to (or identification with) either being the tie that binds one to samsara. I know they are interpreted other ways though.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:
pemachophel said:
(As a humorous aside, I had to go to Berkeley, CA during March to attend a teaching with another Lama. Berkeley/SF sitting on the San Andreas fault as they do, you can bet I put in over-time on this practice while I was there.)

krodha wrote:
Thank you, much appreciated by myself, and I'm sure conebeckham and everyone else who lives here

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
You're already on the path of liberation. The moment you came into contact with the dharma and it caught your interest the path began. But yes Buddha mind is an integral part of it... understanding that your own mind is Buddha mind, and that your own nature is Buddha nature are key aspects of the teaching.

Wesley1982 said:
Thus far, with my mindset I feel like I'm in the physical reality of what really is.

krodha wrote:
At least you know it's a product of your mindset, that means you're already 10 steps ahead of the game... Investigate what makes it "physical" and see if reality claims to be physical, or if reality's physicality is merely a idea (or a belief) projected onto it.

Seek some other possible explanations for reality, perhaps read about sensory perceptions. While the sensory perception view isn't what Buddhism suggests either at least it starts to paint a picture which shows you how "reality" isn't physical at all. How the eyes process information which passes through them by sending it to the brain, which in turn translates the information into a representation. This woud suggest that you aren't looking out of window-like eyes but are indeed experiencing your brain's interpretation of reality. And this goes for all your senses.

From there perhaps look at some quantum physics, which suggests that at the fundamental level the components that construct reality can exist either as waves or particles. And that when the eyes observe the waves they actually collapse into particles, creating an illusion of solidity. When the waves aren't observed they remain in a superposition which is just a field of possibility. This would further suggest that you indeed create reality as you go.

Buddhism doesn't champion either of these views. There's elements of it that point towards these aspects of experience but it actually goes even further.

Some philosophy can help deconstruct reality and physicality as well... David Hume, Brand Blanshard, George Berkeley are a few... Their work deals with perception and how one relates to the senses and thought. Jaques Derrida, Martin Heidegger and others like that as well (though they are a bit more complex than the first few I mentioned).

Buddhism will reflect pieces of all of these but Buddhism is experiential. That being said, these things can help you see through "physicality" and they'll help you understand so that you can gain confidence. Buddhism will actualize these things beyond intellectual understanding so that experience directly becomes that.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
White Lotus said:
it is often said that mind is emptiness. the christian mystic, St John of the cross writes...''On the path toward God - nada, nada, nada, nada, nada (nothing) and on the mountain of God is written 'on this mountain is nothing'. he is famous for his ''dark night of the soul''.

meister ekhart, the dominican monk and theologian says that God is ''absolute nothingness''; that all existence, which God is, is fundamentally absolute nothingness.

Keiji Nishitani of the kyoto school and a great buddhist philosopher talks in his book ''religion and nothingness'' about the influence of emptiness in western thought and says that even in the nihilism of some western philosopy is found a hankering after the positive realisation of nothingness/emptiness in buddhism.

the higher self of advaita vedanta is said to be seen as the void within. And so we know that experience of emptiness is a universal experience.

i would however say that this ''emptiness'' is not emptiness, nor is it nothingness, nor anythingness. emptiness is merely a label. emptiness is pregnanat with energy and potentiality and so to use this label can be misleading.

hope this is helpful.

best wishes, Tom.

krodha wrote:
Seems that most religions/spiritual traditions began in the theme of discovering these truths. Some have fallen further from the tree than others but whether it be judaeo-christian, Islam etc.. They either presently have "higher schools" within them devoted to "union with god" type endeavors or they had schools/members of their traditions in the past which propagated these truths more clearly than they are today.
Buddhism/Hinduism obviously are much more blatant and uncorrupted which makes

their teachings/methods more excelled. But I agree that even Christianity had a past which was involved in seeking the truth Buddhism points to, to a certain degree. 5th-6th century Christian theologian/philosopher Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite wrote those two books Divine Names and Mystical Theology one being cataphatic and the other apophatic approaches to full union with "god"... And St. Thomas Acquinas stated that Mystical Theology and it's apophatic approach was the quickest way to reach that union (per Alan Watts). The dharma is the most clear cut method in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 9:15 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
And this understanding of - buddha mind - is one of the dharmas that leads us on the Path to Liberation? . .

krodha wrote:
You're already on the path of liberation. The moment you came into contact with the dharma and it caught your interest the path began. But yes Buddha mind is an integral part of it... understanding that your own mind is Buddha mind, and that your own nature is Buddha nature are key aspects of the teaching.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 6:50 AM
Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)
Content:

seeker242 said:
Everyone is saved, they just have to do what the Buddha taught to do.

asunthatneversets said:
I'd say the Buddhas recipe is more akin to helping one realize that the poison, arrow, victim, assailant, the task of removing the arrow, the treatment of the poison and the one saved were all figments of a dream which dissipates upon awakening.

Being "saved" has a bit of a western overtone to it (in my opinion).

seeker242 said:
There are just conventional terms IMO, that make grammatical sense. I don't think it's all that western. After all, the Bodhisattva vow, is to save all beings from suffering.

krodha wrote:
True, however the bodhisattva, (having seen the mountain top) remains unattached to his/her compassionate action and (although [s]he takes her/his task seriously, [s]he)

knows that ultimately the "act of saving" and "sentient beings" themselves are merely illusions within the dream.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 1:56 AM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
So . . There's not much the mind does other than interpret reality.

krodha wrote:
For the mind to interpret reality, reality would have to exist separately from mind. Mind creates reality(as an emanation of itself), the two are one and the same.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:11 PM
Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)
Content:

seeker242 said:
Not really! The Buddha gave a recipe of how to treat the poison as well as remove the arrow, none of which involves anything about who shot the first arrow or why. We already have all the information necessary about how to save the victim. More information is unnecessary.

shel said:
Well... I very glad that you've been saved!

seeker242 said:
Everyone is saved, they just have to do what the Buddha taught to do.

krodha wrote:
I'd say the Buddhas recipe is more akin to helping one realize that the poison, arrow, victim, assailant, the task of removing the arrow, the treatment of the poison and the one saved were all figments of a dream which dissipates upon awakening.

Being "saved" has a bit of a western overtone to it (in my opinion).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 12:40 PM
Title: Re: Teach & tell me about buddha mind
Content:
Wesley1982 said:

And the mind connects to the brain which connects to the body. Am I missing something here? or does the dharma of religious practice train the mind leading to awakening/enlightenment? . .

krodha wrote:
"Mind" is used in different ways in Buddhism depending on the context of the teaching. It's most often associated with thought/memory, the stream of thought and memory is said to constitute "the mind". In other instances it can be used as a synonym for consciousness.

Being raised in the west and living under the reigning scientific paradigms which have nurtured our view of reality, we usually approach the world in a very materialist/physicalist outlook. And because of this it is deemed common sense to see things as you suggested above "mind connects to brain which connects to body", however Buddhism points to a different truth. In Buddhism the mind and body(and world) are intermittent states depending on the point of view taken (and ultimately there ends up being no mind, body or world at all).

These views may also change as one continues on the path. One may start with the outlook: "the mind is in the body" and then change to "the body is in the mind" which may evolve into "the body and mind are one" to "there is no body or mind" etc... there are no ultimate truths except for wisdom (vidyā) and even that is ultimately found to be empty. So a statement made at the beginning of ones path may be contradicted and/or even discarded completely as one progresses and it's important to keep this in mind and remain open. Look at the path as a process of shedding ignorance and/or dismantling these little structures of identity and views we have built(and maintained) through the years. Just as in demolishing a building one wants to end up with nothing, seek to associate the endpoint in Buddhism as having removed and deconstructed all of the ignorance which has spawned separation and suffering.

"Buddha Mind" as a full title may also refer to Buddha nature (Tathāgatagarbha) or even the mind of a fully awakened individual, again it depends on the context, seems that you were asking about the thought/memory based mind though from what I can gather.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 6:57 AM
Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
Its plausible that certain areas of the brain are "activated" or "energized" when engaged in Buddhist meditation and other practices of conscious-awareness.

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }

https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-wuOYlxMSY

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 1:42 PM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?
Content:
Yontan said:
That's the point. We can't sit in a world of things and wonder how "time isn't real."

krodha wrote:
Since time is dependent on a thing (bhāva), how can time [exist] without a thing?
There is not any thing which exists; how, then, will time become [something]?"

- Nāgārjuna

Nāgārjuna is saying that for time to exist; an entity(subject) with the means to legitimately grasp and measure other persons, places and things(object) must also exist. Since no such entity can be found upon investigation, said entity is unreal. Likewise contrasting persons, places and things are equally unreal. Therefore time does not exist.

There is no one sitting in relation to any thing, in any world, these imputed notions are merely symptoms of ignorance.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 3:18 AM
Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)
Content:
shel said:
Hate to be repetitive but don't there gotta be a door before an entry...

krodha wrote:
"Recognizing oneself" is a phrase used to convey the nature of the realization... It isn't meant to suggest that a self is indeed making this discovery. The nature of the realization transcends the conventional law of cause and effect as well, so while it may seem commonsensical to frame it causally using an analogy like "door before entry", comparing it to a process of that sort wouldn't be applicable in this context.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?

Content:
Yontan said:
Time is as real as anything else....

krodha wrote:
Which means it isn't real at all.

"If the present and future exist presupposing the past,
The present and future will exist in the past.

If the present and future did not exist there [in the past],
How could the present and future exist presupposing that past?

Without presupposing the past the two things [the present and future] cannot be proved to exist.
Therefore neither present nor future time exist.

In this way the remaining two [times] can be inverted.
Thus one would regard highest, lowest and middle, etc., as oneness and difference. (or after, before and middle, or right, left and middle)

A non-stationary time cannot be grasped; and a stationary time which can be grasped does not exist.
How, then, can one perceive time if it is not grasped?

Since time is dependent on a thing (bhāva), how can time [exist] without a thing?
There is not any thing which exists; how, then, will time become [something]?"

- Nāgārjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 2:40 PM
Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)
Content:
krodha wrote:
"In the transcendental truth there is no origination (utpada), and in fact, there is no destruction (nirodha). The Buddha is like the sky (which has neither origination nor cessation), and the beings are like him, and therefore they are of the same nature."

"He who realizes the transcendental truth knowing the pratītyasamutpāda (or the manifestation of entities depending on their causes and conditions), knows the world to be śūnya and devoid of beginning, middle or end."

"One who imagines that even the most subtle thing arises: Such an ignorant man does not see what it means to be dependently born!"

(i.e. Nothing is being reborn or liberated: One has to see the real nature of being dependently born, of rebirths. There is no continuity, nor discontinuity between lives, or from saṃsāra to nirvāṇa. To think that things are really arising or ceasing with dependent origination is to miss the point of this teaching.)

"Neither atom of form exists nor is sense organ elsewhere;
Even more no sense organ as agent exists;
So the producer and the produced
Are utterly unsuited for production."

"In brief from empty phenomena
Empty phenomena arise;
Agent(cause), karma(action), fruits(effect), and their enjoyer(subject) -
The conqueror taught these to be [only] conventional.

Just as the sound of a drum as well as a shoot
Are produced from a collection [of factors],
We accept the external world of dependent origination
To be like a dream and an illusion.

That phenomena are born from causes
Can never be inconsistent [with facts];
Since the cause is empty of cause,
We understand it to be empty of origination."

- Nāgārjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
White Lotus said:
water is just water.

gregkavarnos said:
Not if it's Perrier!

krodha wrote:
And not if it's Perrier accompanied with a conversation about Dharma with Greg Kavarnos while an old re-run of 'Dharma & Greg' is playing on the TV in the background.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation
Content:

White Lotus said:
just shoes, just hot chocolate, nothing crypic. just reality; no fabrications or theories (views).

just shoes, just hot chocolate, just typing to you right now. thats all.

asunthatneversets said:
Some degree of truth to that but such statements leave room for misinterpretation wouldn't you say? They convey one fold emptiness(absence of self) but subtly give credence to objects and processes. One may misconstrue insight like this as suggesting the existence of an objective world which remains after the natural state has been actualized.

deepbluehum said:
[Thrusting a nail in Zen] Awesome!

krodha wrote:
[Thrusting a nail in thrusting a nail in Zen] Equally awesome.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation
Content:
White Lotus said:
just shoes, just hot chocolate, nothing crypic. just reality; no fabrications or theories (views).

just shoes, just hot chocolate, just typing to you right now. thats all.

krodha wrote:
Some degree of truth to that but such statements leave room for misinterpretation wouldn't you say? They convey one fold emptiness(absence of self) but subtly give credence to objects and processes. One may misconstrue insight like this as suggesting the existence of an objective world which remains after the natural state has been actualized.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 4:02 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Or perhaps you misunderstood what he was attempting to convey.

Sherab said:
What does it imply to say that the ultimate basis of a table is the imputation of a table?

That
(1) the table as an object is merely a subjective imputation of the mind, and that there is really no physical table out there? If so, then there is really no physical things and that all things are mental phenomena. You would therefore be subscribing to the tenet of Mind Only School.

krodha wrote:
The table as an object being a subjective imputation of mind would be just as much an imputation as considering it to be an actual object. What do you mean "out there?", there's no physical table out where? So if these alleged things aren't physical then they're automatically reduced to being mental? Why mental? Why physical? I surely do not subscribe to yogācāra.

Sherab said:
Or, that
(2) there is a physical table out there but that is not important. What is important is the mental image of the table (the imputed table) and its relation to the mind that imputes it? If so, then the path to enlightenment is purely a psychological process and not connected at all with the physical realm. The physical realm that we inhibit does not have any karmic relation with its inhabitants. It would also mean that the stories we hear about siddhas exercising control over physical matter such as multiplying of food, conversion of one thing to another are only that – stories, and not to be taken literally.

krodha wrote:
Again one would allow presuppositions of external physicality to govern their view, both of which are misnomers. Why is the image mental? Are you implying there is a separately existent noumenal table-suchness which is inaccessible due to residing beyond the limits of one's allegedly conditioned perception? And this alleged noumena is then translated by the mind? You again assume that there is a psychological realm existing in relation to a physical realm, internal and external, subjective and objective... skillfully applied emptiness decimates these notions. And as for these siddhas, they would certainly have a rough time exercising control over anything in this proposed schematic you've laid out.

asunthatneversets said:
Or he knew that vertical D.O. is ultimately evaluating and deconstructing misnomers even more so than horizontal D.O. is.

Sherab said:
I have no idea what you are saying. Please explain.

krodha wrote:
In this vertical D.O. you speak of, deconstructing 'objective things' into constituent parts, elements, particles and so on and so forth... by being enveloped and unwittingly overtaken by such a process one again allows their activity to be governed by the assumption that they as a subject are indeed deconstructing an objective thing. If one

isn't careful they may allow their perception to be governed and deceived by assumed designations which are in truth empty, and in doing so they unknowingly construct an imprisoned and constricted view which severs them from seeing the true nature of reality. Dependent origination has to go all the way, annihilating all designations, or else one will fall short and remain in ignorance.

37. Since the Buddhas have stated
That the world is conditioned by ignorance,
So why is it not reasonable [to assert]
That this world is [a result of] conceptualization?

10. When the perfect gnosis sees
That things come from ignorance as condition,
Nothing will be objectified,
Either in terms of arising or destruction.

12. And even with respect to subtle things
One imputes originations,
Such an utterly unskilled person does not see
The meaning of conditioned origination.

18. Those who impute arising and disintegration
With relation to conditioned things,
They do not understand the movement
Of the wheel of dependent origination.

26. Devoid of locus, there is nothing to objectify;
Rootless, they have no fixed abode;
They arise totally from the cause of ignorance,
Utterly devoid of beginning, middle and end.

33. Just as the Buddhas have spoken of
"I" and "mine" for a practical purpose;
Likewise they spoke too of "aggregates,"
"Elements" and "sense-fields" for practical reasons.

35. Inasmuch as the Conquerors have stated
Nirvana is the sole truth,
What learned person would imagine
That the rest is not false?

- excerpts from Nāgārjuna's 60 Stanzas of Reasoning

asunthatneversets said:
In implementing vertical D.O. one is surely confined to the alleged realm of phenomena, breaking an object down into constituent particles etc... at least in horizontal there's a

chance of one taking it back to the realm of the senses and consciousness which is somewhat closer to the mark. That is why I said it's appropriate to eventually venture into horizontal D.O. if one is going to move further down the rabbit hole, otherwise one just reifies and evaluates conventional misconceptions.

Sherab said:
You are exhibiting exactly the fear that I mentioned earlier. There is no need for vertical D.O. to lead to reification or monism.

krodha wrote:
Vertical D.O. begins under the umbrella of reification. It is reification by nature, it doesn't need to lead to reification, it is wrought with it(that isn't to say it's not effective and an excellent method). So beginning under the umbrella of reification, it then seeks to dismantle said reification, for those who are unskilled it certainly may lead to wrong view.

asunthatneversets said:
Exercises like Candrakīrti's Chariot are all well and good, and can be effective tools when properly implemented, but surely not what I was pointing towards. And I wasn't making an argument, just a suggestion.

Sherab said:
I am merely saying that “beyond the name "table" there is no table to be found” is plain wrong. There is a dependently arisen table to be found (and of course that dependently arisen table in the final analysis is merely an illusion.)

krodha wrote:
For purposes of conventional discussion, employing the concept of a table, and then following through with the subsequent declaration that said table is undoubtably dependently arisen is more than acceptable, and yes upon final analysis it's found to be merely an illusion, I agree. So how is my stating "beyond the name 'table' there is no table to be found" plain wrong? If we're both agreeing that beyond the convention there is merely illusion? Do these dependently arisen causes and conditions actually create a table to be deconstructed and analyzed in the first place? I think not, if you disagree you are welcome to.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 12:51 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
He may have been alluding to the fact that the ultimate basis of the table is the imputation "the table" itself, but that doesn't necessarily need to backtrack into "mental image" or "mind" being that those designations are just as imputed.

Sherab said:

I asked specifically about the ultimate basis of every phenomona using only the table as an example. I believed he heard me correctly. So he either interpreted my question wrongly or side-stepped my question.

krodha wrote:
Or perhaps you misunderstood what he was attempting to convey.

Sherab said:
I believed he interpreted my question wrongly and so answered as if it was a question on horizontal D.O. Reason for this? That was how he was taught. He probably never thought about the possibility of vertical D.O.

krodha wrote:
Or he knew that vertical D.O. is ultimately evaluating and deconstructing misnomers even more so than horizontal D.O. is.

asunthatneversets said:
I'd argue that the vertical is just as unending as the horizontal, but the vertical should eventually begin to circle around back into the horizontal if one is applying dependent origination correctly... it's just where does one take it from there.

Sherab said:
This looks suspiciously like a specie of circular reasoning.
http://www.atheistnexus.org/photo/circular-reasoning-works "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
Worse, it keeps you firmly in realm of phenomena.

krodha wrote:
In implementing vertical D.O. one is surely confined to the alleged realm of phenomena, breaking an object down into constituent particles etc... at least in horizontal there's a chance of one taking it back to the realm of the senses and consciousness which is somewhat closer to the mark. That is why I said it's appropriate to eventually venture into horizontal D.O. if one is going to move further down the rabbit hole, otherwise one just reifies and evaluates conventional misconceptions.

And this is actually a species of circular reasoning looking suspicious ---->

asunthatneversets said:
How do the strands which form the web of dependent origination string together to create this weaving interdependency, and where are the foundational strands that (if severed) topple the whole web? Imputation is the weight bearing strand in this web of illusion. The Geshe may have been attempting to convey that beyond the name "table" there is no table to be found.

Sherab said:
This sort of argument reminds of the popular chariot argument which is not valid as argued by Ven Nanavira:

Let us first consider the validity of the argument. If a chariot is taken to pieces, and a man is then shown the pieces one by one, each time with the question 'Is this a chariot?', it is obvious that he will always say no. And if these pieces are gathered together in a heap, and he is shown the heap, then also he will say that there is no chariot. If, finally, he is asked whether apart from these pieces he sees any chariot, he will still say no. But suppose now that he is shown these pieces assembled together in such a way that the assemblage can be used for conveying a man from place to place; when he is asked he will undoubtedly assert that there is a chariot, that the chariot exists. According to the argument, the man was speaking in the conventional sense when he asserted the existence of the chariot, and in the highest sense when he denied it. But, clearly enough, the man (who has had no training in such subtleties) is using ordinary conventional language throughout; and the reason for the difference between his two statements is to be found in the fact that on one occasion he was shown a chariot and on the others he was not. If a chariot is taken to pieces (even in imagination) it ceases to be a chariot; for a chariot is, precisely, a vehicle, and a heap of components is not a vehicle—it is a heap of components. (If the man is shown the heap of components and asked 'Is this a heap of components?', he will say yes.) In other words, a chariot is most certainly an assemblage of parts, but it is an assemblage of parts in a particular functional arrangement, and to alter this arrangement is to destroy the chariot. It is no great wonder that a chariot cannot be found if we have taken the precaution of destroying it before starting to look for it. If a man sees a chariot in working order and says 'In the highest sense there is no chariot; for it is a mere assemblage of parts', all he is saying is 'It is possible to take this chariot to pieces and to gather them in a heap; and when this is done there will no longer be a chariot'. The argument, then, does not show the non-existence of the chariot; at best it merely asserts that an existing chariot can be destroyed. And when it is applied to an individual (i.e. a set of pañcakkhandhā) it is even less valid; for not only does it not show the non-existence of the individual, but since the functional arrangement of the pañcakkhandhā cannot be altered, even in imagination, it asserts an impossibility, that an existing individual can be destroyed. As applied to an individual (or a creature) the argument runs into contradiction; and to say of an individual 'In the highest sense there is no individual; for it is a mere asemblage of khandhā' is to be unintelligible.

krodha wrote:
Exercises like Candrakīrti's Chariot are all well and good, and can be effective tools when properly implemented, but surely not what I was pointing towards. And I wasn't making an argument, just a suggestion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 9:47 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
Sherab said:
I once asked a Geshe what is the ultimate basis of a table since table depends on top and legs, etc. I was alluding to the vertical type of DO. His reply was the table is the

ultimate basis of the table. In other words, he was alluding to the horizontal type of DO.
(Table -> Mental image of table <-> mind)

krodha wrote:
He may have been alluding to the fact that the ultimate basis of the table is the imputation "the table" itself, but that doesn't necessarily need to backtrack into "mental image" or "mind" being that those designations are just as imputed. I'd argue that the vertical is just as unending as the horizontal, but the vertical should eventually begin to circle around back into the horizontal if one is applying dependent origination correctly... it's just where does one take it from there. How do the strands which form the web of dependent origination string together to create this weaving interdependency, and where are the foundational strands that (if severed) topple the whole web? Imputation is the weight bearing strand in this web of illusion. The Geshe may have been attempting to convey that beyond the name "table" there is no table to be found.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 6:08 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
So according to you, the circle and the sentient being both lack essence, but the sentient being is deemed truly existent while the circle isn't?

cloudburst said:
no.

krodha wrote:
Then you're proposing that the sentient being/firebrand lack essence (but are truly existent) and the circle exists in no way whatsoever?

asunthatneversets said:
When you say the sentient being and circle both mutually lack essence, what do you mean by that?

cloudburst said:
I mean the same as you see in the writings of the great Indian Madhyamikas, like Nagarjuna, Buddhapalita, Aryadeva, and Chandrakirti. All phenomena are empty of, or lack, a nature of their own.

krodha wrote:
I understand that, I was inquiring about your own interpretation of the great Indian Mādhyamakas, because your assertions seem to contradict the view Mādhyamaka conveys and generates (or at least it conflicts with my own interpretation).

asunthatneversets said:
How do two essenceless 'things' acquire contrasting designations regarding their

respective existences?

cloudburst said:
They do not. One exists and is essenceless, which is the only way anything can exist, the other does not exist in any fashion.

krodha wrote:
So in what manner does this essenceless manifestation truly exist? To arrive at your conclusion of essencelessness, (in the case of the sentient being and firebrand) are you approaching the deconstruction of these alleged "objects" from the standpoint of initially accepting their objecthood as genuinely valid, and then proceeding (under the influence of that presupposition) with the application of emptiness? In granting the sentient being and/or firebrand the title of "existent" it seems that dependent origination is either being applied incorrectly or is falling short of it's intended mark... this could simply be a difference in views though. I'm failing to understand how emptiness allows what you're suggesting(even under the guise of the conventional/absolute dichotomy).

asunthatneversets said:
What is the nature of said 'essence' which is lacked (according to you)?

cloudburst said:
It has no nature as it it has no existence whatever.

krodha wrote:
If the firebrand and sentient being both exist but lack essence. And the lacked essence in turn naturally lacks existence. How then are the firebrand and sentient being acquiring existence? For something to exist, isn't essential being required? Since they both lack essence(and are found to be empty when meticulously investigated), wouldn't it seem they are misconceptions? And are therefore the same as the illusory fire circle?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 12:36 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
cloudburst said:
no, becasue there is a sentient being there, but there is no circle.
yes, that's true. But the perception that the circle appear to exist at all is a mistake, whereas to say htat the sentient being and stick exist is not a mistake, as long as you do not mean existence by way of an essence. It is the failure to make this key distinction, at least the failure to make it explicitly, that continually reduces your position to something less than it might otherwise be.

krodha wrote:
So according to you, the circle and the sentient being both lack essence, but the sentient being is deemed truly existent while the circle isn't? How do you come to this conclusion? When you say the sentient being and circle both mutually lack essence,

what do you mean by that? Can you elaborate? How do two essenceless 'things' acquire contrasting designations regarding their respective existences? What is the nature of said 'essence' which is lacked (according to you)?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 3:45 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
5heaps said:
the illusions are the internal beliefs that the rainbow can be touched, the internal beliefs that the mirage is actual water, and internal beliefs that the cake has the self-nature of cake.

therefore theres nothing wrong with the cake itself. the cake is 100% utterly fine and utterly real, only the internal conceptions (and even the nonconceptual sense consciousness, uniquely asserted by Gelugs) must be fixed and are the illusions. therefore, the object themselves are ONLY like-an-illusion with respective to a defective mind apprehending them. the cake with respect to a nondefective mind is not an illusion nor like-an-illusion. its just a fullblown direct nonconceptual cognition of the cake....

krodha wrote:
So you accept that the subject is empty and illusory, but somehow the object gets away with being utterly real?

And then if the (allegedly internal) mind which is apprehending this allegedly external cake is deemed defective (with some type of "wrong view") then the cake is indeed like-an-illusion. But if the very same mind is deemed nondefective (and upholds what you consider to be "right view") then the previously defective cake undergoes metamorphosis and becomes 100% utterly fine and utterly real and is neither an illusion nor like-an-illusion?

"....Because of a lack of mindful attention,
self and other are grasped as a duality,
and both outer and inner dependent origination occur.
The whole universe arises
through awareness looking externally.
All sentient being arise
through awareness looking internally.
Through looking there, fearful appearances arise,
through looking here, ‘self’ arises.
Many mistakes arise from the single mistake
about the appearances of here and there.
Because of being mistaken about a self, there is a mistake about other,
attachment to self, aversion to other.
From the seed of attachment and aversion,

the whole outer universe and inhabitants are mistakes.
Because one is held as two,
that is called the delusion of dualistic grasping.
Since one imputed and mistook outer and inner,
that is called “the imputing ignorance”.
Because of familiarity of subject and object of that,
from the thick buildup of traces,
there was entrance into the state of samsara.
That is how the six migrations occurred.”
- excerpt from Uprooting Delusion Tantra

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 9:02 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist opinions about the Historical Jesus
Content:

Nangwa said:
Thats a possibility I suppose but even bodhisattvas in the human realm need penises and vaginas in order to take birth.

Sonam Wangchug said:
'

Than what's your take on Guru Rinpoche?

krodha wrote:
Some say Guru Rinpoche's father was Drenpa Namkha.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 5:56 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist opinions about the Historical Jesus
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
It is widely held as Christian dogma that Jesus son of Mary was conceived/born without a human father.

David N. Snyder said:
Virgin births stories were around long before Jesus. Osiris and other virgin birth mythologies existed hundreds of years before the Christian birth story was created. Greek mythology (which dates to well before the time of Jesus) is full of stories of gods impregnating mortal women. The influence of Greek culture on the early Christians no doubt led to the creation of that story....

krodha wrote:

Though it's met fierce resistance from Christians who have attempted to debunk this info, this first section of the 2007 documentary Zeitgeist covers the long list of virgin births which predated jesus. I believe there are rebuttal videos (assembled by christians) which attempt to smear Zeitgeist, and then further subsequent debunking (of the christian debunking) done by Zeitgeist proponents. It's definitely an ongoing back and forth controversy (as any good religious debate should be), but here's the original video:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oZgT1SRcrKE

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 5:14 AM
Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation
Content:
mzaur said:
Ah, that's a great analogy. Thanks

krodha wrote:
Another good analogy is the attempt to describe the color red to someone blind since birth. The knowledge is a direct, innate, first hand apperceiving. Fully experiential. The intellect actually serves as a double edged sword in actualizing the truth rigpa represents, knowing the right balance is key(intellect will point you in the right direction but cannot take you there).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist opinions about the Historical Jesus
Content:
krodha wrote:
The fundamental underlying assumption is that this story of jesus has authority in and of itself. The bible is merely a book with stories in it, it has no power or authority by itself. Any legitimacy or power it has is solely what is imputed upon it. One has to believe it, and belief is no different than opinion. Just as I am stating my belief/opinion at this moment. Things are what we make them, we like to believe it is the other way around. Just because there is a collective movement behind a certain belief or opinion doesn't make it legitimate, however in most cases it ends up becoming a paradigm which delegates a pseudo-standard of legitimacy via default.

A belief stands alone, and then one either forms attachment or aversion to it. If attachment occurs the belief has to be defended because it doesn't have any power by itself. One has to fight to uphold it's legitimacy and will seek others who mirror their own

beliefs so they can feel comfortable and reinforced. The same goes for one who forms aversion to a belief, they fall victim to the same factors. Disbelief is still belief, one only believes the opposite extreme. Due to these attachments or aversions suffering arises, conflict, war (within and without).

It can be seen unraveling in this very thread, where we are attached, where we avert. The finding of sources to back up claims which reinforce points of view regarding ones respective position on a belief or opinion. These are the seeds of separation. Myself, I see the game and I bow out.

That being said, I enjoy Buddhism because the belief aspect of it is irrelevant. It is an empirical investigation and an experiential endeavor. Belief eventually becomes a binding factor in Buddhism (and can hold one back). Though I am happy for those who benefit from believing whatever it is they choose to believe (and if benefit is derived from it that is a good thing), my not so humble opinion is that belief is slavery.

And I don't fall victim to that opinion because it's seen for what it is, it is consciously employed, and holds no power other than that which I give it (unless of course I share it publicly like I just did then it is also endowed with the power others give it, and thus the seeds of karma are sewn).

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 7:46 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist opinions about the Historical Jesus
Content:
krodha wrote:
He looks like that guy from The Passion Of The Christ who got tortured the whole movie and then nailed to that lowercase 't' looking thing at the end.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 22nd, 2012 at 1:17 PM
Title: Re: What happens when all sentient beings attain Buddhahood?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
What happens when all sentient beings attain Buddhahood?

All the "gods" in the upper realms convene for a council? . .

krodha wrote:
Well they better convene now because there'll be no gods left when all sentient beings attain buddhahood

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 22nd, 2012 at 1:09 AM
Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?
Content:

Jikan said:
is David Bowie a Dzogchenpa? (I haven't squeezed his produce to find out)

again...

krodha wrote:
Could be! He gets down with the crystal ball...
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

And as for the produce, if you watch the rest of that movie his fancy pants are practically painted on, it's like a veritable produce preview extraordinaire... terrifying.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?
Content:
krodha wrote:
They certainly are few and far between, Lopon Tenzin Namdak and Chatral Rinpoche also come to mind(though I don't know them personally). I'm sure there's some dark horses out there who have yet to (or may never) publicly grace us as well. The true heavy hitters (who are still living) could very well be in the single digits though, would not surprise me in the least.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 20th, 2012 at 10:08 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism in a Nutshell: The Four Seals of Dharma
Content:
krodha wrote:
I couldn't resist.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 20th, 2012 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: NON-DUALITY

Content:
Mariusz said:
The answer from Mahayanists against this so called Hvasang Mahayana was "mental nonengagement".

Dronma said:
I agree with Mariusz in that: "Ordinary beings who enjoy Samsara usually take suffering as the pleasure or escape from it to neutral feelings".
Surely, neutral feeling has nothing to do with the end of suffering!
Zombification or not, it can be a subtle trap for practitioners.
It is the first time I hear about Hvasang Mahayana, though. Very interesting....

krodha wrote:
In the book "The Practice Of Dzogchen" which is Tulku Thondup's translation of Longchenpa there's a section called Dzogpa Chenpo And Ha-Shang Mahāyāna (Pg. 112) which compares and contrasts notable distinctions between the two. I was going to type out what it said but it's actually pretty lengthy. It comments on the dangers of the neutral zombie like state Ha-Shang Mahāyāna embraces and I believe has some stories about monks who were found frozen in a state of mindless samādhi and had to be revived. Not a good route!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 20th, 2012 at 2:52 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
trevor said:
Illusion is something that gives a false impression. Is it true that all appearances give false impression of being inherently existent?

maybay said:
It is not true. Who sees the suchness of appearances does not see the imaginary, imputed, and false impression of them being inherently existent.

krodha wrote:
They certainly should if it's a genuine apperceiving of suchness which transcends the imaginary, imputed, and false impression of observer and observed.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 1:56 PM
Title: Re: The permanence of enlightenment
Content:
mzaur said:
Could you clarify what you mean by abiding and non-abiding?

I've heard it said that Theravada is a cosmic suicide club... that the goal is complete

cessation of existence. Is that what is meant by non-abiding?

krodha wrote:
Abiding essentially means permanent... perfect buddhahood. Non-abiding would be an experience of liberation which would have lasting effects and implications, but in time afflicted perception would eventually creep back in. But even within the tenets of buddhahood there are certain attributes which distinguish the nature of that buddhahood; within Dzogchen for example there is buddhahood that reverts to the cause and buddhahood which doesn't revert to the cause... among many other differences.

Namdrol said:
.....But....there are two kinds of buddhahood discussed in Dzogchen; buddhahood that reverts to the cause and the buddhahood that does not revert the cause.

Those whose buddhahood was incomplete can still fall into sentient being hood if they do not recognize the arising of the basis as being their own display.....
There are, if you recall, three stages of Buddhahood. Since the first two stages of Buddhahood do not realized all phenomena as the display of their own wisdom, the eleventh and twelfth bhumi are not complete buddhahood, this true even in Sarma schools.

N
There are two ways these things are explained, the common way, which accords with lower vehicles, in which the basis and the result are more or less the same.

Then there is the uncommon way Dzogchen explains these things, in which the basis and the result are different from that of the lower vehicles.

For example, in general, the nine yānas approach is to assert that all-basis is dharmakāya. In the special Dzogchen view, asserting that dharmakāya is the ālaya is a "Buddhist deviation". In Dzogchen, the ālaya is, as stated in the Mind Tantra of Vajrasattva:

'The all-basis is the bardo of everything,
unconsciousness, unclear, and inexpressible.'

The example for the ālaya is space. The example for the dharmakāya is celestial bodies.

So you see, it is really not so simple as proclaiming that the basis and the result are the same for all schools, only the result differs.

For example, the Samputa maintains there is a distinct different in omniscience between an eleventh and twelfth stage buddha, and a thirteenth stage Buddha. Related to this, Dzogchen refers to the 13-16 bhumis as those that "dwell in wisdom". Why? Because only 13th stage Vajradhara's on up understand that all appearances are the display of their own wisdom.

Most people think that Buddhahood is irreversible; Dzogchen on the other hand asserts that the buddhahood of the lower yanas is reverts into the basis, and only Dzogchen results in complete and irreversible buddhahood.

These are the kinds of things you discover when you read Vima Nyingthig, Khandro Nyingthig, Gongpa Zangthal, the Seventeen tantras and so on.

The later in Tibetan history you go, the more homogenized the presentation of the four schools becomes. When you exam the texts of the Pre-Sarma period, then you find Dzogchen is really very different from what was introduced from India during the time of Rinchen Zangpo onwards.

Dzogchen did not spread widely in India, neither did anuyoga. The main tantric teaching of India was Yoga Tantra/Mahayoga.

Many masters to not present whole picture of Dzogchen. HHDL's agenda, which I respect, is to bring harmony to all schools.

My interest is a little different -- I am interested in what makes Dzogchen so unique and so powerful. I know the difference between what is commonly stated as a nice political thing so Sakyas, Gelugpas and Sarma-oriented Kagyus don't feel bad, and what the real teachings of Dzogchen say, but are not so publicized. I don't owe allegiance to any school. My interest these days in particular is solely anuyoga and Dzogchen teachings.

That being said, don't think that I consider Lamdre, etc., as lacking depth, efficacy, or profundity -- they are profound, interesting, and wonderful teachings. I just think Dzogchen is more profound, more efficacious, and deeper. This is just my opinion.

N

It is because buddhahood of lower yānas is incomplete and does not reach the stage of ka dag chen po, great original purity. The simplest way to explain it is that after the this universe dissolves and the next one arises, those beings who have not achieved the stage of ka dag chen po start all over.

N

krodha wrote:
Regarding Theravāda, it isn't like that at all... it's just the most traditional form of buddhism, Theravāda literally translates to "the Teaching of the Elders" or "the Ancient Teaching," and is sometimes referred to as Hīnayāna which translates to "Inferior Vehicle", "Deficient Vehicle", the "Abandoned Vehicle", or the "Defective Vehicle" however the term Hīnayāna isn't very endearing, and though widely used, is considered improper. In Theravāda they practice according to the original sutras attributed to Śākyamuni Buddha and in their realization is for them alone which makes them pratyekabuddhas. Some claim that the pratyekas realization is equivalent to that of a

bodhisattva, the difference being that a bodhisattva works for the liberation of all sentient beings. Others however say that in order to even achieve proper buddhahood one must abide by the bodhisattva ideal of working for the benefit of all beings, and therefore they denounce the pratyekabuddha's realization as inferior. The sister forum of dharmawheel is http://www.dhammawheel.com which is pretty much exclusively Theravāda I believe. You can find some good information there regarding that vehicle and it's tenets.

The goal of most vehicles can be said to be aiming at a glimpse of cessation and/or total cessation. However the cessation is the cessation of ignorance which arises from identifying with a personalized view of reality. The fact that we take ourselves to be individuals who were born, exist in time and eventually die is ignorance(avidyā) according to buddhism. The proliferation and evolution of ignorance is the cycle of samsara, and the Dharma is the method to transcend samsara, thus reaching nirvana. So while I wouldn't call it a "cessation of existence" per se, it is the cessation of everything which could be considered "you". I suppose the absence of individual 'being' can be perceived/interpreted as some sort of non-existence to those unfamiliar and possibly intimidated by such a notion. But the state of cessation is in fact your natural and true state of being, beyond birth and death... abiding in this state is buddhahood a.k.a. wisdom(vidyā). That state is beyond the 4 extremes which are (i)existence, (ii) non-existence, (iii) both existence and non-existence, (iv) neither existence nor non-existence.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
You're still coming from a position where the external/internal dichotomy is considered an inherent aspect of experience.

5heaps said:
not an inherent aspect of experience, just an existing aspect of experience.
however since you think neither objects nor experiences of objects "ever existed in the first place", you negate both inherent and general experience.

krodha wrote:
You assume it's an existing aspect of experience, and I don't doubt that it may legitimately seem that way. But is it really an existent aspect? Or could it be that in your presence everything simply seems to appear without claiming to be anything in particular? Imputation delegates all divisions, borders, dichotomies, dualities etc. and experience then conforms to those specifications.

Objects (and experiences of objects) certainly seem to exist and their presence is no doubt compelling, however just as others have suggested in this thread: these objects really don't stand up to thorough investigation. Experience is multi-faceted and can

appear in a myriad of ways. Though it may seem to be concretely solidified and endowed with it's own innate laws and principles which govern the way it manifests, this is not the case. Reality is flexible and malleable, able to appear in one manner when influenced a certain way and another when an alternate perception is taken. All fully dependent on the point of view and perception championed. If one is (as it seems you suggest) merely a pawn subject to the rules and regulations of a separately existent reality, established and alien to us as individuals, then how could liberation and enlightenment be possible? Why would the great conquerors claim to have passed beyond the clutches of birth and death, transcending limitation, delusion, affliction and suffering? They didn't accomplish this feat by escaping the trap, but by seeing that there was no trap to begin with. And this realization flowered upon the discovery that the trap and trapped were indeed the very same illusion. The only obstacle to freedom is oneself.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 6:45 AM
Title: Re: The permanence of enlightenment
Content:
krodha wrote:
This reminded me of another thread where the differences in Mahāyāna liberation and Dzogchen liberation were briefly discussed, Namdrol wrote:

Namdrol said:
Parinirvana without any remainder.

This is another place where Dzogchen doctrine differs from common Mahāyāna -- the goal in common Mahāyāna is a non-abiding nirvana.

The ultimate result of Dzogchen is an abiding nirvana.

Why? Because compassion is innate in the basis, and whenever sentient beings appear, so do Buddhas.

krodha wrote:
So it seems nirvana is going to differ depending on the vehicle one is implementing. I've also heard that Theravāda considers enlightenment to be the first initial moment a glimpse of nirvana is actualized(one is then an arhat and considered enlightened according to Theravādin standards). Mahāyāna seems to be close to the same although I'm sure realization has a much different flavor, it seems that one may actualize non-abiding nirvana and in some rare cases actualize the full attainment of abiding nirvana. Lastly Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen are the definitive methods implemented to turn the non-abiding nirvana into the flawless and full abiding nirvana(complete and perfect buddhahood), although I've also seen discrepancies and controversy regarding the nature of their respective definitions of nirvana(Dzogchen being a more complete enlightenment since it contains practices which are unique to it such as tögal).

That being said, I could be wrong about this and I welcome any corrections!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?
Content:
Sönam said:
what do you call a table? a conglomerate of atoms? made of what, with what form?

Sönam

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sc3H4UkkZgk

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 4:03 AM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?
Content:

LastLegend said:
Ok. A table is broken and found at the dumpster, and over time it will become rotten, it will no longer be the table is it?

Sönam said:
It has never been a table ... it always have been just a name.

Sönam

LastLegend said:
Yes and the name is table. And apparently it is here because you are here.

krodha wrote:
It is here because you are here. The Buddha's essential exegesis of pratītyasamutpāda is; "this arises, that becomes". Because the "I"(subject) is conceived, immediately that which is not-I(object) arises. And from there the objective field is cut up and fragmented into all sorts of names, concepts and forms... one of them being a "table". However, in this timeless moment each "field" of sensory perception is unbroken and complete and that which you posit to be your "body" appears just the same as that which you label a "table", both arise in vision and are equal in that respect. It is only when

conceptualization arises that we cut this field up and fragment it into the self/other dichotomy. If you take a step back and just witness each sensory field in it suchness there is no separation to be found, the experience itself suggests no edges, borders, location, dividing lines or anything of the sort... those designations are merely imputed upon seamless experience via conceptualization. The problem is that we habitually identify with a certain and very specific cluster of sensations within these unbroken sensory fields, and that certain cluster of sensation is labeled a "body" and that body belongs to "me".. the "I". From there, the "I" believes it spans time and is subject to all sorts of happenings both good and bad, but the concept "I" is itself only a presently arising thought or concept. Just another appearance in seamless experience, the thought "I" has nothing whatsoever to do with the "body". The concept and the appearance are not connected in any way. So the body is truly just a visual appearance which arises the same as any other color or shape in the field of vision. The body also has tactile and kinesthetic sensations attributed to it, but these sensations also just arise in experience and do not constitute a "body" (or belong to the thought "I"). Now we don't take the table to be "I", and if the table isn't "I" then the body also certainly isn't "I", because they both arise in exactly the same manner. So "I" can be detached from these sensory perceptions and seen for what it is(an arising thought/concept). However, since time is seen as empty, and it is understood that the "I" who would witness the thought "I" is the thought itself, and the moment that thought arises it self liberates... the duality collapses into a nondual and timeless non-arising perfection.

So the table isn't a table, it IS vision. In 'seeing' one doesn't see objects or appearances, what appears as objects or appearances is 'seeing' itself. The act of observing and what is observed are not two separate things, what is seen, is the act of 'seeing' itself. What appears in the field of vision, is vision itself. And this applies to every sensory perception. So no objects are experienced anywhere or at anytime.

Sönam is right, table is just a name, it's just a two syllable sound which arises which sounds like ta-ble. The sound "ta-ble" has nothing to do with the, (for example;) brownish color rectangular shape we associate it with. And further, there is no bordering line or separation between the shape/colors and vision itself, and since the "you" who would "see" this is merely a thought/concept(which is another non-witnessed expression of experience)... vision no longer needs to be imputed as a 'sensory perception' and objects which are seen are also absent... so experience is only the natural state, seamless, borderless, edgeless, nonlocal, complete, unobscured, oceanic, perfect.

As for the broken decaying table: in the timeless moment it appears as such, as a conventional appearance it has never appeared as anything(or any way) other than the condition it's presently in. There was no time prior to now, and will be no time following now... but then again there is no table to begin with, the table is hair on a tortoise, an abstraction which is a figment of imagination... only the natural state IS.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 4:14 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
5heaps said:
and? because none of those things can be ascertained when seeing ultimate truth, this means what? that those unascertained things dont exist ie. are illusions? or that they are like illusions because their mode of existence was previously misunderstood?

krodha wrote:
If an alleged object or appearance is finally understood to have never existed in the first place due to it's initial "existence" being nothing more than a delusional misapprehension; does said object or appearance therefore transfer to a different mode of existence so that it could be characterized as "previously misunderstood"? I'd argue that the initial delusion(object/appearance) never was... it never existed in the first place... so it can't be previously misunderstood because the initial object or appearance was a figment of one's imagination. In the end, if I had to choose between the titles of 'illusion' or 'like an illusion' to describe the nature of the initial misapprehension, I'd have to say 'illusion' would be most accurate.

5heaps said:
i see, you lean towards the mind-only position which denies external objects

krodha wrote:
I surely do not, and I'm not sure how you derived that conclusion from anything I wrote. You're still coming from a position where the external/internal dichotomy is considered an inherent aspect of experience. From your point of view, yes, this duality appears as if it's being subjected to "denial" but that is only because you genuinely believe that your body is a container and your skin represents a dividing line between two worlds.

5heaps said:
yes, the cake isnt external, yet cake is still not asserted as being an appearance. when i say appearance i generally am referring to main minds. for example in the case of seeing a red flower, the appearance is the red mental aspect of the flower ie. the eye consciousness. likewise the cake that you put in your mouth is not a main mind, nor a mental factor, but physical form. because of this cakes are not illusion-cakes, appearance cakes, but actual cakes.

krodha wrote:
While I wouldn't classify the cake under any of those designations you listed, I'll play devils advocate for a moment... when the only access one has (or will ever have) to a cake is via sensory perception, why and how would the cake you put in your mouth be a physical form? I'm not sure how you're delineating any sort of physicality or actuality. You're saying the taste of the cake is in the cake itself? The texture of the cake is in the cake itself? The cake possesses these properties?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?
Content:
LastLegend said:
If things are impermanent, that means time exists to reinforce it?

krodha wrote:
Impermanence is just a skillful way to have one directly perceive the futility of grasping at appearances, and it aids one in understanding that suffering arises from such activity. "Things" are impermanent, because "things" are abstractions born of conceptualization and they rely on you as an individual to exist. So impermanence is just a way to expedite the realization that no peace can be found in dualistic grasping. As soon as the "I" is conceived, time is born, space is born, beginning and end are born and everything which depends on these faculties subsequently manifests, all are predicated on that one seed. One is then slain by time due to identifying with delusion and it just compounds as habitual tendencies become more engrained. The common sense view then becomes "I exist, I was born and in time I will die", reminds me of a friend's band from sacramento... one of their albums is titled; "Time... The Destroyer", everything is destroyed by time. But does time exist? Do things exist? Do you exist as you believe you do? Were you born and will you die? These are questions the Dharma will answer if applied correctly.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Music time
Content:
krodha wrote:
Bon Iver.... incredible stuff

Bon Iver - Calgary
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0KrmxavLIRM

Bon Iver - Holocene
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TWcyIpul8OE

Bon Iver - Re: Stacks
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ePatJIwB-sI

Bon Iver - Wash.
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KMfL7rVAu0U

Bon Iver - Beth/Rest
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wF_Mx2xsdbw

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
5heaps said:
yes, rnam pa in tibetan, its part of the definition of the mind

krodha wrote:
I don't doubt it is, I'm sure every angle has been covered in the teachings (being that the true nature of reality is approached from multiple and various directions and positions), however that doesn't mean certain designations are exempt from emptiness. There truly are no ultimates in this teaching, something stated in the beginning of the path may not hold true in the end. There are levels to this if one is implementing a gradual path, as one progresses contradictions may arise, but they're only contradictory if one remains attached to a certain view.

Fellow forummer Mariusz just posted this yesterday and it reflects the view of reality I (and others on this thread) am attempting to convey:

Suchness (nature of reality) free of all types of differentiation (all ignorance) appears in its one taste (beyond reference points) when these are all absent:

• What appears to the nonconceptual sensory faculty as a duality of perceived and perceiver
• The process of formulation conducted by the rational mind, which is conceptual and first makes the assumption that whatever appears to be a duality (subjekt-object) actually exists that way and then formulates it by assigning a specific term
• The inner faculties, that of the eye and so on
• Outer objects, form and so on
• The principles of awareness, the eye consciousness, and so on
• Vessel-like worlds' appearances experienced in common.

- Ju Mipham

5heaps said:
i dont know what you mean by the tactile sensation bypassing this process...why would it do that. no, all sense consciousness use internal appearances, so no bypassing

krodha wrote:
You made this distinction: "because the appearance of cake is an internal object, whereas the thing you eat is physical form" which sounds as if you're implying the appearance(vision?) of the cake is internal, whereas what is eaten(tactile) is physical... your statement came across as creating contrasting distinctions between the properties of certain sensory modalities.

5heaps said:
are internal appearances not internal? if not, are they external?
if neither, do they not exist at all? if you say they do exist, and yet theyre neither internal nor external, then what are they?
furthermore appearances are not negations, theyre positive objects, unless by appearances youre talking about general categories

krodha wrote:
By "internal" I take it you mean "inside the body" which would naturally suggest it's dualistic counterpart of externality (existing outside the body) with the bordering line being the surface of the skin. But this schematic only holds true if one is identifying with "the body" which is merely a concept imputed onto a certain cluster of sensations. In actuality every appearance inhabits the same space, for instance; we normally take thoughts to be internal, and the sound of people talking to be external, but in truth both of these manifestations appear in the same exact manner. They both occupy the same space we only impute a pseudo bordering line and take it to be genuine when in truth there is no such line. If you listen to "external sounds" and then produce a thought, you'll find that they both appear the same way, you only take one to be internal because through habitual reification and conditioning this has become "commonsensical"... however that does not mean it's true, and earnest empirical investigation will reveal it to be a fallacy.

Further, to say they exist would be attaching to an extreme, to say they don't exist would be attaching to the contrasting extreme... both positions are suicide in this teaching.

Manifestation is beyond the 4 extremes and the reason for this is to allow our normally compulsive need to intellectualize everything, to relax. The truth is not found by implementing the intellect and one cannot think themselves to liberation(though at the same time, a clear intellectual understanding is very key).

Reality mirrors the imputations placed upon it; if you say an appearance is internal, it is... if you say it's external, it is. So your query as to whether appearances are internal or external that question cannot be answered, because again, skillful emptiness doesn't even let such a paradigm become established. Internal and external are empty from the very beginning and are equivalent to hair on a tortoise as I said before. This path to liberation is a process of deconstruction in a sense, structures of thought, presuppositions and assumptions are keenly dismantled so that their innate emptiness can become fully evident beyond the pale of the intellect. The process increases exponentially as one gets closer to the truth of suchness Mipham elucidated above.

If one remains attached to certain presuppositions about reality then they are doomed to remain stagnant in this teaching. Luckily emptiness is a perfect antidote for this predicament. By seeing how dichotomies dependently originate they can be seen for what they are (mere conventionalities).

When you say appearances are positive objects, what appearances are you speaking of?

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 3:47 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
5heaps said:
yes you can...there is a cake outside of the appearances of cake. why? because the appearance of cake is an internal object, whereas the thing you eat is physical form

when analyzing the emptiness of the cake you are analyzing physical form, not an internal appearance. the emptiness of the internal appearance is the emptiness of your mind, not of the cake.

DarwidHalim said:
This is exactly the location of the self that you have hold and it is not a surprise you said cake is like an illusion, instead of illusion.

As I mentioned before, someone who can just accept reality is like an illusion, but not illusion, they have the sense of self deep inside their understanding.

There is no cake outside the appearances of cake.

In emptiness there is no internal and external.

5heaps said:

ah, come now, emptiness has nothing to do with denying external objects by just calling them internal ones ie. just appearances.
any idealist can do that.

krodha wrote:
5heaps let me get this right, you're attributing the "appearance of cake" to some type of internal pseudo visual representation of an external form? But at the same time you're granting the tactile and/or kinesthetic sensation to be a genuine contact with an external physical form? So the fundamental schematic and paradigm you're functioning under is; there is an actual "physical" form existing externally which is apprehended by the senses (translated by a mind which is internal and separate from external reality) and represented as an internal appearance, but that tactile sensation bypasses this process and is in fact a true account of this alleged physical external world? This view is atrocious.

DarwidHalim is correct, there is no cake outside the appearances of cake (and I'd add that there is no cake within the appearances imputed as "cake" either), and there certainly is no internal/external dichotomy in emptiness, which means there is no internality or externality in experience at any time.

No one's denying external objects by calling them internal appearances. That would be an affirming negation, external objects/internal appearances have never been established in the first place, so they cannot be "denied". External/internal is hair on a tortoise, it's a ludicrous notion in the face of skillfully applied emptiness. The notion of internal/external is born of ignorance. As for idealism, it also falls flat on it's face right from the start being that the internal/external dichotomy is empty from the very beginning.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: NON-DUALITY
Content:
mindyourmind said:
I never knew/thought that the non-duality provided any relief from suffering directly. I've glimpsed non-duality and because of my dichotomies I sometimes find the non-duality painful like anything else.

krodha wrote:
Painful in what way?

mindyourmind said:
Why does anyone want to reach any state? I don't know that reaching any state is the point. It's the not reaching that seems to matter most and create the gap that allows for real insight to emerge...

krodha wrote:

It's usually not presented as a state to acquire, but as one's true nature... and describing it as one's "true nature" has the flavor of an underlying actuality which is veiled by obscurations. But I'm sure it is perceived as a truth to be desired because the notion naturally resonates with people. Being told that one is essentially dreaming and that this experience (we take to be everyday life) is equivalent to a dream, should certainly come across as a strong wake up call.

However a nondual experience isn't necessarily liberation, one can have all types of absorption experiences but still be wrought with afflicted view. I remember in one of Tulku Urgyen's books he told a story of a practitioner who had come to his teacher after a long retreat to "debrief". He proceeded to inform his teacher that he had all sorts of auspicious experiences, extended states of absorption where there was no separation between he and his surroundings, feelings of omniscience where he felt the entire universe within him, and so on and so forth. And the teacher essentially looked at the student and said "I'm sorry... keep practicing".

I do agree with you that creating that gap is important... because in merely aspiring to achieve a state of nonduality(or liberation itself) the very aspiration can become a roadblock if one doesn't know any better. The rapid nature of dzogchen is derived from it being a non-causal vehicle. But that being said, if reaching does take place then reaching is appropriate, if "creating the gap" takes place then that is also appropriate. Genuine realizations regarding what works and what doesn't work are most important. One can be told something won't work, but if that advice is only taken at face value, that initial acceptance just becomes another form of reaching more often than not. Without the process of a legitimate personal investigation which leads to the essential discovery of said futility for oneself, the mere acceptance of an alleged futility doesn't mean much. The journey is personal, and all you can do is hope that each individual is ruthless and earnest on their respective paths.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 3:18 PM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:
retrofuturist said:
Greetings Trevor,

trevor said:
So what are we missing here? What more do we need to make the appearance of cake into the real cake? What makes it real?

retrofuturist said:
I tend to understand this in accordance with the following Pali Sutta...

SN 35.23 said:
"Monks, I will teach you the All. Listen & pay close attention. I will speak."

"As you say, lord," the monks responded.

The Blessed One said, "What is the All? Simply the eye & forms, ear & sounds, nose & aromas, tongue & flavors, body & tactile sensations, intellect & ideas. This, monks, is called the All. Anyone who would say, 'Repudiating this All, I will describe another,' if questioned on what exactly might be the grounds for his statement, would be unable to explain, and furthermore, would be put to grief. Why? Because it lies beyond range."

retrofuturist said:
Bringing that to your example of cake, there is the sight of cake, smell of cake, taste of cake etc. To describe a "cake" independently of the actual experience of cake is to go "beyond range".

Here's one I prepared earlier:
http://www.dhammawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=11448&start=80#p173631 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Maitri,
Retro.

krodha wrote:
Good insight! I'd add, that in the act of evaluating cake(or any alleged object), to even posit that there is "anything" which resides "beyond range" or "out there" would be a defeating view. Truly to speak of apprehending the cake(or any appearance) via the senses is a minor deviation in and of itself. Running with the approach that the experience of cake consists merely of it's sensual properties(the sight of cake, taste of cake etc..) still gives subtle credence to the (albeit commonsensical) notion of a cake which is seen, smelled, tasted etc. As if there are substantiated sense modalities which are perceiving qualities beyond themselves. I'd take it further and suggest that there is indeed nothing independent of the experience and that the experience alone is. So not the "sight OF cake" but that the cake is precisely the sight, taste, smell etc.. And that being the case, one can nullify the senses(and the cake) which end up being misnomers. What's left is akin to experience experiencing itself(and even that is saying too much). Insubstantiated and illusory through and through.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 7:19 AM
Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth
Content:
5heaps said:
nor is it true that when you eat a french fry you end up eating 100s of them the longer you chew that one fry.

asunthatneversets said:
Again time, subject and object are assumed to be existent beyond the pale of conventionality.

5heaps said:
doesnt matter. in no instance is it correct to say that each moment is a rebirth

krodha wrote:
I respect your opinion, what may I ask is your view on rebirth?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:54 AM
Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth
Content:
5heaps said:
nope, otherwise you would be an entirely different person each moment, and thats not true.

krodha wrote:
Your position is based on the mutually interdependent presuppositions that time indeed exists and that an entity which spans time also exists. I'm not denying the conventional reality of such designations but to refute the manner of their fundamental and illusory manifestation (as the mere conventions they are) in the name of attempting to establish some type of inherency seems misguided.

Who or what would be an entirely different person each moment? My implementation of the phrase "moment to moment" in and of itself already says too much being that it subtly suggests a consecutive chain of moments(i.e. Time).

5heaps said:
nor is it true that when you eat a french fry you end up eating 100s of them the longer you chew that one fry.

krodha wrote:
Again time, subject and object are assumed to be existent beyond the pale of conventionality.

5heaps said:
the tough part of this basic version of dependent arising is understanding is that while things are momentary, nevertheless objects function over time.

krodha wrote:
They certainly appear to.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:10 AM
Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth
Content:

krodha wrote:
Seems to make sense to regard rebirth as occurring moment to moment, anytime the "I" arises and subsequent imputation (predicated on said "I") proliferates. Due to this initial misapprehension a resultant chain of imputed conceptualization gives rise to varying notions of duality. These apparent dualities in turn manifest all conceivable distinctions and designations (time, space, existence, nonexistence, self, other and any other form of dichotomous misconception). Apart from the utter delusion these (apparently obscuring) factors create, every imaginable aspect of this inconceivable reality (which is beyond the 4 extremes) is unborn.

"The actual essence, pristine rigpa,
cannot be improved upon, so virtue is profitless,
and it cannot be impaired, so vice is harmless;
in it's absence of karma there is no ripening of pleasure or pain;
in it's absence of judgement, no preference for samsara or nirvana;
in it's absence of articulation, it has no dimension;
in it's absence of past and future, rebirth is an empty notion;
who is there to transmigrate? And how to wander?
What is karma and how can it mature?
Contemplate the reality that is like the clear sky!

Constantly deconstructing, investigating keenly,
not even the slightest substance can be found;
and in the undivided moment of nondual perception
we abide in the natural state of perfection."

- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 6:17 AM
Title: Re: Where is karma located?
Content:
AstralProjectee said:
That's lame asunthatneversets.

krodha wrote:
Lame? ....THAT.... IS.... SPARTA! AND THE BUDDHA, DHARMA AND SANGHA!

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Where is karma located?
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 9:53 AM
Title: Re: Is there such a thing as almost pure evil?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Except for that... That's pure evil.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 6:22 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism and Death
Content:
Challenge23 said:
Hello,

Hopefully this should be the last of these newbie questions I'm posting. I am pretty sure this is the most serious one.

To Long; Didn't Read version: I think I have a phobia of dying and am not sure what the proof we as Buddhists have of reincarnation. Help?

From my understanding in order for Buddhism to make sense then we have to have karma and reincarnation. If you only live once then karma isn't nearly fast enough to balance the scales. If you don't have to worry about coming back to repeat the cycle then once you get to the point in your practice where you aren't a bad person to be around then you don't really need to push it anymore.
I would even go so far as to say that if you aren't being some sort of ludicrous hedonist then you aren't living your life right. Why serve sentient beings as in 70 years their suffering will absolutely end?

krodha wrote:
Some of these things such as karma and rebirth may be good pointers in the process of removing the ignorance which binds us to suffering. But there are no "ultimates" in buddhism when it comes to the ins-and-outs of the teaching. What is stated at the beginning may not necessarily be what is true at the end. An analogy of peeling away the layers of an onion is often used... what is present at the start is soon discarded* and you continue layer by layer until you reach the core (*or not discarded per se, but seen as only having conventional purpose and ultimately lacking inherent existence). Use these pointers as a map and a good structure for your personal conduct and view, but don't attach to them too tightly. Do not treat buddhism as a belief system, do not believe anything except for that liberation is real and the Dharma can take you there.

Challenge23 said:
Why work towards the end of suffering as it will come when you stop breathing no matter what you do?

krodha wrote:
Do you absolutely know that the end of suffering will come upon the cessation of breathing? Or is there a possibility that you tell yourself that now as a sort of light at the end of this tunnel you feel you're in? Perhaps a statement like this is a reflection of the way you feel, in that, in the midst of this predicament you find yourself in... the struggle to escape the tunnel has become tiring and pointless. Consider for a moment; the possibility that you were never in the tunnel to begin with, that truth is what this teaching reveals. Suffering is born of a grave misunderstanding regarding the nature of reality. The whole schematic of you as an individuated entity, living, suffering, dying someday, is an unneeded blemish upon the truth of what is happening right now. Why not be free? Your argument is akin to being in a desert and dying of thirst when all of a sudden someone walks up to you and says "hey, you're sitting on a well full of fresh water, it's right there under you, you just have to dig a little" to which you reply "what is the point of quenching my thirst and stopping my suffering if it will cease upon death anyways".

Challenge23 said:
I know there is something I'm not seeing here and that there is some way of proving these things that is as least as strong as the science behind neurology that basically shows that the brain is like an engine and consciousness is like heat that is generated when the brain is running. According to this theory when you turn off the brain consciousness just dissipates like heat dissipating off of an engine.

krodha wrote:
This would be a wrong view (in my opinion), and a debilitating one in buddhism due to taking the brain to be some type of ultimate physical "thing" which generates consciousness. Some neuroscience may state this but it doesn't mean that is the way it is, those neuroscientists certainly haven't figured out how the brain supposedly produces consciousness. This has been the issue with a lot of science... for centuries science has approached it's endeavors with the fundamental assumption that reality is indeed a form of ultimate physical suchness, constructed and composed of matter, constituent particles, elements etc... it treats the world like an artifact and this view in turn makes you yourself an anomaly and fluke living on a rock floating through infinite space. A fluke who was born, subject to decay in time and ultimately succumbs to death. This perception "physicalizes" experience and makes you a mere dissipating consciousness which resides in this structure composed of flesh, bone and blood. This type of perception and belief structure can undoubtably ONLY result in one feeling fragile and anxious. Luckily, although this (physicalist) view has been adopted, believed and taught to the masses, it lacks inherent reality. You have been indoctrinated with this view, but it is unreal.

Things are only that way if you believe them to be. In truth they are quite the opposite, and buddhism is one way (one of the best in my opinion) to experientially discover the

unreality of the deluded view I described above. You are not bound by any such limitations.

Challenge23 said:
As I have been practicing I have realized that this is what is slowing my practice. I am scared that I am wasting my life going towards a goal that I will get to anyway that will at the same time be truly horrifying to me(the idea of all that I think of as me just whiffing off like blowing out a candle is really scary). Help?

krodha wrote:
So you're saying that in pursuing the unreality of yourself via buddhism you're just chasing a fact that will be actualized upon physical death anyways? What buddhism reveals is that this "you" you take yourself to be is a misconception, and that you are indeed vastly more than just this. You take yourself to be a limited individual with a physical body who lives in time and is going to die, but upon the realization of your true nature you discover that you certainly aren't that... and that what you truly are is inconceivable, beyond nothing, beyond everything, unborn, undying, timeless and perfect. It is a liberation, not something to fear. You feel fear and anxiety about your existence at this time because you're identifying with an abstraction, something that isn't truly there(the way you believe it to be). In the fruition of buddhism one doesn't activate a death of self (it's not as you say, "all that I think of as me just whiffing off like blowing out a candle"), instead what happens is a deep and intuitive discovery(beyond belief) that you were never born to begin with, and that which is unborn cannot die. This is why nirvana(liberation) it is called 'escaping the cycle of birth and death', birth and death are understood to be happenings which are predicated on a false "self", and therefore suffering itself is based on an illusion. There is nothing here which was born, and there is nothing here which will die, and I know you cannot believe that (and I would not ask you to) but if applied correctly this teaching will reveal this truth.

Your skepticism and questioning are good things, question everything.

(Apologies for all the edits, i initially typed this out too quick.)

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 2:31 PM
Title: Re: Is there such a thing as almost pure evil?
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
No, there is no such thing as pure evil. There is no such thing as evil. There is ignorance, hatred, desire, pride and jealousy and acting out these mental states has outcomes.

krodha wrote:
I agree, no evil... Just ignorance.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 8:47 AM
Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves
Content:
alpha said:
what does it mean when there is a self aware space without boundary of and cannot be thought of being inside or outside and thoughts seem to arise from the middle of it ?

and the thoughts dont have much strength and seem to be somewhat similar to the space they arose from?

krodha wrote:
It's meaning would depend on whether one is asking from experience or from the perspective of a general inquiry, a teacher with skillful means may answer in different ways depending on the circumstances surrounding the question... And that's just because how one relates to such an experience can either be binding or liberating.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 5:12 PM
Title: Re: nihilism
Content:
omnifriend said:
if we let go of craving and aversion all the time, isnt that nihilism? i dont understand. is it to be understood intellectually? please no talks on how pleasure is the path right now, just looking for bare bones basic buddhism 101.

krodha wrote:
Don't abandon craving/aversion, for that is merely an aversion to craving/aversion due to craving what you believe their absence may reveal. Instead seek to intuitively understand that where craving and aversion arise... you arise, and where craving and aversion are not... you are not.

Likewise nihilism is attachment, don't abandon attachment(or it's opposite: aversion), for that would be an aversion to attachment/aversion due to attaching to what you believe their absence may reveal. Instead seek to intuitively understand that where attachment arises... you arise, and where attachment is not... you are not.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 2:49 PM
Title: Yamantaka Mantra Used In TV Series 'Breaking Bad' Episode
Content:
krodha wrote:
I was catching up on this show the other day and was surprised to hear Yamantaka's mantra used during a scene(Season 3 Episode 13 "Full Measure"). It's a violent scene where Mike(resident dirty work handyman) goes on a bit of a killing spree. Weird they'd

choose the mantra for a sound bite, not sure if it has any significance other than sounding ominous to the untrained ear. The mantra can be heard at various points through the scene (at the start and then again around 3:10 in the clips linked below). Sounds like Gyuto monks. Couldn't find a code that would embed the video but here's some links to the scene.

http://www.amctv.com/breaking-bad/videos/breaking-bad-talked-about-scenes-mikes-killing-spree

http://www.mefeedia.com/movie/49857878

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 7:40 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism and nature
Content:
tk_leaf said:
Hello everyone,

I am curious about the value of nature and proper relation to in in the context of Buddhism. II know that in East Asia Buddhism historically coexisted with Taoism, Shinto etc., in which untainted nature, nature spirits/gods and such are very important. There are also some ideas that everything, even trees grass and rocks have Buddha-nature. But so far I haven't been able to find any similar ideas in Tibetan Buddhism. From the books I have, I got an impression that nature basically does not matter - you can spend your life meditating in some stone room without any contact with nature, and you won't miss anything important. And spirits of forests/mountains/etc are just hungry ghosts. Is my impression correct, or did I miss something?

I am also curious about relation between Buddhism and ecology/green ideas (well, apart from the idea that we should feel compassion for animals and try to reduce their suffering).

Thanks.

krodha wrote:
Nature matters a lot I would say, the elements are a big aspect of Tibetan Buddhism. They correlate with the prominent colors used in imagery such as prayer flags etc... Though ultimately nature isn't taken to be a truly substantiated and independent extant but a play of ones own energy. There ends up being no border or separation between man and nature. It all manifests as a continuum of sorts. Everything we normally consider to be phenomenal aspects of reality are said to be empty.

The earth outside, the stones, mountains, rocks, plants, trees and forests do not truly exist.
The body inside does not truly exist.
This empty and luminous mind-nature also does not truly exist.

Although it does not truly exist, it cognizes everything.

- Vajrayogini

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:23 PM
Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves
Content:
Jax said:
Sun, I never rejected anything, you missed the whole point. As rigpa, notions as abomination along with it's emotional flavor, never arise as Rigpa takes no position regarding better or worse. Sem is not present in rigpa , hence such concepts as abomination would only arise from the mind being in a confused state.

krodha wrote:
My point was that when it comes to interacting with each other and/or expressing ourselves, obviously using language to communicate, dualities are completely unavoidable... 100% part and parcel. In discussing anything dualities are implicit, even if an antonym of abomination (such as beautiful) was chosen it'd still be a naturally dualistic statement. In the actuality of rigpa these positions may not be present, but in speaking about rigpa (conventionally) they naturally come through... but honestly that's neither here nor there, I don't think anyone claimed to be abiding in the natural state (and even if they were it's still besides the point).

In my opinion, it makes no sense to fire on someone for making a statement reflecting how they (and others) feel because it contradicts the actuality of the natural state. And for the record I didn't miss the point, I understood what you were trying to say. It's just throwing rocks in a glass house. I disagree that such concepts (as abomination) would only arise from the mind being in a confused state, they arise from the implementation of language for communicating, and there's nothing wrong with that, it doesn't reflect the level of ones realization or anything of the sort. In stories Guru Rinpoche used to vaporize his enemies... Drukpa Kunley used to go around enjoying alcohol and women... so words definitely don't contradict the natural state. Again, I have no contention towards you... but you spend an awful lot of time negating the "confused state" (because everything is the dharmakāya) to state that the implementation of a concept like "abomination" would only arise from an afflicted mind.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 1:35 PM
Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves
Content:
Jax said:
You also mentioned"abomination" earlier... That sounds like your mind is still plagued by the demon of believing in "good and bad", "better and worse". The non-dual vocabulary of rigpa does not include such words as "abomination". The other

vocabulary available would be that used by sem. What happened to "nyamnyid" as same taste wherein all appearances are equal in value?

krodha wrote:
Sounds like YOUR mind is still plagued with the demon of believing in "good and bad", "better and worse" yourself, being that you're rejecting the use of a conventional expression of language like "abomination". What did happen to "nyamnyid" Jax? Falling victim to your own projection! You can't be serious!

As soon as linear language and concepts come into play acceptance/rejection, good/bad, better/worse are automatically present.

And the "non-dual vocabulary" of rigpa vs. "the other vocabulary" of sems? Talk about duality! Not to mention the "non-dual vocabulary" of rigpa does not include such words as "abomination"? More acceptance and rejection. Funny that it would also be acceptance and rejection to reject "the non-dual vocab" of rigpa rejecting "abomination". There's no escaping duality in language. It's naturally fragmented.

Luckily for us duality is an illusion. And that being the case you should know better, teacher.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa
Content:
Jax said:
In my experience reading texts such as this one can trigger a sudden dissolution of subtle dualistic grasping revealing the ever present, non-dual Clear Light Knowingness. Do others experience the same?

krodha wrote:
I still can't tell if verbiage you use such as "ever-present, non-dual clear light knowingness" is describing the all-ground or the natural state. The vague nature of a phrase like that in the context of this teaching can go either way. Especially to someone who's inexperienced and is genuinely seeking your insight to try and understand dzogchen. The vagueness of that terminology coupled with the way you present the "it's just this there's nothing to do" aspect of the teaching is recipe for disaster. A mere realization of the all-ground's characteristics along with one misinterpreting the non-causal nature of dzogchen as a form of literal complacency could potentially give rise to a false sense of attainment that prevents genuine realization.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 2:48 AM
Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread
Content:

Wesley1982 said:
ok,

I've been reading this info about 'What the Buddha taught'. . at the Chapter 6 section It discusses 'Anatta' doctrine of no soul.

So, why no soul in Buddhist thought? . .

krodha wrote:
Buddhism teaches that what we normally take to be a "self" (our own separate self-ness aka what makes you Wesley) is merely a series of aggregates or "skandhas"... Like pieces that when all pieced together create the illusion of a self and a world. Buddhas discovery was that there was no self and no world.. Both are illusions. And this discovery was an experiential release from the illusion which brought him to an inexpressible truth beyond birth and death, the dharma is his method to lead others to this truth.

About this the Buddha said:

"It is just the dharmas[aggregates, appearances] that combine to form this body. When it arises, it is simply the dharmas arising; when it ceases, it is simply the dharmas ceasing. When these dharmas arise, [the bodhisattva aka enlightened one] does not state, 'I arise'; when these dharmas cease, he does not state, 'I cease'."

And also:

"There is a sphere of being where there is no earth, no water, no fire, nor wind; no experience of infinity of space, of infinity of consciousness, of no-thingness, or even of neither perception nor non-perception; here there is neither this world, nor another world, neither moon nor sun; this sphere of being I call neither a coming, nor a going, nor a staying still, neither a dying nor a reappearance; it has no basis, no evolution, and no support; it is the end of dukkha."

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 2:22 AM
Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
I'm sure that some Christians who properly understand the 'Christian Bible' would object to "idol worship" or declare "false gods."

What do we say to that? not sure.

krodha wrote:
Ancient Greeks who worshipped Zeus would probably object to a notion of Jesus and

proclaim him a false god.. With belief systems it all comes down to where/when you were raised. So what does that tell you? They're just beliefs... Buddhism isn't based in belief but in empirical investigation and understanding which comes from experience and practice. There are some sub sects of Buddhism which are more of a belief system but the majority isn't. If you approach Buddhism as being a mere belief system like christianity then (in my opinion) you won't be getting the full experience. It's more of a practical undertaking based on trial/error, cause/effect, reasoning etc..

And again the tendency for Christians (or any other religion) to declare other religions/philosophies 'idol worship' or 'false gods' is due to the fact that they're identifying with a belief. And in order for that belief to be legitimate one has to negate everything else, it's done out of insecurity. Buddhism (in the most compassionate way possible) calls this ignorance and dualistic attachment and instead seeks to understand how the mind falls prey to such behavior and teaches how to prevent it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 1:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will
Content:
Fa Dao said:
BTW, what does rga thal gyur mean in English? and who was it written by etc?

krodha wrote:
Reverberation Of Sound/Penetration Of Sound

Listed here along with the others:

http://yoniversum.nl/daktexts/tantras17.html

I started a thread awhile back trying to see which ones had been translated and where to find them, but unfortunately not many are available at the moment... Hopefully that changes!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 2:43 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will
Content:
Jax said:
...Our Natural State is an ever present living, vivid awareness or perceivingness that is ALWAYS the place from which we are viewing.

krodha wrote:
I'm not contesting this to be contentious or anything, but if the natural state was merely this vivid awareness or perceivingness then what would the purpose of these teachings be? And to say that the natural state is this "place from which we are viewing" actually

localizes the natural state to 'here'... and is also saying that vision (as a mode of sensory perception) originates from a certain location(which granted is common sensical to most people, but is not applicable in the context of the natural state).

Jax said:
The Dharmakaya is what's noticing in duality or non-duality. When colors are seen, that which notices the sensory experience is this primordial "noticing" or Rigpa. When the noticing recognizes itself that is the yeshe of Rigpa, rang jyung yeshe. There is no need to alter or adjust experience or mental activity in any way.

krodha wrote:
Positing a 'that' which notices sensory phenomena and apprehends appearances such as color is the general feeling that most people experience everyday, that can't be the natural state either, it suggests the observer-observing-observed trifecta which is the cornerstone of dualistic perception and it's processes. Also, "that which is noticing" sounds too much like a substantiated awareness with the way you word your insight regarding this faculty. And if there's "no need to alter or adjust experience or mental activity in any way"... then why isn't liberation manifesting for the majority of those who in fact do go about their lives without altering or adjusting their experience or mental activity in any way? Following your logic there should be no reason for the Dharma at all... for the Dharma would be akin to teaching a fish how to swim.

Jax said:
Simply the noticing of your current condition as-is, is this unchanging primordial Knowingness of the Dharmakaya. It's hysterical when you realize the quality of your simple noticing awareness that is present under all circumstances is your primordial Dharmakaya Awareness, recognizing this obviousness is Rigpa. The "problem" is that it's too simple to believe that our always present clarity of observingness is the Dharmakaya! It's what is observing or experiencing, yet it is unmodified by all experience, like reflections having no impingement upon the glass of the mirror in which they are arising. From either this being "pointed out" or "introduced" a cognitive shift takes place suddenly and unmistakenly... Like a flash of lightening it's completely Known. And what's known is that your already present "naked noticing" has always been all that you are. Timelessly present in samsara or nirvana, whether asleep or awake. Nothing improves it or obscures it. If there seems to be an obstacle, that very "noticing" of your conceived "obstacle" is also It! Let me know if this makes any sense at all...

krodha wrote:
I'm not trying to nitpick at you, I'm really not, any criticism I'm giving is without the least bit of contention, I have nothing against you at all and I'm glad you partake in adding insight to this forum. My refutation is only in the theme of seeing that correct view is propagated so that as many individuals who are interested in this teaching can benefit from it and are blessed with the ability to access their perfection. The issue is that you either understand this teaching and completely choose the wrong way to describe it, or you don't understand it and your misunderstanding comes through in your insight.

Jigme Lingpa sets up the main part of his The Words Of The Omniscient One not with his

own instructions, but with those of an imagined teacher of the simultaneous method, in order to subject the statements of this teacher to criticism. He begins with this advice from the imagined teacher:

Those meditators who are fatigued by the penance of solitude and the burden of things to be counted and the teachers who support them are a long way from the definitive secret, the truth of the Great Perfection. If they can come to the place of the ultimate truth of meditation, just by recognizing stillness and just by recognizing movement, there is no need for any other kind of contemplation.

To which Jigme Lingpa(as himself) replies with:

"Although you may achieve an initial acquaintance with the realization of the great ascension to ever-purity by throwing everything out at once as stated above, you will not really have come close to it."

Later in the same text Jigme Lingpa quotes a passage from Longchenpa's Lungti Terdzö in which much the same criticism is made:

The sage oriented toward realization who explains to every flawed person with little merit he meets, "The genuine realization that whatever arises is the nature of the dharmakāya is itself self-arisen wisdom," and, "Absorption is accordingly nescience and manas," teaches what is tantamount to a fabrication that seduces beings. Because of this, one sees [disciples] who are cut off from the profound Dharma, which will not be found elsewhere. Such a teacher is a thief of this vehicle. There are many appearing nowadays.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 11:27 PM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
heart said:
Buddha never said there was an ego in the first place.

krodha wrote:
Right, thats what the whole point of my post was.

heart said:
Anatta doesn't affirm anything. Your thoughts constantly affirm an non-existing ego. The Buddha just pointed-out the obvious.

/Magnus

krodha wrote:
I'm not affirming anything, the ego is an illusion. And it can't be as obvious as you're making it seem otherwise there would be no point to the Buddha's teaching.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 3:47 PM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
Jax said:
Or perhaps Sun, instead of:

"The Great Perfection, in a sense, abides prior to imputation because it takes into account that use of the intellect is actually populating experience with dualisms(and time itself) which are inherently absent in it's true form appearing as one's true nature(vidyā)."

Perhaps the Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... As opposed from being separate from or prior to?

krodha wrote:
In the context of breaking (or avoiding) the habitual tendencies which create and sustain avidyā the initial step is abiding in that unchanging nature which transcends arisings. That space is neither here nor there, close or far, up or down, left or right, self or other. The Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... only in the context of their suchness, and only in the context of that initial unchanging nature being ascertained not as a substratum located 'here' subject(separate/prior) to the series of arisings, but as the arisings themselves, appearing to themselves, non-arisen and non-established. There is only THAT and THAT is beyond the 4 extremes. So truly to say that the imputations/dualities ARE the Great Perfection can't be said, because the dualities are born of imputation and the imputation is born of ignorance, the entire unfolding and habitual reification of this ignorance is avidyā itself. Even though once true realization takes place it is intuitively known that avidyā was unreal from beginningless time, to posit that avidyā lacks reality from the perspective of avidyā itself, only sustains the illusion. There are subtle facets and levels within the illusion, in attempting to jump straight to declaring all is the Great Perfection the underlying and debilitating delusion persists.

I posted this in a response from another thread and it's relevant to what I'm attempting to say here:

...Telling someone they are already perfect can again be misinterpreted as advocating complete non-action. Granted the action is ultimately illusory, but it's only illusory from the vantage point of the natural state. Non-action is also the route, but done skillfully. The natural state is not causally attained in any way or by anyone, yet the path must be walked, otherwise one remains in delusion which causes suffering, no matter how illusory it is, it appears real.

It has to be presented in steps in most cases (even if they end up being illusory), except on rare occasion when one becomes realized simply upon hearing it the first time. I

agree that the natural state (though beyond the 4 extremes) is all-that-is in a sense, but only upon the actualization of final fruition. Until that has been established those attributes do not apply. It's much like anattā, prior to that experience (necessary and actual experience) the idea of no-self was merely a philosophical notion. It actually could be intellectually understood to the point where I had in fact convinced myself that I knew there was no self... and thought I "understood" or "got it" for the longest time. Until that actual experience dawned and annihilated all of that, an actual experience which removed all doubt, and after that (even though the emptiness of self was fully apparent) I felt foolish for having thought I initially understood from whatever mental/philosophical gymnastics I had employed. Avidyā is like a plague, it's a disease which causes suffering and skews the true nature of reality. The Great Perfection is not the disease and the necessary steps to curing the malady need to be taken in cases where they're appropriate. So I can see what you're trying to point at but it's too extreme a position to take in my opinion, the process is an illusion but nevertheless a process takes place... hence the beautiful quote which started this thread.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 1:43 PM
Title: Re: What creates the illusion of time?
Content:
wisdomfire said:
I have been pondering on this for a long time. Time is supposed to be an illusion, so is space. Can someone explain what is the term 'timelessness' like in actual experience? And how is time created as an illusion? Thank you.

krodha wrote:
Time is believed to be composed of the past, present and future. Of these three, the past is past only in reference to the present and the present is present only in relation to the past, future is future only in reference to the present. So all three being interdependent, even for their very existence, it has to be admitted by sheer force of logic that none of them are real. Therefore, time is not.

Experience is the only criterion by which the reality of anything can be decided. Of the three categories of time, past and future are not experienced by any, except when they appear in the present. Then it can be considered only as present. Even this present - when minutely examined - reduces itself into a moment which slips into the past before you begin to perceive it, just like a geometrical point. It is nobody's experience. It is only a compromise between past and future as a meeting point. Thus the present itself being only imaginary, past and future are equally so. Therefore, time is not.

So your present wakefulness is always in this 'now', everything happens 'right now'... wherever you are or whatever you do, it is always 'right now'. Time, comes into being when thoughts which seem to be recalling a previous happening arise in this present moment and this thought(called memory) is then said to be commenting on 'the past'. However, all that is occurring, is an image arising 'right now' which seems to be representing "another time". Likewise, thoughts which seem to be projecting events

which have not yet come to pass arise in this present moment and this thought(called an aspiration, hope or fear) is then said to be about 'the future'. However, all that is occurring, is an image arising 'right now' which seems to be representing "another time". Lastly, this present moment, is only the present moment in relation to the past and future, the past and future only being presently arising thoughts are never experienced as actual 'times' so therefore the present cannot be the present and time is seen as empty.

Every "moment" is the first moment that has ever been, but being that first would imply second and third, it's not the first or the last nor anywhere in between. It's an utterly timeless eternal 'now' (And even now only exists in reference to 'then' and is therefore negated).

Here is the teaching on the four great unchanging (essential points called) "nails."
(First) there is the great nail of the unchanging view:
This immediate present awareness is lucidly clear.
Because it is stable in the three times, it is called "a nail."
(Second) there is the great nail of the unchanging meditation:
This immediate present awareness is lucidly clear.
Because it is stable in the three times, it is called "a nail."
(Third) there is the great nail of the unchanging conduct:
This immediate present awareness is lucidly clear.
Because it is stable in the three times, it is called "a nail."
(Fourth) there is the great nail of the unchanging fruit:
This immediate present awareness is lucidly clear.
Because it is stable in the three times, it is called "a nail."

Then, as for the secret instruction which teaches that the three times(past, present, future) are one:
You should relinquish all notions of the past and abandon all precedents.
You should cut off all plans and expectations with respect to the future.
And in the present, you should not grasp (at thoughts that arise)
but allow (the mind) to remain in a state like the sky....

- Padmasambhava

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 9:13 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
Sally Gross said:
Perhaps a distinction needs to be made between ego (self, atta/atman) and consciousness, which is not-self (anatta/anatman) ..... Denial of the existence of ego in ultimate terms (paramattha in Pali, paramartha in Sanskrit) is certainly not annihilationism, any more than using the first-person singular pronoun (the dreaded "I") in conventional terms (sammuti in Pali, sa.mvrti in Sanskrit) is ipso facto eternalism.

The Ananda Sutta in the Pali canon is perhaps relevant here. (See http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn44/sn44.010.than.html " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;).

I hope that this makes sense.

krodha wrote:
This is good to keep in mind, however one still needs to be careful with the implementation of distinctions like this. As it is, this teaching is already irrefutably predicated on one's intention to establish an authentic distinction between the relative condition of ignorance(avidyā) and one's true nature(vidyā). So distinctions are useful and already clearly present(for it's the purpose of the dharma to take one from ignorance to wisdom). Ignorance and wisdom in and of themselves automatically imply separate and distinctive attributes which define their respective natures; I'm sure most of us agree/understand that avidyā(ignorance) implies identification with an illusory self(ātman, atta), whereas the contrasting condition of vidyā(wisdom) implies non-self(anātman, anattā). So distinctions are obviously helpful, the only issue is that in actualizing the true path which takes one from ignorance to wisdom acquiring the skillful means and discrimination to properly traverse the obstacles and habitual tendencies which create ignorance is of utmost importance.

Not merely understanding that there is in fact a distinction between avidyā and vidyā, but coming to ascertain why and how. Dzogchen is unique in this aspect because it goes straight to the "source" in a sense, and while it could involve itself in establishing the myriad distinctions it actually(in the absolute traditional sense) does not. The reason for this is important and is why Dzogchen can claim to be the swiftest path to liberation.

In the act of establishing and introducing the conceptual dichotomy of the ego(ātman, atta) vs. non-ego(anātman, anattā) there is obviously the tendency to deny the ego. Which is naturally because one comes to understand that the ego is illusory and perpetuates avidyā, therefore the dissolution of the ego would naturally bring the manifestation of wisdom. While this is true and appropriate insight to keep in mind, unless one intuitively understands the nature of the ego then this same insight can tragically reify and strengthen the ego.

For the sake of avoiding this predicament it should be understood how the ego manifests(the nature of it's appearance) and why Dzogchen traditionally avoids reifying this distinction. And this doesn't pertain strictly to ego/non-ego but to any distinction.

Egoic mind is not merely thought(ideas, memory, notions, concepts, belief), but thought that is identified with and/or grasped at. Ego is identification with thought on any level and in any form. So the ego IS thought which is being projected (objectified/subjected) and apart from projected thought ego is absent. Amalgamation of thought is the intellect and what needs to be understood is that the very implementation of making a distinction between ego/non-ego is itself a product of the intellect.

So the denial of the ego is a product of ego, likewise the affirmation of the ego is a product of ego. In either instance the ego is reified and can even be further solidified if one doesn't catch this slip. This property can actually even be applied to the necessary notions of egoless mind and/or consciousness/awareness. Being that egoless mind and consciousness/awareness are concepts they are product of the intellect and are objects to/of the very same ego they purport to contrast. However that isn't to deny the implementation of such concepts(or the intellect itself), it's just something to bare in mind and remember. The reason for this is that unless one has the skill and discrimination to not get caught in ones own projections, notions of egoless mind/awareness/consciousness can become objects themselves and therefore the subject(ego) is kept alive in this grasping and true "seeing" is blocked. Another way this becomes an issue is when the clarity aspect of the nature of mind is mistaken as an apprehending consciousness(or awareness) extending out into space from the pseudo reference point of 'here'.... coupled with the illusion of time, this faculty is erroneously misperceived as a substratum and (as ignorance habitually unfolds) becomes the base of all afflictions(all-ground, kun gzhi). So projected thought plays a huge role in one's experience because it truly is the definitive and delegating factor which decides the manner in which manifestation conforms and appears. Manifestation seemingly alters it's appearance in accordance with the notions projected upon it. This is how the five lights become the five elements and so on... reality has a certain degree of plasticity in this way.

But getting back to the point, creating the distinction between the ego and non-ego actually serves to solidify an ego which in truth isn't there. And further the ego then feeds on this duality of itself and it's absence, in addition to also feeding on the dualistic notions of it's own existence(as a subjective entity) contrasted against that which is posited to be other-than-itself(objects). So things go from 0 to out of control very fast.

Dzogchen avoids this predicament by (at first) abiding in one's natural and spontaneous manifestation of wakefulness that stands prior to seeming arisings of phenomena, and it rests there without humoring the intellect, thus avoiding further dualistic imputation. Thoughts are allowed to self-liberate upon appearance avoiding identification and proliferation. As one gains confidence in this "position" other faculties such as timelessness(previously obscured by thought projection) begin to become more apparent. From there, resting on ones potential laurels graciously revealed by the teacher in direct introduction, the true nature of mind (if cultivated properly) can flower in it's fullness.

The Great Perfection, in a sense, abides prior to imputation because it takes into account that use of the intellect is actually populating experience with dualisms(and time itself) which are inherently absent in it's true form appearing as one's true nature(vidyā). While absolutely necessary, the use of the intellect if uncoupled with skillful means, becomes the very snare one is attempting to escape from.

In the end that which was imputed as "thought" by thought itself, is innately known to be the nature of mind appearing to itself as itself (along with all other previously imputed appearances).

"Here the external forms that are perceived are not designated as empty of self. When emptiness is made an intellectual object, the form and emptiness aspects of the object arise in the intellect. However since the perceived forms have no intrinsic characteristics, those forms should not mix with the intellect. Therefore the statement, 'Emptiness is not other than form, nor form other than emptiness,' should be taken as an axiom"

Jigme Lingpa's argument here seems to be that, through analysis, the intellectual method of establishing emptiness generates the concepts of form (gzugs / rūpa) and emptiness, while in fact the form, as it manifests, bears neither the characteristics of form nor of emptiness. The distinction between form and emptiness comes into being only through the application of intellectual analysis to that which manifests.

.....Jigme Lingpa paraphrases the well-known lines from the Heart Sutra to argue that the nondistinction between form and emptiness stated there is in harmony with the usual presentation of emptiness in the Great Perfection. The union of form and emptiness is not taken as a goal, but as the already present nature of that which manifests. This is the explanation given for the rejection of a conceptual, dualistic mode of establishing emptiness. A non-dualistic practice of emptiness is also emphasized in YL where Jigme Lingpa writes that in gnosis, "appearances are not cut with the razor of emptiness."
It is suggested that in KGN that the distinction between relative truth and ultimate truth is another false duality. The line is "In the awakened mind there is no relative or ultimate truth." In accordance with this rejection there are very few references to the two truths in any of these Longchen Nyingtig texts.

In SN, Jigme Lingpa enumerates four mistaken approaches to emptiness, which he calls the "four ways of straying (shor sa bzhi)." These are borrowed from the Mahāmudrā tradition, where they are to be found at least as far back as Dagpo Tashi Namgyal (1512-87), who enumerates them in his Legshe Dawai Özer. They are (i) straying into the condition where emptiness is an object of knowledge, (ii) straying into taking emptiness as the path, (iii) straying into taking emptiness as an antidote, and (iv) straying into taking emptiness as a seal. The first three errors are related to the criticism of approaches to Madhyamaka set out in the previous paragraphs.

- excerpt from "Approaching The Great Perfection" - Sam Van Schaik (in italics)

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
I am not contesting anything, that is your projection. I am trying to understand the difference between the Madhyamaka view rearding sunyata and the Dzogchen view regarding the Basis....

krodha wrote:
Took this from the "Differences Between Dzogpa Chenpo And Madhyamaka" section in "The Practice Of Dzogchen" by Longchen Rabjam (Translated and annotated by Tulku Thondup)

Madhyamaka, having distinguished the appearances and emptiness separately, emphasizes the concept of emptiness. Dzogpa Chenpo, having distinguished the Intrinsic Awareness, the pure and natural state of mind, from mind, realizes and perfects the Intrinsic Awareness directly and nakedly. Thereby it realizes the truth of the whole universe free from discrimination and extremes. Longchen Rabjam explains:

"Most of the methods of comprehending (analyzing) the freedom from extremes (mTha'-Bral), and so on, of Natural Great Perfection are similar to Prasangika Madhyamaka. However, Madhyamaka regards the emptiness as the important thing. (Dzogpa Chenpo), relying on the primordially pure and naked Intrinsic Awareness which is just non-existent and unceasing, comprehends it (the Intrinsic Awareness) and all the phenomena arisen from it as free from extremes like space."

Jigmed Tenpa'i Nyima summarizes in the following lines:

"In Choying Dzod (Ch'os-dBying mDzod), etc., there is praise for the (view of) Prasangika Madhyamaka philosophy. Thus (Dzogpa Chenpo) follows Prasangika in regard to (defining) the limits of the object-of-negation (dGag-Bya'i mTshams-'Dzin). However, (Prasangika), having distinguished the appearances and emptiness separately, apprehends the emptiness of non-affirming (Med-dGag) negation, calling it the distinction of the appearances and emptiness or the exclusion of emptiness. It is a method of maintaining (meditation and view) by concepts. It also asserts that if one first distinguishes (the view) by concepts and gains experience (of it) through meditation, then it will become as it is said: "with the fruition of bliss, clarity and no-concept mind." In any case, Dzogpa Chenpo tradition uses the intrinsic awareness as the path, or it maintains only the intrinsic awareness. It does not employ concepts since concepts are mind, and it meditates (on intrinsic awareness after) distinguishing the mind and intrinsic awareness separately."

Although in pure Dzogpa Chenpo one doesn't train on admitting the energy into the central channel, the training is more effective and direct than the trainings given in the tantras. Dorje Wangchog Gyepa Tsal explains:

"Those who have attachment to the path of skillful means (Thabs-Lam) think, 'No matter how good the path of Dzogpa Chenpo is, since it doesn't rely on the method of admitting the energy into the central channel, it's (realization) is not higher than an experience of (the meaning taught in) Madhyamaka.' This kind of wrong judgement arises (due to) lack of understanding of the essential points. The (sole) purpose of admitting the energy into the central channel is (as a means) to arouse the primordial wisdom (which is realized directly in Dzogpa Chenpo)."

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
Jax said:
Wow! What amazing sharings of profound erudition! However, perhaps being a bit of a contrarian, I might suggest that there is no need for a Dzogchenpa to accurately understand in a precise way any of these philosophical details. The common ground for Dzogchen and Madhyamaka is the experiential wisdom of nirvikalpam samadhi. Through applying the Madhyamaka dialectic a non-analytical "samadhi" results, nirvikalpa samadhi. This is a non-dual state, the realization of "kadag". It's a condition of utter transparency. It's vividness is lhundrup. The "vividness" is an alert Knowingess of it's condition. If you realize kadag, lhundrup is automatically there, no further study or practice is necessary as they are inseparable from the beginning. Lhundrup is not some unique quality that only Dzogchenpas can know. The "luminosity" is fully mentioned in Hinayana and Mahayana sutra. We should perhaps discuss methods to come to nirvikalpam samadhi, or concept-free Knowingness. It is only in nirvikalpa samadhi that we may access the fully liberating non-conceptual yeshe or Wisdom. There is no need to know anything about all these conceptual details for realization. Liberation is not an "understanding", but rather is non-dual samadhi or ting'e dzin. Newbies maybe overwhelmed by all of these discussions "about" rigpa, but one is only ever introduced to one's natural state, through samadhi, no matter how it's "triggered". I very much appreciated Xabir's experiential sharing. Knowing the origins or definitions of the base intellectually brings one no closer to samadhi or ting'e dzin. However, as a personal note, I do enjoy the scholarly discussions greatly, yet I know a precise intellectual understanding regarding Dzogchen has nothing to do with non-conceptual self-knowing or yeshe. The one doesn't lead to the other...

krodha wrote:
Good to see you back Jax, things seem to be going better this time around, you seem to be choosing your words better which isn't giving off such an advaita-esque feel to your insight. I agree that there isn't an essential need "to know anything about all these conceptual details for realization" as you said, but for some it may be helpful and necessary. It's easy to get lost in wrong view and misunderstanding which can veil and obscure Dzogchen. For instance(as stated earlier in this thread) it is important to know the difference between the natural state and kun gzhi, failure to make this distinction is suicide in this teaching.

I'd also argue that non-conceptual knowingness isn't an essential prerequisite to accessing the natural state, it can be helpful, but one does need to understand that in becoming attached to the actual experience of non-conceptual knowingness (or hope for non-conceptual knowingness) that very non-conceptual knowingness becomes an object in and of itself, and thus dualistic view(mistaken as wisdom) supersedes and obstructs the natural state if one lacks discrimination. Nirvikalpa samādhi is also a temporary state, one reaches this "summit" of nirvikalpa samādhi and then "regresses",

it's actually a pseudo attainment(in the face of the natural state) and can be dangerous if one over-identifies with it instead of using it as a tool to access the natural state.

Even the Advaitin Shri Atmananda Krishna Menon downplayed nirvikalpa samadhi:

"Some yogins hold that you can experience the Absolute only by going into the nirvikalpa state. If this is so, it is not the highest; since it limits the Absolute to a state, however broad.
Therefore, in order to reach the natural state, which is the highest, you have also to transcend this last taint, namely the misunderstanding that you can experience the Absolute only through nirvikalpa samādhi."

And then he even goes as far as to claim that the nirvikalpa state is artificial:

"The pioneers of the traditional (cosmological) jnyāna path understood and interpreted the spontaneous state of deep sleep as the seat of causal ignorance. It was with a view to avoid or remove this ignorance by human effort that the nirvikalpa samādhi was invented. They succeeded in their goal only partially; because when they came out of the samādhi state, the shroud of ignorance engrossed them once again. So a permanent solution had to be sought again."

And mind you this is a teacher of Advaita... so I'd say that in Dzogchen this temporary state of nirvikalpa samādhi is even less appropriate. In Dzogchen the non-conceptual knowingness can tragically become an 'object' just like the nirvikalpa state(as said above), this is why the duality of stillness and movement must be seen as a fallacy, otherwise it can become a block,

Mipham elucidates this predicament;

"When you rest your attention in naturalness without thinking anything whatsoever and maintain constant mindfulness in that state, you may experience a vacant and blank state of mind which is neutral and indifferent. If no vipashyana of decisive knowing is present, this is exactly what the masters call 'ignorance'. It is also called 'undecided' from the point of being unable to express any means of identification, such as 'It is like this!' or 'This is it!' Being unable to say what you are remaining in or thinking of, this state is labelled 'ordinary indifference'. But actually, it is just an ordinary and nonspecific abiding in the state of the all-ground.

Although nonconceptual wakefulness has to be developed through this method of resting meditation, to lack the wisdom that sees your own nature is not the main part of meditation practice. This is what the 'Aspiration of Samantabhadra' says:

'The vacant state of not thinking anything
Is itself the cause of ignorance and confusion.' ....."

- Mipham Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 7:34 AM
Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience
Content:
YogaDude11 said:
The fewer thoughts is happening as well. When that state happens that i described, there is absolutely nothing. I mean the mind is still.

krodha wrote:
When you rest your attention in naturalness without thinking anything whatsoever and maintain constant mindfulness in that state, you may experience a vacant and blank state of mind which is neutral and indifferent. If no vipashyana of decisive knowing is present, this is exactly what the masters call 'ignorance'. It is also called 'undecided' from the point of being unable to express any means of identification, such as "It is like this!" or "This is it!" Being unable to say what you are remaining in or thinking of, this state is labelled 'ordinary indifference'. But actually, it is just an ordinary and nonspecific abiding in the state of the all-ground.

Although nonconceptual wakefulness has to be developed through this method of resting meditation, to lack the wisdom that sees your own nature is not the main part of meditation practice. This is what the "Aspiration of Samantabhadra" says:

"The vacant state of not thinking anything
Is itself the cause of ignorance and confusion."

.....(continues on from here)....

- Mipham Rinpoche

Mipham's explanation continues from there, into a form of pointing out instructions which wouldn't be appropriate for me to post (I apologize for building you up and not delivering!), but know there is some important insight to be gained from direct introduction that a teacher like Namkhai Norbu can provide... and I hope you do pursue it because you've built a strong foundation for yourself to correctly perceive what he'll be pointing at and it's nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: What is the difference between a Christian and a Buddhist?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Good videos... worth watching both (and the others in the series) but if you want an expedited explanation of the fundamental difference in views between Christianity/Buddhism he sums them up pretty clearly starting at 7:58 in Pt. 2

ALAN WATTS: Buddhism And Christianity Pt. 1 of 2
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eV7FLlRmuf0

ALAN WATTS: Buddhism And Christianity Pt. 2 of 2
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rr73khHDqeE

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: What is the difference between a Christian and a Buddhist?
Content:
Wesley1982 said:
I also think there is a misunderstanding about the golden statues which some Christians could call "idols" . .

krodha wrote:
They can be called idols(although i wouldn't call them that) as long as it's clear that any image of Jesus or crucifixion statues etc are idols as well... Any image the mind can relate to is technically an idol. The difference between buddhism and christianity is that most buddhists don't "worship" anything, much less any images of Buddha. Unlike christians who clearly worship an idol but like to pretend they don't, and are so insecure that they actually claim everyone else is idol worshipping so they can get a false sense of legitimacy in their practices. It's bizarre. When Jesus said thou shalt not worship false idols that means any image the mind can conceive, including himself... which leads to a more apophatic form of theology, and would actually be more akin to Buddhism in some ways. But christianity went a different route altogether. Christians nowadays are clearly cataphatic idol worshippers gone wild.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 4:09 AM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
Dronma said:
The Duality is manifesting externally as the separation of the self and the other.
The Duality is manifesting internally as the separation of the self and own's action.

When both separations cease, the separation between internal and external disappears.

PS. I do not agree with the negation of "no one", since any negation encloses the analogous affirmation of "someone".
Let's go beyond any negation and affirmation...

krodha wrote:
Though "no one" is an affirming negation, to reject this convention based on the inescapable fact that it naturally suggests(and creates) it's opposite counterpart is no different than accepting it. The negation of (and desire to go beyond) acceptance and rejection is itself a subtle rebirth of the acceptance and rejection dichotomy. Rejecting the convention and accepting what is postited to be other-than-conventional(which is itself a convention). The "going beyond" is contained within the seeming duality of acceptance and rejection itself, for the duality is an illusion. There is nothing to accept or reject, and that includes the act of acceptance and/or rejection itself (and also the futile desire to go beyond them).

The moment a subject relates to an object, acceptance and rejection, attachment and aversion, are immediately present. There's no harm in implementing the conventional concept of "no-self" as long as it's understood to be just that. The very self it(concept of no-self) negates arises from (and is sustained by) the very act of accepting/rejecting which is perpetually reborn as long as experience is dominated and swept away by the plague of delusion the initial(no-self) concept attempts to reveal. So you're right to be weary of this notion, however while you're correct in stating that only the "self" would dualistically accept/reject the self/no-self, it must also be taken into account that likewise only the "self" would accept/reject the acceptance/rejection of the self/no-self. It becomes an inescapable downward spiral(hence the endless cycle of samsara, the shoreless ocean of suffering). This is why skillful means and right view are so imperative. The more one struggles to escape, the tighter samsara's noose becomes around ones throat. But at the same time utter non-action is the same death sentence. There's no going beyond acceptance and rejection, it was empty from the start, the unestablished cannot go beyond that which is likewise primordially unestablished. There was never two to begin with.

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed;
Independent of the conventional, no [ultimate] truth can be found. - Nagarjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 11:53 PM
Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa
Content:
krodha wrote:
I enjoy this one; Xabir turned me onto it actually ^^^

The Buddha speaking to Bahiya, after Bahiya had insisted multiple times that he expound his quintessential view:

In the seen, there is only the seen,
In the heard, there is only the heard,
In the sensed, there is only the sensed,
In the cognized, there is only the cognized.
Thus you should see that
indeed there is no thing here(subject);
This Bahiya, is how you should train yourself.
Since, Bahiya, there is for you
In the seen, only the seen,
In the heard, only the heard,
In the sensed, only the sensed,
In the cognized, only the cognized,
and you see that there is no thing here,
you will therefore see that
indeed there is no thing there(object),
As you see that there is no thing there,
you will see that you are therefore
located neither in the world of this,
nor in the world of that,
nor in any place betwixt the two.
This alone is the end of suffering.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 10:17 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist Prime, finally!!!
Content:
krodha wrote:
Man that's some skillful means using the swastika... make sure you're very careful! I'm sure you are... worrisome though, I have friends who wouldn't even ask about it before taking action and it's frightening... as good as your intentions are I would hate so see something bad happen to you, be safe!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:38 AM
Title: Re: Why is it when I do visualizations, I get tired?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Edit: (Haha I just posted this and then read your post Dechen! Didn't mean to restate the same insight!)

Sounds like you also may be too relaxed perhaps. It's one of the two.. Over exertion or under exertion. Finding that balance is key. Maybe try noticing the intensity of practice, if you start feeling tired then focus more, and if you feel too tense then let up and relax. Also perhaps visualizing something easier like a ball of light and then different colors,

something simple may be less strenuous to start. And then work up to a candle.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience
Content:
YogaDude11 said:
Have you had any experiences similar to what i have described?

krodha wrote:
The non-arising of thought or "hard to tell if thought is arising" instances are usually just an inevitable product of regular sitting meditation... And then couple that with tuning your energetic movement in yantra yoga and I'm not surprised you're having experiences like this. The only issue with it, is what comes into play with the lack of transmission like Namdrol was saying (transmission for Yantra Yoga/Dzogchen practice). With the transmission you're then going to be operating from the fundamental view of your true nature which will allow all practices to excel to their full potentiality and respective fruitions much more easily. Even though ones true nature ends up being the base, path and fruition itself... So the view governs your activity, and what happens is that instances like being caught under the sway of experiences like non-thought and vibratory manifestations doesn't happen (or may happen but then is quickly noticed and liberated). Because in truth, when it comes to Yantra Yoga these secondary results are not the point, the point is the continual tuning of the energy to achieve balance so one can abide in the view effortlessly and also remain healthy so one can avoid succumbing to illnesses. It's a supplement to Dzogchen practice and is meant to be approached in that context. So maybe something to think about! The transmissions can only be beneficial. And you'll probably find that your practice will be of much greater value.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 1:02 PM
Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Please tell me what happens to channels and physical body when practicing Dzogchen

krodha wrote:
The question is predicated on misnomers.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Breathing through nose vs. Through mouth in Dzogchen
Content:

alpha said:
this is a very important point.not to be disregarded...

the reason for breathing with the mouth slightly opened is that the movement of the winds in the chanells will be restricted and they will not move in the normal way.
When they move in their normal way(by closing the mouth and breathing through the nose)their movement will give rise to discursive thought and therefore the practitioner very easily falls into duality.

By restricting their movement you create a condition for the discursive thought to be stoped.

krodha wrote:
Thanks for your response / explanation, much appreciated! Funny, even though I feel like I should know better, I failed to see the connection that breathing through the nose would indeed be stimulating energetic movement and therefore stimulating thought... even though I suppose the habitual reification of the stillness/movement dichotomy ultimately serves as a block, surely in the beginning the less potentiality there is for distraction the easier it is to rest in uncontrived naturalness, glad you pointed that out!

Nangwa said:
It depends on what practice you are implementing.

krodha wrote:
So the difference would be practices which are based on energetic stimulation of winds (which implement breathing through the nose).... as opposed to practices where the winds are being suspended to aid in pacifying discursive thought (which implement breathing through the mouth)?

---

heart said:
Unfortunate that Crystal Cave been put on the net. But I guess it been out of print for a to long time.

krodha wrote:
Understandable, I'm also glad it's available for those interested in reading it, it's listed online for $220!

heart said:
I would really like to inspire you and others to get the transmission and instructions on that text as well as "Advice of old Vijaya" by Sechen Gyaltsab, root Guru of Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. They are very special indeed.

krodha wrote:

I'd love that, how would one go about receiving the proper transmissions?

heart said:
Oh, in Dzogchen you always breath trough the mouth.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Indeed good to know... thanks for your insight, much appreciated!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 2:11 AM
Title: Breathing through nose vs. Through mouth in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've always practiced breathing gently through the nose.. And was also taught this is appropriate due to the correlation with stimulating the central channel, but I recently came upon this teaching titled "Key Points In Dzogchen Practice" written by "A Carefree Vagrant" the opening lines include this...

"...look with wide open eyes and without support into the sky straight before you, since the eyes are the gates for the manifestation of wisdom. As for the key point of speech, let your breathing flow naturally, not through your nose but very gently through your mouth. There is a reason for each of these points, so do not disregard them or think them unimportant."

Sounds like an important thing to take note of.. Anyone know what the significance of breathing through the mouth is? (as opposed to nasal inhalation?)

Note to moderators: I would have posted this in the meditation section but seemed more appropriate here given that the insight is based on what is correct in the context of dzogchen specifically.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 10:21 AM
Title: Re: A few questions
Content:
ghost01 said:
I am curious, can tonglen be your only meditation practice, or should it be practiced with other methods too? What is common?

krodha wrote:
There was another thread where tonglen was mentioned in the past couple months... I don't recall the name of the thread unfortunately, but maybe do a search. The visualization of taking others negativity by inhaling it in the form of black smoke was the

part in question... There was speculation about whether or not this could produce adverse side-effects in practitioners who lacked stable view. Could be merely speculation, maybe someone who is more knowledgeable could elaborate...

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 7:54 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Dronma said:
I'd like to bring this question to the surface of the board again, since it was buried by many posts.
So, from the replies it seems that "Dzogchenpa" is a qualified, serious practitioner of Dzogchen. Isn't it?
Then, what is the term for the female Dzogchen practitioner?
Dzogchenmo or Dzogchenma?

Pero said:
Perhaps there isn't one. The -pa doesn't necessarily indicate the male gender wherever you see it. In this case I think it simply means someone who is in the state of dzogchen.

Dronma said:
I think that -pa indicates the gender.
I'd like a response from someone who really knows.

krodha wrote:
The natural state is genderless! I remember specifically being taught not to identify with any moniker related to dzogchen. It's not really of that nature, not a religion or philosophy or something that one can say "I am this". I remember there used to be times where I'd ask my mentor a question and he'd look at me and ask "are you dzogchen??!" and I'd reply "no" and his eyes would light up and he'd laugh and say "very good". But he refers to my son as a dzogchenpa, I think its more a term of endearment one refers to another with, not really a self appointed title to identify with. I also recall rinpoche touching on this in a retreat a long time ago.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2012 at 2:32 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism?
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Buddhism: The Religion Of No Religion" by Alan Watts has a pretty all encompassing overview when it comes to the fundamentals and the different schools and vehicles. He also has some good talks you can find online

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2012 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Bhusuku said:
Dear asunthatneversets & Pero,

many thanks for your replies. And asunthatneversets: Altough I'm generally quite bad when it comes to visualizations, I don't have much problems visualizing a mirrored tibetan A, however, the mirrored HUM gives me some trouble...

krodha wrote:
Just become familiar with it, maybe find a high resolution image online you can print out, or pull up the image so you can look at it on your screen, locate it in a book or even draw it yourself. Trace it with your eyes and get to know the symbol... the more you familiarize yourself with it the easier it'll be to visualize it, just like flash cards in school for example. I'm sure you can visualize your own bedroom pretty easily, but visualizing a friends' room correctly you've only visited once or twice or seen in passing would be fairly difficult, it all comes down to consistency and earnestness. I have a friend who has a wildly intricate symbol associated with a particular terma printed out(and laminated) on 8.5x11" paper in a rainbow gradient which he uses to become familiar with the image. Just work within your circumstances/capacity and what's appropriate for you, just like rinpoche was saying yesterday' there's no limitations to practice so whatever is going to help you discover your natural state and abide in it is 100% appropriate.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2012 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Pero said:
Mirrored. That is, if someone were to look at you he could read the A.

krodha wrote:
That's right i forgot to account for that, its mirrored if it's visualized being located in your body (head, throat, heart etc..) Or if its being emanated out into space or to a yidam/being. But if it's being visualized in front of you in space it's not mirrored. But like I was saying the english "A" is a good failsafe... Alot of people like using the Tibetan A because it feels more authentic and that's good if it makes one feel a stronger connection to the process but the english A can be used too, or any other symbol familiar to the practitioner that represents A. Starting with the english A is good sometimes because for those with limited visualization ability trying to do a practice while struggling to properly visualize a symbol which may seem awkward or difficult to produce can be an unneeded distraction to the practice. Especially if ones trying to flip it around.. the english A is the same both ways. Even beginning with a colored thigle with no symbol can be good for beginners, and then as the visualizations increase in strength you can add layers to make it rainbow and/or add symbols. Your visualizing is

like working out a muscle, it will gain strength, clarity and solidity with time if you're practicing regularly. There's stories of great masters manifesting appearances into what's considered by most to be the "physical world" because having increased that energetic visualization capacity to such a strong level, there's no longer a bordering line between the visualization and vision itself.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 22nd, 2012 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Bhusuku said:
Hello everybody!

I'm a new member of the Dzogchen Community. I participated in the last WWT and after receiving the necessary practice books/cds I started practicing thundus. However, recently a question regarding the visualizations popped up during my practice. If I visualize the white A for example, do I have to visualize it in a "normal" way, i.e. the way it is written, or do I have to visualize it in a mirrored way? The same question applies to the mantras - for instance, the Thun-book says that one has to visualize one of the mantras rotating clockwise. But does that mean rotating clockwise from my own perspective, or rotating clockwise from the perspective of, lets say an observer standing in front of me?

I hope someone here could help me with this problem, because I really don't want to do the practice in a wrong way. But if this question is inappropriate to ask on a public forum, feel free to delete this post.

krodha wrote:
Visualize the A like "A" and then it's the same mirrored/unmirrored... visualize everything according to your perspective unless you're sending it out to other beings or into space etc then reverse it... when you're receiving it back from other beings/space then it's again normal to your perspective

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, March 21st, 2012 at 6:45 AM
Title: Re: essential texts
Content:
featherhead said:
thank you for the suggestions.
it's just hard to figure out where to start, as one thing i have learned is that buddhism is not at all like most "religions" in the sence that buddhism seems to have nothing like the christian's "bible" or islam's "koran"; one book that kinda says it all.
there seems to be a million different things to read depending on exactly which path you choose to follow, which is where i am having trouble. i don't know what path is right for me, and with so many different paths, and so many different translations of so many different texts, i find myself just "throwing darts at a map" trying to decide what direction

to go in.
any further help any of you can offer up would be greatly appriciated.
thanx again.

krodha wrote:
It's good you're taking your time to investigate different paths and vehicles in the dharma. If its any consolation they all mirror each other in one way or another so any insight you gain is going to be applicable across the board for the most part. And even if it isn't knowledge applicable yana to yana it's still good to be multi-cultured between the schools and vehicles, because after all it is about your own personal experience. As for finding what's right for you, when something intuitively resonates with you on a level where a teaching is found to be especially compelling, that is probably the place to start. And once you choose a certain direction that doesn't mean you can't delve into the other schools of thought, it's good to stay open to anything that can be beneficial to you and others.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Were deviating into dangerous waters fast here!

Dronma said:
Better than splashing in the mud, asunthatneversets!

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WX8KXx40hRA

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:
krodha wrote:
Let's try to stay constructive everyone... Were deviating into dangerous waters fast here!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:
Dronma said:
Much Ado About Nothing!
The whole topic has been mutated to a personal controversy between gad rgyangs and Namdrol.

krodha wrote:
What seems like personal controversy on this thread is more like a resurfacing battle which originates from an epic and ancient war spanning eons of thread. We may never see the end of it, but know that you'll learn some interesting things and gain valuable insight while it goes on. It never sleeps and it cannot be stopped... Resistance is futile!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:03 AM
Title: Re: Consciousness in the Heart Sutra
Content:

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 2:25 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
if sentient beings are not the source of marigpa, then what is?

krodha wrote:
Sentient beings are the product of delusion and misapprehension, so saying that sentient beings could be the source of something is like claiming the snake in the rope/snake analogy could be the source of something. The snake is only the result of something, which is misunderstanding and delusion, likewise sentient beings are the same. Nonrecognition is the source of marigpa.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 2:13 PM
Title: Re: Consciousness in the Heart Sutra
Content:
krodha wrote:
What makes you posit that the skandhas are interpretations of noumenality? It seems like you're holding an assumption that sensory perception is a translation of something beyond the senses.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen
Content:

Sönam said:
The crystal canal is not about mind ...

Sönam

asunthatneversets said:
Whatever term you would say the crystal canal concerns is synonymous with what I'm designating as "mind". I don't usually refer to it as mind either, it only warranted that title in the context of this thread to show the wide array and uses of the term "mind". So any deviation in shared view between you and I is going to be merely semantical.

Namdrol said:
No -- in this context the mind is physiologically sited in the lungs, and wisdom is sited in the heart. This is one key difference between the common teachings (i.e. mind has no source, no location and no destination when it leaves) and the uncommon teachings (mind has a source, a location and a destination).

N

krodha wrote:
Ok I was using mind as a synonym for wisdom, i wasnt implying sems was in the heart, but you're right not the best attempt at swapping terms since mind is accounted for already my mistake

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 12:52 AM
Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Its value/use applies mostly to tögal I'm pretty sure

Sönam said:
The crystal canal is not about mind ...

Sönam

krodha wrote:

Whatever term you would say the crystal canal concerns is synonymous with what I'm designating as "mind". I don't usually refer to it as mind either, it only warranted that title in the context of this thread to show the wide array and uses of the term "mind". So any deviation in shared view between you and I is going to be merely semantical.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 9:23 AM
Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Could it not be that mind does not have a place to stay, because its very base would be emptiness?

So would the mind realy abide inside the body together with its memory?

Mutsog Marro
KY

asunthatneversets said:
That's the difference between thought-based "mind" and "mind" as in the primordial "enlightened nucleus" or whatever label it's given in the heart. There's pretty in depth descriptions of how mind resides in the heart and actually manifests out into(as) the "objective sphere" through the eyes.

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Thanks for your reply.

In how far, would be that inside - outside experience over the medium "eyes" , be illusion ?
Then, in how far could be that experience be valued or be of use ?

Mutsog Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
Its value/use applies mostly to tögal I'm pretty sure

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Could it not be that mind does not have a place to stay, because its very base would be emptiness?

So would the mind realy abide inside the body together with its memory?

Mutsog Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
That's the difference between thought-based "mind" and "mind" as in the primordial "enlightened nucleus" or whatever label it's given in the heart. There's pretty in depth descriptions of how mind resides in the heart and actually manifests out into(as) the "objective sphere" through the eyes.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 3:37 AM
Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen
Content:
CapNCrunch said:
"asunthatneversets" recently quoted Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche from (I'm assuming) the Second book in the "As it is" series thusly:
The relationship between dharmadhatu, dharmakaya and dharmadhatu wisdom is like the relationship between a place, a person and the person's mind. If there is no place, there is no environment for the person to exist in; and there is no person unless that person also has a mind dwelling in the body. In the same way, the main field or realm called dharmadhatu has the nature of dharmakaya. Dharmakaya has the quality of dharmadhatu wisdom, which is like the mind aspect."
I happened to read this right after reading a passage from Longechenpa's commentary on the Precious Treasury of the Basic Space of Phenomeon, (Richard Baron, LCN's translation) where Longchenpa is quoting the "Great Garuda" and says: (pp 50 of the 2001 Padma Publishing text)
Just as a flower has no place to grow in the sky, having no support, the mind is not localized in the body, so there is no possible support for habitual patterns
1) Is this apparent contradiction just a translation issue - one of the hazzards of not understanding Tibetan while still trying to understand the Great Perfection teachings based primarily on texts that have been rendered in English, a language that is, by all

accounts, simply not a good interface w/ Tibetan?
2) If it's not a translation issue, then why the contradiction?

So, to echo the question posed (for the first time ever) by the Pixies: "Where *is* my mind?"

krodha wrote:
It can also depend on the context of the statement, and to whom it's being directed. There's obviously lots of ways the mind is spoken of, you get statements like; the mind resides in the heart, everything is mind(including what's perceived to be a body/world), there is no mind, the mind is localized, its non-local and non-established, etc... I'd say the safest bet is just to know that mind/body/universe are all intermittent states, then you don't get caught on being stuck on a certain notion, and each statement is allowed to be appropriate in it's own right, because they're all correct in their appropriate contexts.

And then you also need to know when mind is being spoken of as the thought-based-mind, and mind as in the awareness, consciousness type "mind" and then the ultimate nature of mind which is clarity and emptiness. There can be alot to discriminate between.

And "where is my mind" is also a common tool the historical Buddha and countless teachers since traditionally implement. It can be a useful and effective exercise. Usually the thought-based mind is the one in question there. But it can be used in the other ways mind is spoken of too. They'll all give the same result more or less.

The heart is the residing place for the mind in dzogchen though.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 1:44 PM
Title: Re: Cancer rare in Egyptian mummies.
Content:
krodha wrote:
There's no doubt industrialization, chemical byproducts, genetic engineering of food by companies like monsanto, hormones in meat and dairy, western medicine being controlled by big pharma companies who need artificial strains so they can patent their meds that merely treat symptoms instead of curing, pesticide spraying etc are the cause of the sharp increase in cancer... Were destroying ourselves.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

Dronma said:
I agree with asunthatneversets.
I am new in Dharma Wheel, so I do not know what was happening before.
But if the numerous topics and discussions which misrepresent Dzogchen is exclusively a latest phenomenon, then - with all the risk to sound paranoiac - I say that it could be a deliberate attack....

krodha wrote:
It wasn't deliberate I think they meant well and have their heart in the right place.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
It's wonderful that it's accessible but traditionally it was only given to those deemed mature enough to comprehend it's message.

krodha wrote:
Orville Redenbacher

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
And unfortunately it's implicitness has potential to be misunderstood and ran with by those who automatically relate it to traditions like advaita etc..

trevor said:
You don't know that, so please admit it. You don't know what "other people" think.

krodha wrote:
There was a series of topics and discussions on here in just the past week which were exemplary of this. In the sense of both misconstruing dzogchen to be advocating utter complacent non-action (as opposed to skillful non-action) and also mistaking clarity as a fundamental ground awareness instead of understanding the clarity to be inseparable from emptiness. It seems to be pretty self-evident this tends to occur.

My comments aren't directed towards anyone in particular, I'm just noting that it tends to happen. Which is why there was such a calculated and monumental backlash to such notions on this board recently, because those notions misrepresent this teaching. This is the downside to the open and easily accessible state of dzogchen this day in age. It's wonderful that it's accessible but traditionally it was only given to those deemed mature enough to comprehend it's message. So in it's wide distribution to individuals of

capacities and backgrounds which span the spectrum there is room for misunderstanding. And if that misunderstanding is allowed to proliferate then the integrity of the teaching can be potentially compromised. So for that reason misunderstanding paraded as genuine insight must be systematically annihilated with extreme prejudice. Conservation of integrity is of utmost importance.

And you're right, none of us can read "others" thoughts, but we dont have to when theyre openly put on display in the form of misguided insights and erroneous views.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 12:48 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:
White Lotus said:
1. Patrul Rinpoche to Nyoshul Lungtok:
''Theres really nothing to it''
''Do you see the stars in the sky?''
''Do you hear the dogs barking in the Dzogchen monastery?''
''Do you hear what i am saying to you?''
''Well, the nature of Dzogchen is this, simply this.''

the first approach could be summed up... just be. or according to lonchen Rabjam, normal awareness....

best wishes, Tom.

krodha wrote:
I think it's more that those who don't understand misinterpret and misconstrue this type of statement to be advocating that ones normal afflicted nature is "it", but that isn't what he's saying. He's using skillful means to convey the nakedness and simplicity of pure perception. But it certainly isn't describing the delusional dualistic perception dzogchen and the dharma serve to remove. And he isn't saying "just be", his words are meant to aid in discovery, and remove notions of seeking for it "elsewhere". He's just saying "here, it's this right here, now seek to understand how and why it is just this". Method 1 and method 2 are the same, it's just method 2 is a bit more explicit while method 1 has a more implicit nature. And unfortunately it's implicitness has potential to be misunderstood and ran with by those who automatically relate it to traditions like advaita etc..

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 6:13 AM
Title: Re: Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche about Non-Duality
Content:
heart said:
More good stuff from DJKR

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

/magnus

krodha wrote:
The metaphor he uses at 24:35 is great... thanks both of you for posting these

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 3:55 AM
Title: Re: "...and after 12 years, he was liberated into space."
Content:
padma norbu said:
HENH!? <- that's a very nasal "huh?!"

krodha wrote:
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5TFDCrcoboQ

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 7:02 AM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
what if you're a closed-minded petty intolerant self righteous fundamentalist and you practice dzogchen, what are you reborn as then?

krodha wrote:
Rush Limbaugh

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 6:07 AM
Title: Re: after understanding im nothing
Content:

tuddel said:
the problem is i dont find a reason to continue this life.logically even my body doesnt want to continue as i see.
im not saying this in a depressing way.im very happy actually.
but then i see many people suffering and i need to help them then that i see is the way.

krodha wrote:
But if this "you" has clearly been apperceived to lack inherent existence, then what is not finding a reason to continue in this life? What is there to accept or reject life? It seems the same "I" that was seen to be nothing has re-emerged in that insight, which actually serves to negate the initial insight. The true absence of the "I" should manifest as a complete and total severance beyond intellectual understanding.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 5:22 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
it says "since there is nothing but X1 and X2, X does not exist" how does that make sense semantically?

Namdrol said:
You are being myopic:

Here is the passage Vimalamitra is commenting on:

There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.

Context, context, context.

krodha wrote:
Would you say the translation you just posted above is most accurate? (I assume you would being that I'm sure you translated it)

I posted this same passage earlier but a different translation and there seems to be a few clearly noticeable differences. I believe someone(Mr. G?) already posted a quote from you(in response to an unrelated post) stating that use of the term "gnosis" is unnecessary and can actually potentially muddle things up, but aside from that there also seems to be other terms which don't correlate.

This is the other one:
Within self-emergent primordial gnosis,
there are no objects to be experienced,
There is nothing which has previously passed away,
Nor anything which will subsequently emerge,
Nor anything at all which currently appears.

There is no karma,
There are no latent karmic propensities,
There is no dimmed awareness,
There is no mind,
There is no psyche,
There is no insight,
There is no cyclic existence,
And there is no transcendence of misery -
It is not the case that even awareness itself exists.

There is nothing whatsoever which manifests within primordial gnosis.

- excerpt from The Tantra Of The Wordless Secret
(Absence Of Letters | yi ge med pa) or (Letterless Tantra | yi ge med pa'i rgyud)

At any rate I suppose it just goes to show the potential contrasting meanings and connotations different terms can give depending on translation, even though overall they both seem to ultimately convey the same insight.

Also should note because it ultimately coincides with the topic: Jax proceeded to label me a nihilist for posting this passage... and not that the labeling in and of itself matters (I'm not here to bicker about mudslinging), but it does serve to reify the necessity of this discussion at hand. Glad this is all being addressed thoroughly.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita
Content:

samdrup said:
Just Jax vs (mostly) Everyone else on Dharmawheel.....it got ugly sometimes!

krodha wrote:
It was ugly before?! I feel like in this thread... I just metaphorically witnessed Namdrol and Xabir take Jax out back and beat him halfway to death.

It was like office space...

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dN3v0drnTdQ

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 8:20 AM
Title: Re: The Golden Child vs Tibetan Buddhism?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Brotha Numsie!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 6:13 AM
Title: Re: Jax's Dzogchen
Content:
Jax said:
Padma there is no transmission from one to another. It's an illusion. The Wisdom is already you, within you. Nothing is needed from "outside". You are already perfect.

krodha wrote:
Though it is ultimately illusory, the transmission is the pointing out and the subsequent discovery of this innate aspect. So sometimes a push is needed from the "outside". Telling someone they are already perfect can again be misinterpreted as advocating complete non-action. Granted the action is ultimately illusory, but it's only illusory from the vantage point of the natural state. Non-action is also the route, but done skillfully. The natural state is not causally attained in any way or by anyone, yet the path must be walked, otherwise one remains in delusion which causes suffering, no matter how illusory it is, it appears real.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: Jax's Dzogchen
Content:
mzaur said:
What's with the lynch mob? Is this how a Buddha would act? You're only perpetuating your karmic tendencies by acting with attachment and aversion. I agree with Xabir that Jax's realization is of One Mind and lacks insight of non-inherency, but the lack of respectful discourse on here is a bit appalling.

krodha wrote:
Aren't you doing the same with your aversion to the lynch mob? The moment any interaction takes place attachment and aversion are automatically there.

But yes I agree with you I suppose we could all conduct ourselves in a better manner, you are right.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Final Resolution in Trekchod
Content:
Jax said:
Mr. potato head,

Quoting texts like a parrot without direct experience have caused your feathers to be colored by the extremes of nihilism. That text was designed to smash the conceptual frameworks of the minds efforts at reification. This is the same purpose of the Prajnaparamita Sutras. I will call you by your new name: Mr. Parrot Potato Head.

krodha wrote:
I assume this is directed towards me. Your compensation for your own insecurity, projected as an authority of some type has imputed the notion of me proposing a nihilistic view so you can maintain an image of yourself. My view is in no way nihilistic, but I certainly believe the view you expound is more akin to advaita(as do others), contrary to your self appointed expertise on dzogchen you ignorantly propagate. It is unfortunate the wall you have built up around yourself to hide this insecurity won't allow you to listen to others and/or take constructive criticism/critique.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 11th, 2012 at 7:32 AM
Title: Re: Final Resolution in Trekchod
Content:
Jax said:
asunthatneversets:

"Nothing is experienced, and there is no "awareness" perceiving experience. And pure primordial being is not an accurate definition or description of dharmakāya."

If that were true than you must be a potato...

Yes, semantics... perhaps you prefer: "experience is self-aware"

krodha wrote:
Within self-emergent primordial gnosis,

there are no objects to be experienced,
There is nothing which has previously passed away,
Nor anything which will subsequently emerge,
Nor anything at all which currently appears.

There is no karma,
There are no latent karmic propensities,
There is no dimmed awareness,
There is no mind,
There is no psyche,
There is no insight,
There is no cyclic existence,
And there is no transcendence of misery -
It is not the case that even awareness itself exists.

There is nothing whatsoever which manifests within primordial gnosis.

- excerpt from The Tantra Of The Wordless Secret

I'm a potato.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 11th, 2012 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Final Resolution in Trekchod
Content:
Jax said:
The only stability is your unchanging perceiving of whatever is experienced. That unchanging perceivingness is Awareness, the heart of the Dharmakaya (Pure Primordial Being).

krodha wrote:
Dangerous words my friend... unchanging perceiving of whatever is experienced? May be a description of awareness in mindfulness... but not an accurate description of the natural state. You need to be careful with your words... though there is a possibility of your remarks being merely a semantical error, using terms like of whatever is experienced paints the wrong image of instant presence/pure presence. It allows for misinterpretation, and wrong view, which you very well may be victim of yourself, the verdict is still out on this due to the subtleties of the terminology you use, you just barely squeak by. Nothing is experienced, and there is no "awareness" perceiving experience. And pure primordial being is not an accurate definition or description of dharmakāya.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, March 11th, 2012 at 2:51 AM
Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen
Content:

Jax said:
(don't mind me, I'm just Jax, flaunting my super-egotistical fake guru schtick).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 10:46 AM
Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen
Content:
wisdom said:
The only thing that matters is the contents of the texts themselves. Their origins make no difference to me. I will read a Dzogchen text with as much enthusiasm if its written by Garab Dorje or by some bum on the street.

As far as causal vehicles are concerned, if you know the great perfection then you know how causal vehicles benefit those who are not yet able to abide in the natural state without effort. In essence, causal vehicles help people overcome habitual ways of obscuring their own primordial nature, and to that end it serves Dzogchen well.

gad rgyangs said:
according to dzogchen view, causal vehicles are not some kind of preliminary practice for the slow witted, they are delusions. they are the problem, not the solution.

krodha wrote:
But at the same time everything is a product of delusion according to dzogchen. Causal vehicles may be beneficial to some, there is a wide array of capacities and what is appropriate or inappropriate will be based on the individual, I'm sure you can agree...

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 5:52 AM
Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Jaxwheel.net! The big question is; do you resemble jax from mortal kombat 2? And if so how do you feel about this?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:59 AM
Title: Re: What is the Point of Togal?
Content:
Jinzang said:
Because of our strong habituation, it is difficult to see though dualism and abide in non-dual awareness. This is true even after the initial opening. So one uses special methods, like the Six Yogas to complement mahamudra or Togal to complement Trekcho. This is why tantra is considered a fast path, because it speeds up the process. Otherwise mahamudra/trekcho would be more or less the same as sutra practice.

Astus said:
Interesting. They explain the nature of mind as complete with the three bodies and needs no improvement. Of course, that doesn't mean there is no need for practice. But what is strange to me is that compared to "By not altering it from being as it is, The state of buddhahood is now spontaneously present." and "The conduct is nondoing and the fruition beyond adopting and discarding.", I find that, however natural those visions are, all the techniques and instructions are extraneous. Comparing this to Mahamudra teachings, the Six Yogas can be complementary, but they are not necessary nor are they the next step.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't say extraneous, the visions are product of the utter dissolution and exhaustion of dharmata. I wouldn't even say it's to strengthen trekcho... trekcho is the means to cut through obscurations, and rigpa is the basis or foundation of these practices so it's not necessarily to strengthen rigpa either. It's referred to as "leaping over" because it's the pinnacle practice to utterly attain perfect buddhahood fully exhausting all the obscurations of body, speech and mind... a process of returning the elements to their unobstructed and original form of light. There are no contrived visualizations like other common practices, a series of four or five postures coupled with certain gazes and ways of breathing produce a very specific series of visual experiences, each representing an aspect of reality being exhausted. The visions are activated by certain gazes related to certain light sources and/or pressure being applied to certain sense organs in a specific way. It's all lamp, bindu, energy related. Overall it's a complete and total breakdown of "reality" and for that reason it is quite unparalleled by any other practice in any other system. Unbelievable stuff!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 4:30 PM
Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Good read thanks for posting!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 4:07 PM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
krodha wrote:
What other systems have thögal? Goose egg.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 1:39 PM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:
krodha wrote:
Damn xabir just came with the heat! Y'all don't wanna see da heater. And the plot thickens...

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 11:47 AM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
padma norbu said:
At $70 per person per day, he's probably not really raking in the bucks, so I'm willing to believe it's a labor of love and he's really trying to help people... but, lol @ the idea he's figured it all out and we should be looking to him for advice. If he levitates and radiates colored lights, that's a different story....
Like I said, if he can levitate or display something else utterly miraculous, that's a different story. All I see is a kid who thinks he's got it all figured out. Relative to your average jackass, he's ahead of the game, but so what?

krodha wrote:
Are there any living masters who have supposedly attained siddhis like that? I'm just curious for off topic's sake... I haven't heard of any but I'm generally out of the loop. And also not to throw a wrench in the works but levitation and siddhis of that sort wouldn't necessarily mean one was fully realized in a dzogchen sense or anything. Powers may just be a sign that one has done certain practices very thoroughly. That being said they would certainly be quite a remarkable case!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?
Content:
Jax said:
You are confused my friend. Garab Dorje made clear the means of conveying Dzogchen: 1. Direct Introduction to the State. 2. All doubts resolved. 3. continuing in that State (rigpa). There is no need for ANY empowerments. Garab Dorje's view and insrtuctions trump all later deviations as is being incorrectly shared here. Likewise Karma Lingpa or Padmasambhava said "no antecedent or subsequent practices are necessary" regarding the direct introduction offered in the famous terma. People are attempting to reduce Awareness to some sort of attainable state by engaging in foolish empowerments that only apply to "cause and effect" approaches. All these beliefs are no more than confused conceptualizations grounded in dualistic mind (sem).

heart said:
All empowerment's are actually designed to be direct introductions. In the Dzogchen tradition there are accordingly loads of empowerment's, both short and simple as well as long and complicated. Just read through the Rinchen Terdzö empowerment's

http://orgyendorjeden.org/2010-2011-ODD-RT_Record.pdf " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; . Atiyoga empowerment's start on page 101.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
Orgyen Dorje Den! I was invited to help make prayer wheels there today.. Vajrakilaya themed I believe... Couldn't make it though

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2012 at 2:38 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
I counted 6 A's too... That music was wild that popped up, everyone was laughing

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2012 at 7:55 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
Jax said:
From The Treasure Trove of Scriptual Transmission, Longhenpa, Padma Publications.

Page 190: first main paragraph:

Lonchenpa writes: "Since all phenomena are timelessly free, nothing need be done to free them anew through realization."

Next paragraph: "Even the thought that freedom comes about through direct introduction is deluded. One strives to free this essence from whatever binds it, but nothing need be done to free it, for unobstructed Awareness, which has never existed as anything whatsoever, does not entail any duality of something to be realized and someone to realize it. There is equalness because nothing is improved by realization or worsened by it's absence, so there is no need for any adventitious realization. And because there never has existed anything to realize- for the ultimate nature of phenomena is beyond ordinary consciousness- to speak of realization on even the relative level is nothing but deluded. What can be shown at this point is the transcendence of view and meditation, in which nothing need be done regarding realization, nothing need be directly introduced, and no state of meditation need be cultivated. So there is the expression 'it is irrelevant whether or not one has realization'."

krodha wrote:
So the purpose of this is to show that it is already this present awareness, there's no need for one to strive to achieve something else in time. That being said, there are still

habitual tendencies which serve to reify the presence of this pseudo-self which seeks liberation. And normally that pseudo-self posits that liberation is something to be "achieved" as in an end which is reached, which it is in a sense, but not through the effort normally employed and propagated in the lower vehicles. Liberation comes when it is innately discovered that there never was anyone trapped in "samsara" to begin with. So therefore what is shown is the transcendence of view and meditation where nothing need be done regarding realization because if one remains in "the view" (aka rigpa as opposed to sems), the meditation (or non-meditation) takes care of itself. The enlightened nucleus wakes up and begins to recognize it's own display and all one has to do is rest in awareness, as awareness. When knowledge dawns it is seen that the obscurations only ever existed due to habitual imputation (and that may not ever occur because in that fruition, time is not present and neither is the individual who would fall under the spell of imputation to posit such a claim). He's using a bit of skillful means here and presenting an alternate approach to the "process".

Jax said:
Page 191: middle paragraph

"In this case what makes perfect sense in the Ati approach is the superior realization whereby one directly experiences the unobstructed state in it's nakedness, without relying on anything whatsoever. Since one does not experience separation from the essence of Awareness even for an instant, to say that is realized or perceived is merely to use a conventional expression."

krodha wrote:
He's saying this because the 'single point' one "decides on" is this ever-present awareness one is endowed with, yet again, due to habitual tendencies it can remain obscured... and become apparently re-obscured if identification with sems continues to dominate experience. Once it (rigpa) is recognized then one remains in that unobstructed awareness without relying on anything whatsoever. And it requires "no effort" because of the fact that one does not experience separation from the essence even for an instant. Even though, at the same time it requires much effort to break through the habits which bind (but this effort doesn't entail effort by the individual, it is just effort asserted and re-asserted to relax in uncontrived natural awareness which in fact does become completely effortless after some time). To say that is realized or perceived is merely a use of conventional expression because the realization or perceiving would be predicated on the separate "I" or "me" to realize it or perceive it, and the "I" is a convention which lacks inherent existence.

Jax said:
These quotations are capable of freeing infinite numbers of Dzogchenpa's and others who have yet to see beyond the web of their own dualistic projections of "cause and effect" efforts. May all beings prosper!

krodha wrote:
This is true.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2012 at 7:29 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
Jax said:
by Jax » Wed Mar 07, 2012 10:29 pm

Longchenpa makes clear that "direct Introduction" is a fallacy, as the Dharmakaya has never gone out of itself. He also states there is no such thing as " recognition" as one has never left the Natural State. A forgetful ego-self has arisen in the unchanging Dharmakaya. The ego seeks recognition and realization. Awareness has no possible benefit from a direct introduction or the absence of one. Can't you see your existing immediate Awareness is unchanging? Can't you see that your current Awareness is beyond "cause and effect" efforts of such things as direct introductions? Can't you see Awaeeness has not and cannot be obstructed? How can the Dharmakaya be obstructed? Awareness is fully functioning in it's own perfection in each moment. It is engaged in the play of generating a "yidam" that is no more than a character in a dream. That's the " self" that experiences samsara. It's purely a mental construction. One is perfect, Awareness is self perfect. Two perfect, it's samsaric projections are perfect. This wisdom cannot be attained by some seeker... Awareness has never been in dualism.... This is a much more accurate and direct pointing out by Lonchenpa, then what is being offered today in current Dzogchen.

krodha wrote:
Alas! Though I myself am devoid of straying, from my dynamism straying emerges. Nature having arisen unobstructedly and unceasingly from the unchanging Ground, dimmed awareness is naturally emergent from within compassionate resonance's indeterminacy. As an analogy, although clouds form in the sky, it isn't the case that the clouds genuinely exist there but rather they emerge adventitiously. Just so, dimmed awareness is not present at all within the Ground - dimmed awareness emerges from spontaneous presence arising in the manner of compassionate resonance, which comes to be termed "an abiding reality of the Ground's spontaneous presence". Furthermore, this is present as a great indeterminate manifestation.
- excerpt from The Exquisite Auspiciousness Tantra

From within the lighting-up of the great differentiation,
Both existence and non-existence emerge;
The common site is termed the foundation of straying,
And since it becomes polluted with dimmed awareness
That which is known itself appears to be stained.
- excerpt from The Garland of Precious Pearls Tantra

Therein, the Ground of indeterminate spontaneous presence
"Strays" through the pollution of this triune dimmed awareness,
quartet of conditions, and cognitive energy.

- excerpt from The Conch Shell Lettered Tantra

So straying does seem to manifest, and therefore avidyā certainly appears to exist. From the perspective of avidyā a process does take place, though when buddhahood manifests it is known innately that the process was illusory. Honestly, I initially made this same mistake and got my card pulled on here when I first started posting... and I see why now. Even though ones true nature is inherently perfected and wholly incapable of being stained in any way, via the manifestation of innate/imputed ignorance this nature is conceived to be fragmented into the dichotomy of self and other. For this reason ignorance does proliferate and build from the ground up... to say that ignorance does not exist, and that there's nothing to do... would mean that one's dimmed and dichotomous awareness is in fact the full fledged immaculate gnosis achieved through the implementation of anu/ati-yoga and the other vehicles, and this is not the case. So while you're right that this awareness ever-present in one's experience is at base perfect and is fundamentally endowed with the properties/characteristics you mentioned, it is dimmed, and it is obscured by afflictions from the perspective of one trapped in delusion. So unless action is taken one remains in ignorance (even though this is ultimately a falsity once awareness recognizes it's own display and buddhahood manifests). It's a catch 22 and requires skillful means to achieve, because you're right, if one acts from the personal and seeks a goal in time, one remains forever trapped, but at the same time if one does nothing they also remain trapped.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2012 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
duckfiasco said:
Some questions before I forget. I feel like I'm going in circles, but I hope it's actually a spiral... albeit a very, very gradual one

From a relative point of view, we see objective outside being observed by subjective inside, so we can go, "He's rude" and feel like quality X out there is observed empirically by person Y in here. The substance of our being is this experience which we create with our aggregates.

krodha wrote:
'Aggregates' is just a relative term used to break experience down into constituent pieces for means of evaluation. They're solely a convention. "We" create nothing, because "we", "I", "you", "me" are imputed projections (conventions) as well. Nothing is created or destroyed.

duckfiasco said:
It still seems obvious to me though that there is something aside from those aggregates that influences them. Is it still inaccurate to say they're part of the continuum of existence, like cells in a body, even if the aggregates are not a discrete, enduring self?

krodha wrote:
It only seems that way, because you're accepting that there are inherently existent aggregates for some type of influence to act upon. Positing that something is acting upon "something else" is always ultimately a product of projection(but is useful in it's place). Yes it would be inaccurate to say they exist in a continuum of existence. It's truly all tetralemmic and paradoxical in nature when it comes to capturing this truth in words.

It's naturally cleansed of the four extremes' stains.
- The Tantra Of Awareness' Natural Freedom

duckfiasco said:
I can see how changing the process of observation can change what is observed in the sense that the observer has no other referents, but why would that have any substantial bearing on the thing itself, and therefore how others might perceive it?

krodha wrote:
These reference points and processes are conventions of language... and all lack inherent existence. That includes the 'thing itself'. There appears to be bearing on the 'thing itself' because there never was a 'thing itself' to begin with. The perceiving of a 'thing' is a projection of ignorance and the removal of this veil of ignorance is the dawning and actualization of truth.

duckfiasco said:
I feel like I'm getting two messages... that our experience of a thing isn't the thing itself, but then there is no thing, just our experience of it. It feels like it all boils down to subject-object again.

krodha wrote:
Language is naturally dualistic so it's impossible for it to accurately describe that which is being discussed. But to clear up your two messages in a way that points somewhat closely; Experience appears to happen, however there's no experiencer and nothing which is experienced. However the absence of self/phenomena cannot be believed, because the self is reborn in the belief, as that which believes or disbelieves. The experience of a thing is a projection, there is no 'thing itself'(even apart from sensory perception like noumena). So there are no 'things' or objects anywhere in experience(of course there is conventionally). But if this is left on the level of belief then it's a rebirth of the same exact ignorance. A notion of absence is just as imputed as the original notion of appearance. A subject-object split of any nature is a projection of ignorance. Thought creates all separation, the problem is that thoughts are believed, and it's believed that thoughts are merely commenting on a 'thing' which inherently exists apart from the thought. But in truth the thought creates the 'thing'. The thought implies a thinker and that which is thought of. Thought and memory create time, space, everything. If you can start to view thought in it's suchness, as merely a sound, that points to nothing and self-liberates the moment it appears, and then eventually see that there's no one who views the thought but that it is self-originated... and it continues to collapse in from there with a few other possible steps until it's only emptiness.

duckfiasco said:
I remember reading in one of my books that thinking, "I don't exist" and "Only I exist" are nearly the same wrong view. It's frustrating that those options keep popping up in my head.

krodha wrote:
This is because holding onto either view is what reifies the alleged "holder". Only a self would believe there's no self. The intellect cannot access the true state of what-is. Attachment and aversion is what generates and keeps the illusion of self/other alive.

duckfiasco said:
When I meditate on emptiness of self, I dissect all the parts of myself and try to locate where this sense of solid "self" comes from. It's not in my fingers, bowels, eyeballs, brain... it's not in a memory, thought, opinion, or even consciousness which can be knocked out. And not a single one of these exists in its own right, but has a gazillion causes and matter helping them be what they are, while they in turn influence everything else. There's not even really control by something over something. It's just stuff being caused and creating other causes.

krodha wrote:
On the highest platform causes are actually conventions as well, as is matter. But the causal view is no doubt helpful, just don't take it to be an ultimate truth.

duckfiasco said:
So then things start to get very weird. If this is so, what in the heck is observation really, just change by a different name? How is it so clear that there is no observer when I search for one with a fine-toothed comb, then one magically appears as soon as I get off my meditation cushion? And if there is no solid, controlling observer in the ultimate sense, how could there be influence over the process of observation? It feels like it's all smoke and mirrors.

krodha wrote:
Change is an imputed projection. Its a useful convention but experience is always in the immediacy. Observation and processes of observation are also imputed, a process would require time, point of origin, end point, etc.. And observation as an act itself would require an observer and something observed.

duckfiasco said:
And in the big picture, if there is no witness/observer to the aggregates of self and their observations, what is it that causes change from delusion to right view then experiences it?

krodha wrote:
The aggregates are also imputed as mentioned above, as well as observations... the cause for the removal of ignorance is described in different ways, and realization itself varies among the different vehicles. Realization in Theravada isn't to the same extent as mahamudra or dzogchen. Each tradition has it's own nomenclature as well. On the

ultimate platform nothing ever happens, there is no change, no samsara, no nirvana etc.. But that is a little extreme for this discussion. I guess you could say 'that-which-is' suddenly becomes aware of itself, although that isn't exactly accurate either. The metaphor of the sun being obscured by the clouds is good too like Greg mentioned, the sun is ever-present and ever-shining and only seemed to be absent or difficult to see due to the cloud cover. The Dharma is the means to remove these clouds.

duckfiasco said:
I suppose in all honesty, I have no clue how to approach this problem. I can do all the thinking and intellectualizing I like (and believe me I have!) but it doesn't feel like I really know how to apply it. It's like I've studied music theory inside and out, but have yet to play a piano and for that matter, where do you even get one?

krodha wrote:
Again like Greg said qualified teacher is the best way to start. And then depending on your personal preference the vehicle you implement is up to you.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, March 6th, 2012 at 7:57 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Halleys theory does not fulfil one of the four seals of Dharma: " ALL phenomena are empty" ,thus it is not Buddha Dharma.

This is Mr. Halleys facebook profile outlining his personal interests: The Psychology of Paranormal Phenomena, Jungian Psychology, Connection Depth Psychology & Quantum Physics, Clinical semiotics, Spirituality, Psychic side of Sports, movie making and movies for archetypes and as dreams, dream interpretation, Dream Healing Energy, simulation.
Notice how the Buddha Dharma is not mentioned anywhere?

Now please feel free to talk about half-shorn sheep, I can understand and even agree with a lot of what your are saying, but at some point in time you may wish to differentiate between a sheep and a goat. You see New Agers don't differentiate between sheep and goats, they figure if it's got hooves then it must be the same. Unfortunately though, horses have hooves, cows have hooves, donkeys, mules, giraffe, deer and pigs have hooves. Even camels have rudimentary hooves. But guess what?! They are not all the same. Well, except for the fact that they have hooves.

krodha wrote:
I don't think anyones attempting to say Mr. Halley is expounding buddha dharma.

But what he is saying about thought is the same thing the buddha dharma says.

All that we are is the result of what we have thought: it is founded on our thoughts, it is

made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with an evil thought, pain follows him, as the wheel follows the foot of the ox that draws the carriage. All that we are is the result of what we have thought: it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him, like a shadow that never leaves him. 'He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,'--in those who harbour such thoughts hatred will never cease. 'He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me,'--in those who do not harbour such thoughts hatred will cease....

- Opening lines of The Dhammapada

When you look upward into the space of the sky outside yourself,
if there are no thoughts occurring that are emanations being
projected, and when you look inward at your own mind inside yourself,
if there exists no projectionist who projects thoughts by thinking
them, then your own subtle mind will become lucidly clear without
anything being projected. Since the clear light of your own intrinsic
awareness is empty, it is the Dharmakāya; and this is like the sun
rising in a cloudless illuminated sky. Even though (this light cannot
be said) to posses a particular shape or form, nevertheless, it can be
fully known. The meaning of this, whether or not it is understood, is
especially significant.

- Padmasambhava

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, March 5th, 2012 at 3:41 PM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:
krodha wrote:
I was surprised to hear blue too, I went into it expecting dark red.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 9:49 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
duckfiasco said:
It seems this ignorance you mention works on several levels. When we go, "there is a perception" in the first place, is that even accurate? It seems like perceptions themselves only exist in relation to other perceptions that constantly occur as a backdrop, so they too are subject to anatta. Kind of like seeing a mushroom pop up and being unaware of the whole network of fungus underground.

krodha wrote:
I'm using perception as meaning a notion or an idea about experience(experience otherwise communicates nothing about itself, it just IS), so imputed conceptual overlay creates a false sense of separation between what seems to be an inner subjective self and an outer objective world.

duckfiasco said:
So I have ignorance of a perception arising separately, then I liberally misunderstand just what that perception says about the world, then react in accordance with habits and ideas without realizing that part, either. Sounds a bit discouraging! I suppose you can't work through ignorance without realizing how much you have to begin with.

krodha wrote:
Somewhat, the notion that objects and things exist separately(exist at all) is due to imputed perceptions(ideas about experience). And then yes everything spins out of control from there and becomes habitual to the point that this skewed view becomes the way things are, and to posit that experience could exist any other way seems completely counterintuitive.

duckfiasco said:
So in essence, we are a part of everything else. It seems obvious at first blush, but then it's kind of shocking how hard it is to live like this is true. It's very easy for me to accept ideas like my perception of a person is more shaped by my own mind than anything about them. But then you get into things like the double slit experiment, and it's like people (myself included) expect the "real world" to exist as wholly discrete from the subjective human reality. Seeing something as basic as an electron being affected by observation seems shocking. Self-grasping in another form, no?

krodha wrote:
It's not so much a thing you "live like", as if it's adopted as an idea and then you're set. It has to be actualized in your experience, beyond belief.

duckfiasco said:
I guess the challenge is not just reinterpreting this into more subtle terms of ego. It's not that I decide to perceive something a certain way, then it magically changes in substance to match my perception. That seems like the ultimate ego trip.

krodha wrote:
Ha well actually, it is something like that in essence. This usually would depend on what school of buddhist thought you're engaged with though. In some it is that way, substance does change. But there are safeguards to make sure the ego is either completely dismantled or held at bay until it is destroyed.

duckfiasco said:
The barrier for me feels like a tidy little package of habits. Me vs. you, mind vs. everything out there. I feel very drawn to the ideas you've brought up, even though I can't understand them beyond a theoretical vagueness. I have a lot more groundwork to build

krodha wrote:
The barrier certainly is a package of habits! Although if it's tidy or little I don't know, is can certainly seem large and daunting to some.

duckfiasco said:
What does discarding projections mean? Is it similar to the bare awareness that is the goal of some meditations? It seems like it would be very, very easy to attempt to drop projections then in fact throw some others up without realizing it. "Look at me, I'm perceiving reality with no projections, woohoo!"

krodha wrote:
Discarding projections essentially means getting to the point where you're no longer under the sway of your own projections. Notions of separation and feeling that you're a subjective entity living in an objective world (which is separate from you) is actually created by continual and habitual reification of projections over time. I'm not sure what you mean by bare awareness. Yeah that is usually the case, the process of coming to the state of wholeness is based on accounting for habits that create fragmentation, and yes some are very subconscious and will pop up without one realizing it if they aren't mindful and earnest.

duckfiasco said:
Like you tell me later in your post, I'm my own worst enemy here. I'm having a hard time getting out of the way I've thought for most of my life.

For that reason, it seems like what you're saying IS dualistic. Things somehow only exist if I perceive them. More projection at work, I bet. How convenient that someone very learned shares the views I already have!

krodha wrote:
Yeah mostly anything you describe using language and concepts is going to appear dualistic(in the description), it's unavoidable. A vague attempt at capturing it would be; [the observer]-[the process of observing]-[the observation] are all one thing.

duckfiasco said:
Would meditating specifically on emptiness help here? I know you're not preaching some capitalized Truth, more like giving road directions, but I can't even understand the directions yet.

krodha wrote:
Meditating on emptiness is a cornerstone of the dharma and yes it would be helpful. So this would mean investigating into the fact that everything in experience is dependently originated... and that nothing has an inherent existence by itself.

duckfiasco said:
Is this your way of exhorting me to "come and see"? This is all so tricky. I can see what you mean, I think. If we fight the "I" then we just make another "I" that has to somehow

be better than the "I" we're fighting. And it can be even more dangerous if this new "I" is clothed in emptiness, non-self, and other Buddhist concepts. How wise the "I" now seems!

krodha wrote:
I suppose it is somewhat tricky that's why it's a difficult process and requires skillful means to actualize. It's just saying that realization(on one level) is the loss of this "I"... so how can "I" lose the "I"? Any attempt to remove the self is done by the self. So it's a process of chasing ones own tail in a sense. Likewise if one does nothing to attain it, one remains stuck in delusion. So it requires effort, but effort skillfully, and the dharma provides the skillful means to actualize realization.

duckfiasco said:
I take it the way to cut through all this is investigation, pure and simple?

krodha wrote:
Yes but investigate keenly and the right way... the buddha left thousands of ways to do this.

duckfiasco said:
I've found your posts so instructive and helpful, start to finish. Thank you for taking the time to write them and help me along. I'm very grateful

krodha wrote:
Glad to help! Some of the stuff I've said may seem counterintuitive and/or unclear or weird at this point. My word of advice would be to keep at it and remain earnest and hungry for it. In my own experience, i found that whatever I didn't understand I would try my best to, and then I would leave it alone and return to it some time later, even months, or a year later, and it would make more sense then after I had assimilated other information and had other realizations in my experience. So if things don't make sense don't get frustrated and don't give up... the fact that this is possible, that these realizations spoken of can be actualized, is unparalleled in importance.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
krodha wrote:
I actually didn't realize that story was about Drukpa Kunley, he went rainbow?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 6:27 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
gregkavarnos said:

Yup and the mind of a Christian is the same as the mind of a Buddhist, but a Christian will (use their mind) to attribute existence to God, will claim an eternal soul and will posit that religious fulfilment consists of going to heaven and playing a harp all day. Should we also accept that analysis because it comes from a mind?

krodha wrote:
If it's in ones nature to do so, sure. But your example is spot on with what were discussing, that the thought projected onto experience creates the nature of said experience. That is projection.

gregkavarnos said:
Well, we are taking this personally aren't we?

krodha wrote:
Are we? I didn't know.. Sounds like a great time though should we fight about it in the streets? How about meet me in downtown San Francisco tomorrow morning and we'll use kitchen utensils for weaponry... We'll go with spoons.. You can bring a ladle if you really want, you'll have more reach. Bring a pot to wear on your head.. Preferably one with the two handles on the side because if it only has the one long handle that sticks out and it's facing forward you're automatically disqualified. Loser gets a sky burial on alcatraz.

gregkavarnos said:
I'm not trying to prove any objective truth about the videos past the fact that they are not Buddha Dharma. You want to see it otherwise? It's your boat, whatever (Hacking the Unconscious: Beliefs, The Secret & Mind Control???) floats it. I merely pointed out that the videos are new age and that this is a Buddhist forum. Everything else is your projection (well, almost everything else).

krodha wrote:
First off I just want to make it clear that I in no way follow, endorse etc.. This dimitri guy. He has good insight on thought patterns and their relation to experience in regards to their projective nature, but other than that I'm only defending my use of his videos to avoid total discrediting at the hands of Sir Greg "I like to stir the pot" Kavarnos (which I'm glad he does!)

My argument is that the buddhadharma approaches the subject of thought patterns and how they effect ones experience in the same way this dimitri fellow does. Not the rest of it. 'Hacking the unconscious' is clearly referencing dispelling the habitual patterns of thought that reify separation and suffering, which go unnoticed and/or are usually taken to be commonplace amongst most people. 'Mind control' is referencing how many of these habituated patterns are instilled in us as children, especially in the west where spiritual traditions really only tend to reify dualistic view rather than cutting through it. Those terms taken out of context certainly sound radical and almost conspiracy theorist in and of themselves. And no doubt this guy posits some unique theories other than his teachings on projection, but I only referenced his stuff for the insight on thought, not anything else.

So what he says about the nature of thought projection, and what the dharma says are the same.
As I said when I can get to some books later today I will post some dharma quotes which match my sentiments.

gregkavarnos said:
So now this Dimitri Halley dude is the 6th Patriarch Huineng and Drukpa Kunley simultaneously? Whoa!!!

krodha wrote:
Zing! I like your sarcasm, and you seem like a happy guy smiling in your photo i'm glad to see that. My only correction would be that I prefer "Drukpa Kunley the Enlightened Pervert" but other than that you're golden!

gregkavarnos said:
I'll take that as a compliment!
:namaste:

krodha wrote:
Anything less would be uncivilized!

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Firstly, this is a Buddhist forum and the question was posted in the section "way of the bodhisattva" subsection "exploring BUDDHISM ". Buddhism has Abhidharma to explain the workings of mind (basic function of thought), it does not need Jungian psychoanalysis

krodha wrote:
Jungian psychology just happens to be based on projection, which is what this thread is about. If you'd feel better about my points being backed up with Buddhist sources I'll assemble some and post them. They will be of the same nature. The mind is what is being discussed, and the mind and it's attributes are universal. The mind of a buddhist and the mind of a non-Buddhist function the same way. I don't want you to adopt whatever points I'm attempting to make, if something I say doesn't vibe with you then discard it. I don't believe what anyone says, and certainly don't believe the "theories" of this dimiri fellow. I empirically investigated what he pointed to and found that i benefitted from it. All of my statements are free standing, I only posted those videos as a supplement to what I was saying. Look at your mind, and how it accepts and rejects things based on points of reference. Rejecting something automatically because it doesn't scream Buddhism. We understand you don't care for the video... If you think you're going to establish or prove some objective truth about the videos beyond your

own opinion then you're kidding yourself.
gregkavarnos said:
Rajneesh and a whole host of other new age guru types also spoke of the dharma with high regard and saw the monetary profit that could be made off it. That does not make them Dharma teachers. Anyway if he was a full blown Dharma practitioner I am sure it would have been pasted all over his facebok account and his blog profile and...

krodha wrote:
It's speculation either way. You've heard those stories of the head of the monastery posting the statement about the mind and it's mirror like qualities only to return the next morning to find his paper annotated and corrected. Causing an uproar until the janitor finally came forward who had become realized by secretly listening to the teachings and practicing without anyone knowing. And he was named the new patriarch. Or the stories of the village madman who is a beggar and considered an insane nuisance by all the local practitioners disappearing one day... And then everyone finding only his hair nails in his house... Having attained rainbow body and being wise and realized worlds beyond any of the practitioners who ignorantly labeled him a nobody. You never ever know.
gregkavarnos said:
I am not interested (and this thread is not the place) in discussing how anybody's theories contrast/deviate from Dharma. I am interested in Dharma. There's more than enough of it to learn without having to contrast it to the half baked theories of the unenlightened (including myself). I tend to take my Dharma as original as possible, once I fully understand and realise it then maybe I can start to produce my personal take of it. Until then, just call me a fanatic! Buddha mini gun.jpg

krodha wrote:
Fanatic.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 12:33 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
krodha wrote:
Speaking of "new age" teachers; anyone interested in more projection themed discourses and teachings should check out Byron Katie, all of her work is based on projection. She has a simple 4 step process for identifying projection and turning it around to reveal the source within yourself. She calls it "The Work". And she is "Dharma certified".

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, March 3rd, 2012 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Dimitri Halley is a new age psychologist/psychotherapist, not a Buddhist, thus it comes

as no surprise that the videos confused you.

krodha wrote:
Firstly, his question was about projection. Not Buddhist projection, not non-Buddhist projection. Anything this Dimitri guy is saying applies to the basic function of thought (and our relation to thought in general), and it correlates with the dharma just fine. I wouldn't link up some bullish*t and lead people astray. Nor would I share something if i was unsure of what i was attempting to convey and/or my points were based on elementary notions/conjecture. I'm not here to waste anyones time let alone my own.

Secondly, with all respect, how on earth would you know if this Dimitri guy is or isn't a full blown dharma practitioner? Do you know him? For all we know he could be a seasoned practitioner. He certainly speaks of the dharma in high regard and uses Buddhism as an example of a tradition which hasn't strayed into delusional dogmatic religion and still maintains it's roots as a genuine vehicle for soteriological fruition. I know this board is no stranger to a plethora of different people, and some here and there who make unfounded statements, don't mistake me for one of them.

That being said, I appreciate your opinion and I'd love to hear you further explain and specify how these basic aspects of thought contrast and/or deviate from the dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, March 2nd, 2012 at 6:04 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
duckfiasco said:
I have to admit I'm a bit confused about how to use this information about observation, though I find it fascinating.

All this is diametrically opposed to how we normally view things so it's a bit of a mental wrestling match to make sense of it. Is this the gist of the idea in Buddhist terms?

krodha wrote:
It's completely natural to be confused but that's good you find it fascinating! Some would say your fascination signifies that you're karmically predisposed to this knowledge and are ready for it. All of it is undoubtably diametrically opposed to, and surely contrasts how we normally view things but that is the point. How we normally view things is due to ignorance or avidyā, which is predicated on habitual patterns and tendencies to reify a dualistic schematic of subject-object. This dichotomy is unreal apart from it's illusory nature, it has conventional value but apart from being a convention it is a fallacy.

duckfiasco said:
There is an absolute truth (suchness), and we continue to perceive it on relative terms (subject-object) because we latch onto our aggregates as something wholly separate and unique. Ignorant of the existence of this process, we see exclusively our version of

things, believing we have no part in creating what we perceive. There may be hints of what the actual thing or experience is if we try to average out many relative experiences. This may even be what science tries to do.

krodha wrote:
Being able to experience reality in it's suchness is the doorway to liberation, although labeling suchness as an absolute truth in-and-of-itself would ultimately be a misnomer. Suchness is a quality of what-is and is an extremely important pointer, but in this teaching and on one's path to posit any type of absolute truth can be dangerous, I would advise that it'd be beneficial to hold any conviction of absolute truth very lightly. We have to use labels and words to communicate, but ultimately any label, idea, concept etc.. is going to be a projection. This goes for aggregates as well, aggregates is useful in seeing that "things" and experience itself are product of constituent parts but again, to hold this as a truth is only going to serve as a block.

"Just as the Buddhas have spoken of
"I" and "mine" for a practical purpose;
Likewise they spoke too of "aggregates",
"Elements" and "sense-fields" for a practical reasons.

Such things spoken of as the "great elements",
These are fully absorbed into consciousness;
Since they are dissolved by understanding them,
Are they not falsely imputed?"

- Nagarjuna: excerpt from his 60 Stanzas

So seeing that "we see exclusively our version of things, believing we have no part in creating what we perceive" is also important insight to gain because it starts to disarm the notion of taking our perceptions as king. We start to see the relativity of any opinions, beliefs and ideas we hold onto about 'things' and this is a step in the right direction because it allows us to unlatch from our projections in that way. This unlatching starts to bring projections from a level of subconscious imputation paraded as inherent truth, to a new level of 'conscious knowing' that our ideas are merely implementations of conventional language for communication purposes. But this is the catch; this realization of relativity in our notions and ideas is absolutely necessary, but if it's left here then one remains in avidyā. This is because to conceive that it's possible to identify "hints of what the actual thing or experience is if we try to average out many relative experiences" is assuming that there is a 'actual thing' 'out there'. This definitely is what science tries to do, although newer schools of thought such as quantum physics and such are starting to deviate from the old paradigm, the old paradigm still subtly reigns supreme in dominating understanding. That Dimitri Halley guy touches on this in one of those other videos where one of C.G. Jung's successors is being interviewed and is explaining something in the context of comparing something psychologically to known science, with the reigning scientific paradigm being used as the fundamental inescapable absolute truth to make the comparison against... making a comment such as (and I paraphrase) "mythology is always present, that's like asking 'is matter always

present in todays world?' and the answer is of course, yes" to which Dimitri replies(again paraphrased) "there is no matter, that is the illusion". (Mind you I'm not continually going to or quoting this Dimitri guy as some kind of great guru who has all these answers or anything. It just naturally fit the conversation at hand.) But it is inescapably true; this is the scientific process this day in age, and is considered the scientific process. To gain the 'true' knowledge of some 'thing' by using experimentation or deductive reasoning etc... and as I said they're getting closer and closer, but the duality of the 'thing' in question, being an object, will have to be removed before the reality of experience can shine in it's true form. And sadly this cannot be done if it is continually approached from a dualistic perspective, because the dualistic perspective becomes the confines that the experiment dwells within. Reality mirrors how it is perceived, if you perceive it as something separate it is that way, and if you can get to the point where this perception is realized to be projection and it is discarded, then reality will reflect that knowledge. Experience has plasticity in this way, your projections shape and define it, it doesn't define and shape your projections(but of course it does shape you in a fundamental way, you being a projection yourself, and a natural formation or expression of it).

The point being that there is no 'thing' beyond the projection of a 'thing'. There is no way to know something in it's true form apart from your projections about it. There are no hints of the actual state of affairs or the thing in it's actuality. The 'thing' cannot be known apart from your knowledge of it, and the thing is in fact your knowledge itself and inseparable from that-which-you-are. To put it another way, as you stare at this computer screen, you feel as if when you get up and walk away from this computer it is somehow still existing 'over-there' or 'in the other room' or something of that sort, but what needs to be fundamentally understood is that the 'thing'(computer screen) is the experiencing of it. The computer screen IS the visual seeing of it, and the tactile touch sensation of it(I have to again clumsily say 'of it' as if there's something the vision or touch is objectively contacting). The computer screen IS vision, the computer keyboard IS touch. And you ARE the vision, you ARE the touch. Merge with the senses, the subject and the object coalesce to create a continuum, this is your true state. But this must be actualized experientially, apart from intellectual understanding.

duckfiasco said:
If you are enlightened or an arahant, then you have full knowledge of how your aggregates operate. Being a human living in society, an arahant is still subject to emotional responses and distortion via our sensory apparatus like everyone else, but the difference is they intuitively *know* what's going on and can see through their own crap, so to speak. In that way, they're able to know the absolute truth.

krodha wrote:
Yes but why settle for being an arhat? You are only your own worst enemy in this... if you remain open and earnest and ferociously inquire into why this is, you will traverse this path swiftly. Being a 'human' is a projection as well, your true state has existed since beginningless time, ever shining, ever present... it's only obscured by our habitual tendencies and presuppositions(projections). This is why you hear of gurus saying 'let go of everything, let go, let go' because when you drop the projections, the true state of

affairs becomes self-evident.

duckfiasco said:
I'm still very much entrenched in a dualistic view of the world. When I first listened to those videos, it seemed very easy to interpret it as "there is the world out there, there is me in here, I create an illusion of what is out there in myself." Especially dualistic language like observer/observed can be a stumbling block.

krodha wrote:
Ah but you see this is how we become our own worst enemy! By saying "I" am still very entrenched in a dualistic view... "you" can ONLY ever be entrenched in a dualistic view, because "you" imply "not you"... there must be a keen investigation into the nature of this "you" or "I"... if you see through this sense of a subjective self you'll see through the sense of an objective world, the two go hand in hand, but mind you fighting against the "I" only strengthens the "I" because only the "I" would fight. Only the ego wants enlightenment or liberation and it will NEVER get it, enlightenment and liberation will come when the "I" that the whole process is dependent on is seen as false.

Your insight into "There is the world out there, there is me in here, I create an illusion of what is out there in myself." is one level of it, and must be actualized. From there attempt to see through the projections of externality(world) and internality(me in here) they're only projections, the problem is that the projections are believed to be true. Dualistic language like observer/observed can be a stumbling block to some, for them taking the middle ground of simply 'observing' may be beneficial, but each person requires different insight and realizations.

duckfiasco said:
This may seem like it's going into the realm of pointless mental gymnastics, but it feels crucial to understand... I was even wondering how we can tell when to help people and what they need if everything we perceive is ultimately our own view of reality. Someone who appears to need our help or compassion may not need it at all, and vice versa. Basically, how can we know anything if all we know is our side of things? I presume this is why meditation is so crucial... to get to know how you're perceiving so you can even begin to understand what's really being perceived. I can feel my own dualistic view warring with what I'm trying to understand

Sorry to ramble. Anyone ever feel almost crushed by their own ignorance? I have a bit of that going on now

Anyway, thank you all for your thought-provoking comments. I feel like I'm almost beginning to understand something, but the pieces aren't quite in place yet.

krodha wrote:
To truly help others you need to be beyond the need for help yourself. But always help others who turn to you and confide within you, love everyone like you love your own family. A good quote by Bodhidharma comes to mind "If you can understand the mind, everything else is included. ... Those who don't understand the mind practice in vain."

much like the aphorism "know thyself"... if you understand yourself, you understand everyone else, if you understand the inner workings of your own mind, what causes you to suffer, the results of action based on acceptance or rejection then you understand the inner workings of everyone else's minds. Strive for wholeness and peace within yourself and there's no way you can miss the mark in helping others, but always help others in any circumstance, unless you are being taken advantage of, never allow your kindness to be taken as a weakness.

You hit the nail on the head with "I presume this is why meditation is so crucial... to get to know how you're perceiving so you can even begin to understand what's really being perceived" but meditation isn't merely sitting in a lotus posture and visualizing or chanting mantras... it is an all inclusive delving into the depths of your mind at all times, and watching your reactions to events and people, noticing your projections, your judgements, your interpretations, understanding that you are the power behind and the cornerstone of every experience, that you create what you experience on the level of perceiving, projecting, in every shape, way and form.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 29th, 2012 at 3:12 PM
Title: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Which of the 17 Dzogchen tantras have been translated and published? And if so what books are they available in? Partial or complete(by partial I mean a considerable amount, not an excerpt).

I know some are in the Precious Treasury collection by Longchenpa and #12 is translated by Keith Dowman in his book Old Man Basking In The Sun but does anyone know about any of the others? There's a few titles associated with each listed.

1. Natural Arising of Awareness (rig pa rang shar)
Great Tantra of Self-Arising Awareness (rig pa rang shar chen po'i rgyud)
Rangshar Tantra (rang shar gyi rgyud)

2. Mirror of the Heart of Vajrasattva (rdo rje sems dpa' snying gi me long)

3. Lion's Perfect Expressive Power (seng ge rtsal rdzogs),
Tantra of the Perfected Lion (seng ge rtsal rdzogs kyi rgyud)

4. Absence of Letters (yi ge med pa),
Letterless Tantra and/or Tantra of No Letters (yi ge med pa'i rgyud)

5. Beauteous Good Auspices (bkra shis mdzes ldan),
Tantra of Graceful Auspiciousness (bkra shis mdzes ldan gyi rgyud),
Tantra of Great Auspicious Beauty (bkra shis mdzes ldan chen po'i rgyud)

6. Penetration of Sound (sgra thal 'gyur),
Dra Talgyur Root Tantra (sgra thal 'gyur rtsa ba'i rgyud)

7. Mirror of the Heart of Samantabhadra (kun tu bzang po thugs kyi me long),
Tantra of Samantabhadra's Mind Mirror (kun bzang thugs kyi me long gi rgyud)

8. Blazing Lamp (sgron ma 'bar ba),
Blazing Lamp Tantra and/or Tantra of the Radiant Lamp (sgron ma 'bar ba'i rgyud)

9. Studded Jewels (nor bu bkra bkod),
Array of Fine Gemstones and/or Norbu Trako (nor bu 'phra bkod),
Tantra of Studded Jewels (nor bu phra bkod kyi rgyud)

10. Coalescence of Sun and Moon and/or Union of Sun and Moon (nyi zla kha sbyor),
Tantra of the Union of Sun and Moon (nyi zla kha sbyor gyi rgyud)

11. Pearl Necklace (mu tig phreng ba),
Pearl Garland Tantra (mu tig phreng ba'i rgyud) and/or (mu tig 'phreng ba'i rgyud)

12. Natural Liberation of Awareness (rig pa rang grol),
Tantra of Self-liberated Awareness (rig pa rang grol gyi rgyud)

13. The Six Spheres (klong drug; klong drug pa)
or Sixfold Expanse (klong drug gi rgyud)
or Six Spheres of Samantabhadra (kun tu bzang po klong drug pa'i rgyud)

14. Naturally Born Perfection (rdzogs pa rang byung) and/or Self-Existing Perfection

15. Black Wrathful Goddess (nag mo khros ma); referring to a black form of Vajrayogini (khros ma nag mo)

16. Blazing Relics of the Buddha-Body (sku gdung 'bar ba),
Tantra of Shining Relics (sku gdung 'bar ba'i rgyud)

17. Mound of Gemstones (rin chen spungs),
Tantra of the Jewel Mound and/or Tantra of Piled Gems (rin chen spungs pa'i rgyud)

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 29th, 2012 at 8:26 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
ghost01 said:
I think we can avoid being drawn to our thoughts and emotions, but we can not stop them from happening. So we let the thoughts arise and return the mind to stillness, no?

krodha wrote:

You're right you cannot stop them from happening, but what does this fact imply? Why can't you control them? Inquire into the existence or nonexistence of this potential "controller".

Also as for letting the thoughts arise and then allowing the mind to return to stillness; It certainly appears this can happen, and these seeming processes are no doubt useful for navigating our apparent experiences and life in general on a relative level. However, though these processes are useful and appear to happen, they are in fact only useful due to their conventional nature. The "seeming" nature of their conventional appearance manifests because the conglomerate of senses(vision, hearing, touch, smell, taste and their respective "objective fields") combined with what is taken to be subjective inner-appearances(such as thought, emotion, memory) are merged to create the illusion of a substratum(or ground of being) which endures through time. That substratum is translated as "I" or "me" and appears to be separate from 'things' which arise and fall, as if it is an unmoving background which can watch them but remains untouched, like a witness. In truth however, this witness would require time and no time is ever experienced, only projected as existing via memory(past) and anticipatory-thought(future). No past or future are found in direct experience. Memory of the past, and thoughts about the future only ever arise in the immediacy. So there is no substratum("I" or "me") which endures through time, only presently and spontaneously manifested qualities which are of a single nature. That which is referred to as "thought" just appears and lacks a thinker, likewise the senses are self-manifested and lack an observer to observe them... it's even clumsy to use terms like "appears" and "manifest" because it implies time, but these terms are inescapable using language. It's all projection.

Attempt to locate the "I", "me", "you", "he", "she", "they" etc.. in experience apart from thought, or the story that thought tells.

ghost01 said:
If I am my thoughts and emotions, am I also the sunshine, the wind on my face, the feeling of cold or warm on my skin? How are thoughts and emotions different from these perceptions?

krodha wrote:
Thoughts and emotions are no different from those perceptions, and in the theme of "projection" the thought IS the perception. And yes you are all of those things... minus the "you".... and minus the "you" who would believe these things to be true... it's always already the case.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 29th, 2012 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
ghost01 said:
I don't think it's applicable in every situation, but for example when we see police

brutality, and we find ourselves angry and maybe even thinking violent thoughts in response, how could this be if anger isn't a problem in our own mind?

Or when we see someone who is exceedingly arrogant, and we don't like them, how could we understand arrogance, or humility, or any other emotion-- unless they were also present in our mind? So when we encounter a person who invokes a certain emotional response in us that we dislike, it's because that emotion is also strong in us, and when it's invoked we say, I don't like that person.

If we're not drawn into our thoughts and emotions, they don't bother us, and we have no need to project our responses onto other people. Of course, this is kind of a simplification and doesn't always apply.

krodha wrote:
True but there are other levels to this still. And it gets more subtle. I would argue that it(projection) does always apply, in every situation, just not always overtly evident. You are a projection, the other is a projection, so the dance of accepting and rejecting persons, places, things, events, qualities, characteristics, traits, beliefs, opinions etc.. predicated on these illusory positions (self/other) is always rooted in projection. If one thinks any of these aspects are free-standing inherent qualities of experience they are in delusion.

You can't NOT be drawn to your thoughts and emotions because you ARE your thoughts and emotions... there's no one there apart from them. There is no thinker of thoughts, or one who feels the feelings, or 'has' emotions. Not being drawn to ones thoughts and emotions so that they don't bother us is a step in the right direction but if things are left here one remains lost.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 29th, 2012 at 6:27 AM
Title: Re: Defilements and projections onto other people
Content:
krodha wrote:
One of the ways projection happens is the ego's (or thought based sense of identity) tendency to ensure it's own perfection and innocence by projecting problems and defilements onto the other/world as separate causes, as a victim of these causes. The ego does not like to admit wrong, or weakness or any personality trait/characteristic that is viewed as negative and will instead either outright deny these qualities or project them onto others as the other person's characteristics or defilements they inflict onto us.

Other times projections are the resurfacing of past instances of severe emotional trauma which have been suppressed. For example if one was abused as a child and obviously lived in fear due to not being able to control a clearly unfortunate situation, they may either 1) carry that mistrust they had in their abuser or situation forward and place it onto others (people/places) which share the same traits as the initial abuse. Or

2) will reenact the past abuse they suffered onto others because they can now be in control and that reliving of the situation (now at the polar opposite of the spectrum) serves as an emotional catharsis... but is never liberated through the actions.

The hardest ones to catch are the really subconscious projections in daily life which is what I think you're inquiring about... these are tough to spot sometimes, and it isn't an exact science, there has to be some very open inquiry into the possible causes. Sometimes it can be very simple, yet seem greatly obscured due to the ego going to great lengths to remain undefiled.

Something like feeling a statement by a political candidate is divisive is more-so clinging to a view of yourself which is mistaken as an inherent self-evident aspect of experience or reality. If you understand that all that is happening is a bunch of people are standing around spouting opinion and beliefs then it's usually disarmed. But if you want to spot the divisive quality in yourself; it will usually always be your attachment to that which is being contrasted by the other. Sometimes it can be something you want (either now or in the future) because you feel that is what will make you content, so if there is possibility of that being destroyed by another, then you will project an evil quality onto them.

This is why buddhism speaks of the middle way, you're eventually coming to the place free of these extremes and attachments. Because the extreme views and the attachment to these views creates this false sense of identity.

Other ways projections can occur is through expression, for instance in some cases when someone wears flashy clothes or drives a fancy car they may (more often than not) be compensating for insecurity within themselves. Also when you meet people who are egotistical, in that they exude a very pompous attitude appearing overtly confident, they are more often than not very insecure with themselves. When you encounter someone who likes to put others down, they are doing so to build up their own depleted sense of self. And then the same goes for those who would attack these traits I just listed, if someone were to put someone down for acting pompous and egotistical, this is a projection of theirs. If someone was to put another down for wearing flashy clothes or driving a fancy car it is because they, within themselves suffer from the same insecurity, only they compensate for it by demeaning others. I used to work for a distribution company which sold local rap and hip-hop music and we would have the artists coming into the office for business and such, and obviously some rap really glorifies a rough lifestyle and personality which was something expressed by those we dealt with. But I never forgot what my boss told me one day, which was the loud and tough guys who come in and try to act hard aren't the ones you need to worry about. The guys to worry about were the ones who came in quiet, composed, soft spoken and polite. Those had a past of being hardened criminals and such were extremely mild mannered and polite, they had nothing to prove. The others who acted the "gangsta" role were (more often than not) the insecure ones who were in fact the opposite of their projections.

This is all because our sense of self and that which is other are intermittent states, they are co-emergent interdependent qualities. You can only know one, in the context of the

other. There's a quote someone made I forget who which goes "If I am I, because you are you, then I am not I, and you are not you."

The most important thing to realize is that we are never experiencing a person or world separate from ourselves (on a few levels). Everything experienced is filtered through our own reference points. So instead of seeing the other person, you are seeing your translation of them, your interpretation. Or your view of the world socially, politically, economically, environmentally, also is being filtered through your point of view as interpretation. Nothing is ever experienced as it truly is separate from you, and this is because there is no way for this to happen, because in truth there is no thing anywhere that exists which is separate from you to begin with. We only perceive it to be this way because of our delusion. Our perceptions are illusory, falsehoods paraded as facts and inherent aspects of reality.... in truth there is no perception, only projection. So working deeply with projection isn't a process of accounting for these qualities within ourselves so that we can reach a point of understanding ourselves and others without the projections, the process should reveal that self/other are projections themselves, and that nothing exists apart from ideation, translation, opinion, belief... which are born of, and kept alive by habituated thought processes.

And because experience lacks inherent separation, our intentions and beliefs actually manifest and create what-is on a fundamental level.

This guy Dimitri Halley goes over projection very thoroughly and extensively in his videos... and how one can move from feeling you observe a separate reality to seeing that all that you view is a projection of your self unconsciously. So the process is bringing the subconscious (which is paraded as a separately existing world) to the surface, thus changing it to a conscious observation. From there, changing observation to see that which you observe and the observing itself are inseparable. And that you yourself are only these processes, completely absent apart from them.

Transcendence Series 1/5: "Beyond Observation"
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

direct link to video on youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hHOLnBftXGM

The Observation Problem 2/3: "Thinking about Thinking"
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

direct link to video on youtube:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z-RPZ_8LGDA

Ask & You Shall Receive Series 6/12: "Hacking the Unconscious: Beliefs, The Secret & Mind Control"
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

direct link to video on youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t27eEKnUbUM

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 28th, 2012 at 5:35 AM
Title: Lama Lena on The Nature Of Mind in Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Short video of Lama Lena discussing the Nature Of Mind in the Dzogchen teachings and other yanas. Video has been around for awhile but I've always enjoyed it, thought I'd share.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Direct link to video on youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hb2NDSpqdKQ

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 27th, 2012 at 8:41 AM
Title: Re: What Is The Name Of This Mantra?
Content:
alpha said:
This is a praising prayer dedicated to the founder of Tashi Menri Ling monastery in the Tsang province of Tibet
His name is Nyame Shrab Gyaltsen and Bonpos keep him in very high regard thinking of him as the second Buddha.

Dechen Gyalpo Kunzang Gyalwa Dhud
Mijed Szung Dhen Sherab Ma wey Seng
Zam-ling Bon Gyi Tsuk Gyen Nyam-med Pa
Sherab Gyaltsen Zhab la Sol wa Dheb.

krodha wrote:
You rule... found the mp3 here http://bonshenling.org/audio/

Much appreciated!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 27th, 2012 at 3:10 AM
Title: What Is The Name Of This Mantra?
Content:
krodha wrote:
I've been wondering what the name of this mantra or song is for awhile now and was wondering if anyone could help? I have another recording of this song at the end of a teaching on mahamudra and it's beautifully sung, it's actually sung so powerfully that even my 3 year old is captivated by it and likes it played. But I only have it at the tail end of a 45 min teaching mp3 and have been trying to find the recording by itself. Needless to say I haven't had much luck and had given up... and then came across this video today which has the same song (with someone else singing it) at the end. So seems to be an iconic mantra or song, figured someone here might know... any help would be greatly appreciated!

Here's the video from youtube I found today, it's a video by Tenzin Wangyal

The song starts at 3:33
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Direct link to video on youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jGlqHNeKOQw

The other recording (with the incredibly powerful vocals) is at the end of a teaching on Tilopa's instructions on mahamudra given at the ganges... the teaching is given by Dan Brown

Tilopa's Instructions mp3 can be downloaded for free in the link below for anyone interested in that as well... song starts at 46:30 on there, I emailed Dan to ask about it awhile ago and didn't hear back (figured he's a busy man with all the good work he does).
http://www.pointingoutway.org/doc.html

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 27th, 2012 at 1:19 AM
Title: Re: Jesus, a Buddhist?
Content:

krodha wrote:
Interesting Video with some interesting alleged facts

"Did Jesus Christ learn Buddhism ??"
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Direct link to youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rmCS7P-vdRM

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 25th, 2012 at 4:00 AM
Title: Re: Awakening compassion dzogchen style?
Content:
padma norbu said:
Thank you for the explanation. Is it possible they would work even if I don't really have any real understanding of it? I received transmission, yes. I have attended retreats, yes. I have been practicing, yes. I am not sure I understand everything the way I should, however, and not sure if this lack of real genuine understanding interferes with this practice. Basically, I would be doing it by faith and by memorization rather than true understanding and knowing intention. By "knowing intention" I mean doing something in absolute surety of how it will turn out due to past experience, logic, etc. For example, if I move my pen on a page, I have a pretty good idea what I can draw. If I was blind, I would have no idea if there was any ink in the pen or if I was drawing anything. The Six Lokas practice for me is a bit like drawing a picture without knowing if there's really any ink in my pen because I don't know if I'm really doing it right, what each mental process is really supposed to be like and if I have done it right.

krodha wrote:
The lack of real genuine understanding probably doesn't inhibit the practice too much since that initial base intention is there, but I'm sure if you gained that genuine understanding it would significantly strengthen the practice and youd really start to see it bare the fruit it is intended to. It's like those flashlights which can go from a "widespread flood-light type beam" to a "sharp spotlight type beam" either way the light will help you to see in the dark(much like your initial intention), but the light is 10x more bright and strong when sharpened to a smaller area, and your practice will be too when you have that clear cut knowledge because that educated action will bring confidence.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 25th, 2012 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

krodha wrote:
Wait so what's the controversy?! I know there's no way everyone is agreeing right now... If that were to happen the Internet might violently implode inwards upon itself infinitely, swallowing the universe.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 2:33 PM
Title: Nice Lil Dharma Song CHINESE TRANSLATION by M. Ward (Video)
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Chinese Translation" by singer/songwriter M. Ward...

Nice dharma themed singer/songwriter song

little dude in the video goes great transference rainbow at 2:28.... no big deal

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Direct link to youtube page:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cUfIKX5ReKQ

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 12:25 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The basis is a convention isn't it?

gad rgyangs said:
the word "basis" is a convention, the basis is not.

It's only the basis from the perspective of non-recognition, because the "basis" is in fact is self-originated wisdom(emptiness). It's not as if there's some inherently existing ground or source called the basis.
one of the many names for that-which-is-beyond-all-partial-characterizations is "self-originated wisdom" (rang byung ye shes), and while its nature is pure/empty, it is also spontaneously manifesting and dynamically responsive (not "just" empty, and certainly not the reification "empti-ness"). The ontological status of the basis is usually described as "beyond existence and non-existence" or "not existent, and not non-existent". i think my favorite is "it does not exist as anything at all, yet it can arise/appear/manifest as anything at all."

If you can experience a sense of astonishment that there is clearly apparent manifesting going on rather than nothing, and then turn towards that in you which enables you to experience this, that is pointing to the basis.

krodha wrote:
Word. I actually didn't realize that is what was being spoken of when the term basis was being used. So how does the basis differ from the nature of mind? Or are they synonymous? Because the description certainly seems the same. I'm not even sure if "that in you which enables you to experience" can be considered accurate but I suppose it can on a basic level.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
krodha wrote:
The basis is a convention isn't it? It's only the basis from the perspective of non-recognition, because the "basis" is in fact is self-originated wisdom(emptiness). It's not as if there's some inherently existing ground or source called the basis. So ignorance comes prior to the basis because the basis (acting as a basis of "something else") is a result of imputed ignorance. If recognition that display is "self-originated wisdom's" own-display as self originated wisdom in-and-of-itself, the basis is no longer the basis but wisdom.

That's my stab at it... That being said isn't all of this basis talk irrelevant unless one is involved in certain practices? Mainly thogal? Seems like it's really attempting to capture something that linear thought and language can't properly represent except for a basic outline for those about to do said practices.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:00 AM
Title: Re: Awakening compassion dzogchen style?
Content:
padma norbu said:
There are some kinds of nastiness that aren't motivated by moral outrage. The sadist, as an extreme example, takes pleasure in harming others just because he likes it.

krodha wrote:
Right but why is this? Because they suffer from afflictions derived from ignorance. A lot of sadistic acts are predicated on power. It is a display of power much like rape is. For some reason they (either now, or have in the past) feel helpless and powerless, usually from being a victim themselves. So they inflict harm as an act of power so that they are now the one in control. They can now act as the giver of pain, and be the controller. And this control and power serves as an emotional catharsis and release of their own pain

they harbor and feel tormented by. It is the projection of their own subconscious shadow fully manifested into the physical and expressed through the torment of another. While this doesn't mean their actions are justified or acceptable, knowing the root cause of their predicament allows you to approach it effectively and mindfully. Knowing that due to their attachment and identification with their own pain they are a victim, and their display of their own pain in the torture of others is an expression of this victimization which further victimizes. It continues the circle and perverts the fundamental ignorance which persists endlessly. That is being trapped in a hell realm. And those people are the pretas with small mouths and insatiable appetites. Their pain can never be satisfied or satiated. So you acting with compassion use skillful means to remedy their pain. Your heart has to open to all beings and knowing that there are fundamental causes to these expressions of samsara is the key to ending the cycle of ignorance. You act from love, you embody love. Compassion is knowing that wherever you look you see yourself and whoever you encounter you encounter yourself. When this blossoms in its fullness and the reference point predicated on the false "I" is seen as utterly empty, the reference point used to judge others and their actions is liberated and compassion remains. This is the great bodhicitta.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: Awakening compassion dzogchen style?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I'd say awakening true compassion is the absence of acceptance or rejection, allowing what-is to appear as it does.

padma norbu said:
This is how I used to basically see it, since all is the display of the illusion of self and other. But, I think if you suddenly realize what you're allowing to appear is essentially pleasure at someone else's misfortune, then that is a problem. You could not indulge it and let it dissolve, but if it keeps coming back, then it seems to me like it's never really being addressed. It is strange, but something like this just occurred to me, I guess because I may have finally been more mindful than usual and so I noticed my thoughts. And I thought, "wait a minute, I am actually enjoying this thought of another's misfortune" and I began to wonder about this... if, knowing everything I know about samsara, I still take pleasure in another's misery despite generally thinking I feel compassionate toward people and frequently thinking throughout the day how everything is illusory projection, then how do you change something like that? To reduce it to something really simple so you can get my point: it's like enjoying the taste of pizza; if you like the taste of pizza, how could you ever not like it? You may stop eating it for dietary reasons or whatever, but you will never stop liking the taste of pizza.

This is basically self-cherishing and there are certainly many ways to change it, but I don't know... it worried me because I had the realization that over time it seems maybe I have become more calloused and selfish than I was when I first started looking into Buddhism seriously half a lifetime ago. I think 15-20 years ago I had similar ideas pop

into my head but I probably either felt justified because I disliked whoever I was thinking about and so didn't really notice or else felt guilty about it and depressed with shame (I was quite down on myself back then, in general). But, yesterday, as my mind was wandering recently into these self-cherishing thoughts, I noticed a complete lack of guilt about it, but that it was just sort of compartmentalized in a "safe zone" like I had become used to saying to myself "just thinking, no harm done" so much so that I could really indulge such thoughts without guilt while enjoying the idea of someone else's misfortune. I've also noticed that as I've gained experience, I've become more hateful of certain attitudes and personality traits rather than more accepting of them. Sure, I'm more patient and accepting in some ways, but I'm more fed up and impatient in other ways.

I want to change all this ASAP. This dawning realization felt like a climactic scene in some b-movie where, after acting like a psycho for an hour and twenty minutes, the bad guy suddenly realizes he's nutso only when he accidentally kills someone he truly loves and then he gasps, "What have I become?!" before blowing his own head off. I don't want to have a secret place in my head where I can entertain hateful attitudes privately. The more these habits are repeated, the stronger they become, I believe. Maybe pizza was the wrong metaphor before— maybe it's more like coffee or cigarettes; an acquired taste, but one that quickly becomes addictive and is reinforced with every imbibing.

krodha wrote:
Same thing I'm talking about, so I'm saying you'd go to the root of that projected indulgence in another's misfortune, what you start to realize (more often than not) is that you, yourself are exactly the same as the other person you dislike (or that you're no better). Say for example; in my personal experience I had a hard time getting over those who inflict harm onto animals, or who dehumanize other people for their sexual preferences. I would loathe and abhor these people to the point that if one of them came to receive some kind of misfortune or pain, I would actually enjoy their suffering. And as you said this became deeply engrained, and in my eyes I was "right" because I felt that what they were doing was wrong. So I felt that any misfortune that came to them was deserved, and that misfortune was justified, and I took joy in what I saw as redemption for their wrong-doings.

Once I started to learn of the Dharma I started to realize this wasn't a right view, I knew it was counter-productive to progress in the teachings but I didn't know what to do about it. I still felt that my views were "right" because those other people we're harming or dehumanizing other sentient beings, and I felt I wanted what was best for all sentient beings, so retribution for any wrong-doing done to animals and those persecuted for their race, or sexual preference etc.. was justified in my eyes. Almost to the point where I'd see that church in the south who promoted that "god hates fags" agenda, and I hated them for that, and I seriously would think that if these people were all wiped off the face of the earth the world would be a better place for it. Or if I saw anyone hurting an animal in a documentary or anything like that I would become enraged (even today there is lingering sentiments of this due to it's thorough reification over time).

So what had to happen, is that I had to start to see that I was hating them for their hatred, except my hatred was justified for some reason. They hate and inflict pain on others because of their afflictions, and in turn I was approaching them just as they approach those they hate. In their eyes, they feel justified in their actions, they feel it's ok to harm others... and then I taking the opposite view, feel justified for hating them and feel it would be ok to see harm inflicted on them. To the circle just becomes more and more perverted. No answer is ever reached and I am no better than they are... I am them, and they are me. So I had to be open with myself and see directly and fully that this was going on, and I had to step back and account for this in my experience.

Once that happened it was forever diminished, I would see that they hated or inflicted pain due to afflicted views, so instead of hating them for that, I knew that they didn't know any better (and in fact felt justified) and my heart opened to them. I understood that they were ignorant of their actions, and while this wouldn't stop me from intervening if I saw them hurting an animal or abusing another person. I would do it from a more mindful approach, not driven by rage or anger, and instead of inflicting pain or abuse myself I could disengage the situation and then attempt to speak to them, if they wouldn't want to listen there's nothing I could do, but at least the chain would be broken because I wouldn't be reactive. The reactivity is a subconscious explosion, so me bringing that to my conscious attention within myself, I am not victim to my own ignorance anymore and can act with compassion.

Another example (and this may not be true on all levels, I'm not attempting to offend anyone or start some political discussion I'm merely using this for an example) of this on a macrocosmic level is the United States attitude towards policing the world, as a collective people the majority might feel justified for occupying other countries to ensure that they aren't furthering some agenda etc... but what we don't see is that we, the U.S. are the ones furthering an agenda, and starting war, killing others for our own ideology. We are the "terrorist" in the eyes of those countries we police. We become that which we reject in the world and then project that onto those we objectify. And our occupation doesn't "end" the circle, it just perverts it. Because it further upsets those who have hate for the west. We actually reify the hatred within those who hate is through our actions. So the "enemy" is ever recreated and solidified, and no peace will ever come to the world (even though we would feel we're attempting to create peace). Hate breeds hate.

So the hate ends with you. You are the answer. The peace isn't reached by changing your environment, your environment is changed by changing and finding peace within yourself.

From there, later in my personal journey I found the emptiness of self, and therefore the emptiness of other, directly in experience. And this forever made these subconscious movements conscious, they rarely arise but if they do arise I see them at once and they are dropped, dispelled and they self-liberate. They're no longer about an other who is a dream, and they no longer belong to the dream "me". It's all a dream born of ignorance of the true state of perfection.

This excerpt from the documentary Kymatica talks about the attitude of those who wish to inflict harm on others for their actions. And how this just perverts the problem.
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Direct link to video on youtube:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pnyBb5858sE

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:
When I was trying to fit in with Straightedge kids I listened to some Hardcore
.

krodha wrote:
Me too, except I still do... been straight edge for 10 years now.. Woooo. I love indie rock and hip hop and all that too though, love all music.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012 at 3:36 PM
Title: Re: Awakening compassion dzogchen style?
Content:
padma norbu said:
What is the best practice for developing a change of heart once a real character flaw is noticed? I'm sure we could answer "guru yoga" to everything, but how about Tonglen, the 4 contemplations, prayer wheel, etc.? I'm sure they're all good, but does anyone have any specific experiences and recommendations based on these experiences? Or is there some specific dzogchen practice which perhaps has been taught by Namkhai Norbu and which I may be able to practice?

krodha wrote:
I'd say awakening true compassion is the absence of acceptance or rejection, allowing what-is to appear as it does. The breakthrough for me came with realizing that, "that" which I reject or repress in another is exactly "that" which I reject or repress within myself. So what you're fighting is really an aspect of yourself which you are ignorant of due to subconscious suppression. It's not always apparent but when you locate it within yourself it is immediately accounted for and brought from the subconscious to the conscious level and dispelled. Because in truth the other is a projection, and you yourself are a projection, the 2 sides of the coin reflect each other. You've heard the saying to change the world you must first change yourself... It's 100% true. If there's at

any point in your experience something you are dissatisfied with in the context of another's negative action, belief, habits, etc.. It is a part of you which is being projected out and taken to be an objective "problem" or "flaw". If you can be open you'll find that the character flaw mirrors an aspect of yourself you have not come to terms with. I know it sounds kinda harsh! But it's flawlessly true, and it's the road to true healing and purification. Combine this with your other practices and you'll excel swiftly I promise

*edit: spelled excel wrong

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012 at 12:29 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
Sherab said:
My 2 cents:
Ignorance is not a phenomenon.
It is an absence of a phenomenon.
And that phenomenon is recognition of one's true state.

gad rgyangs said:
if recognition is a phenomena, then failure to recognize is also a phenomena. The question is: are all phenomena of samsara and nirvana appearances of the basis? And if not, then what is there besides the basis and its appearances?

krodha wrote:
I'm pretty sure that if you check back on any of the 6 threads you've become exceedingly efficient at making you'll locate a suitable answer there..

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012 at 6:09 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
krodha wrote:
It's also the type of thing where, as your practice develops you'll actually see a sharp decrease in ailments. You won't get sick. I remember in either "crystal" or "self perfected state" ChNN talked about how they would send accomplished dzogchen practitioners in to aid the sick during outbreaks of disease because they wouldn't fall ill. Having significantly decreased or fully removed duality from experience there's no longer a disease or an individual... All appears as the natural state.

So that also brings into question the inquiry into "material causes"... Are there actual material causes beyond what it is that you truly are? There truly can't be. Hints of this come into play in instances where placebo has just as profound an effect as the "real cure".

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, February 22nd, 2012 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
alpha said:
I understand that for a dzogchen practitioner having some concrete experience based on their practice is very important.
But one needs to know whether these experiences are errors or something which is natural and expected if certain practices are employed.

What is the way of gaining some clarity as to what is happening?

Somebody was sugesting that before going any further one should eliminate any possible material causes to these experiences by checking whether they are in good health or having an ear or eye exam for example....

krodha wrote:
A qualified teacher should be able to give some sound advice...

but what types of experiences? Visions? Heat? Energetic movement? Vibrations?

some of it you'll just have to use deductive reasoning etc... like if you're seeing continual spots in your eye it could be cataracts or if you see constant yellow tinges it could be glaucoma, big stuff like if you feel you're losing vision, going blind, things are continually more blurry over time, those are things you need to worry about... but other than that there isn't much else and if you're experiencing visions while doing practices geared toward that... that's what's going on I'm sure.

Same with increased energy movements and heat/vibrations.

Some experiences can be kinda wild! But just stay relaxed and let it happen

remember experiences are usually signs that you're doing something right, but don't become attached to the experience! Take an almost indifferent attitude... when an experience arises that's out of the ordinary just treat it like any other "normal" arising... for example if you see a vision just relax and treat it like seeing a stop light turn from red to green, just a simple appearance.

There's certain texts that can give a rough outline of progress, I think "The Practice Of Dzogchen" by Tulku Thondrup was mentioned on here before... there's a rough outline in the back section

but always remember everyone is different and everyone is going to have different experiences, in some practices there's definitive signs of progress and in some it's really conditional to the individual.

it's sort of the type of thing where you'll definitely know more often than not.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2012 at 11:14 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I never denied circumstances, I just cleaned puke and gave a bath.

gad rgyangs said:
if thats not a universe, I don't know what is.

krodha wrote:
If "universe" translates and equates to a conventional relative appearance which manifests through imputed conceptual designations including space-time and memory I agree with you 100%.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2012 at 11:05 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Like a collection of 'things' extended into space and time, created and destroyed with periods of time between arisings.
my kid just threw up gotta go! Be back later

gad rgyangs said:
seems like an "arising" to me....

but seriously: of course its all metaphors, including your kid's puke. we have to deal with "circumstances" as ChNNR likes to put it. Nevertheless, be careful not to slip into solipsism... you're not the only appearance of the basis....

krodha wrote:
Solipsism would depend on an individual mind or consciousness which would be solely subjective to a vast array of objective 'things' and 'states'. Which is not the case. Or a type of mind-only view pertaining to an individuated consciousness. Which is not the case. I never denied circumstances, I just cleaned puke and gave a bath.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2012 at 10:41 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Like a collection of 'things' extended into space and time, created and destroyed with periods of time between arisings.
my kid just threw up gotta go! Be back later

gad rgyangs said:
seems like an "arising" to me....

krodha wrote:
Certainly appears as such.. It all appears to happen. That being said; in actuality, the conventional appearance of these happenings does not contradict the true inherent nature of what-is. If that is recognized and known to be true by means of "knowing ones own face" as its said, it inhibits the possibility of being fully emersed in the ignorance of non-recognition and duality.

What's being discussed is how a "universe" seems to arise. How an individual seems to exist. However no cosmogony or psychology are truly being talked about. All of these discussions about the basis are discussing something which is illusory and has never come or gone, appeared or disappeared.

The reason it's brought down to the level of the apparent individual is because that is where the ignorance can be dispelled most effectively. The apparent macrocosmic universe is only in relation to the microcosm of the apparent individual, but if the individual remains believing they are subject to an objective universe beyond themselves they're lost. So the cosmological aspects are applied to what is apparently individual and then the illusion of individuality, materiality and so on and so forth are annihilated into their true state. (that is, unless one ripe and of high capacity realizes their true state and own display upon direct introduction)

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2012 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Who was speaking of abstract primordial cosmic states/manifestations?

gad rgyangs said:
this, and related threads, have discussed the so-called bardo state of the gzhi, in between manifestations of universes, the latent traces that impel the eruption of the new universe, etc. is that cosmic enuf 4 u?

Namdrol said:
Oh, this comes about because of traces of action and ignorance. Nothing in the basis changes, of course, what happens is that there is sort of cosmic pulsation of ignorance and its subsidance which results in the appearance and disappearance of samsara and nirvana; and as we know, traces can accumulate in wisdom.

You have to understand that all of this explanation of cosmic cycles is really intended to be brought down to the level of the indivdual's life cycle in terms of the four bardos:

The bardo of death == destruction of the universe up to the two higher form realms
The bardo of dharmatā == the arising of the sound, light and rays of the basis
The bardo of becoming == non-recognition of the basis
The natural bardo of this life == the appearance of samsara and nirvana

krodha wrote:
There is no "universe" as such, none of this is describing some phenomenal artifact type "universe" like the universe or cosmos are usually spoken of. Like a collection of 'things' extended into space and time, created and destroyed with periods of time between arisings. Everything said in those quotes by ChNN falls directly in line with all the discussion which has been going on previously on the basis and the manifestation of samsara and nirvana via non-recognition and recognition...

my kid just threw up gotta go! Be back later

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 21st, 2012 at 8:35 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and lest anyone say "wait a minute- we were talking about the basis and the appearances of the basis during some kind of primordial cosmic manifestation." we can quote pg89 of "Crystal"
The Base, or Zhi in Tibetan, is the term used to denote the fundamental ground of existence, both at the universal level and at the level of the individual, the two being essentially the same; to realize the one is to realize the other. If you realize yourself, you realize the nature of the universe.
and that is why these are not dry, abstract intellectual deliberations about some abstract cosmic state, both the cosmic process and our state, our condition, are one and the same.

krodha wrote:
Who was speaking of abstract primordial cosmic states/manifestations?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 4:17 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
Manichaean Dzogchenpas....

Is there a such thing, as in Dzogchen and Manichaeanism actually being compatible?

Is that what some consider the Bönpos to be?

krodha wrote:
What aspects or themes of Manichaeanism would you say correlate? The gnostic?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: from selflessness to emptiness
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Why do you feel it's dangerous to claim the "mental aspect" is all there is? Whether it's all that is, is truly ultimately irrelevant, it's all conjecture. It's the classic phenomena vs. Noumena argument. If such a noumena does exist there is still no way to ever "know" it. What is experienced directly is what-is. There is no objective physical form and subjective mental representation(of said objective physical form).

5heaps said:
its a basic tenet of all of buddhism that you cannot have a mind/cognition without an object of engagement. so thats why we cant claim that only mental aspects exist. even the mindonly with their no external objects will never accept that only mental aspects exist.
http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/audio/fundamentals_tibetan_buddhism/level_4_deepening_understanding_path/mind_mental_factors/recognize_basic_factors_mental_activity/transcript.html

krodha wrote:
The cognizer perceives the cognizable;
Without the cognizable there is no cognition;
Therefore why do you not admit
That neither object nor subject exists [at all]?

The mind is but a mere name;
Apart from it's name it exists as nothing;
So view consciousness as a mere name;
Name too has no intrinsic nature.

Either within or likewise without,
Or somewhere in between the two,
The conquerors have never found the mind;

So the mind has the nature of an illusion.

The distinctions of colors and shapes,
Or that of object and subject,
Of male, female and the neuter -
The mind has no such fixed forms.

In brief the Buddhas have never seen
Nor will they ever see [such a mind];
So how can they see it as intrinsic nature
That which is devoid of intrinsic nature?

"Entity" is a conceptualization;
Absence of conceptualization is emptiness;
Where conceptualization occurs,
How can there be emptiness?

The mind in terms of perceived and perceiver,
This the Tathagatas have never seen;
Where there is the perceived and perceiver,
There is no enlightenment.

Devoid of characteristics and origination,
Devoid of substantiative reality and transcending speech,
Space, awakening mind and enlightenment
Posses the characteristics of non-duality.

- Nagarjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 12:57 AM
Title: Re: from selflessness to emptiness
Content:
catmoon said:
Terms like "physical" "particle" and "real" are imputations too. When we are gripped by the idea that there is something other than sense impressions that we can work with, a form of reification has taken place.

5heaps said:
same problem as i said earlier though: sautrantika has already established that "particle" and "physical" are imputations, but they dont accept emptiness.

i think the 2nd part of what you say can be dangerous. its a basic function of the mind to produce a mental aspect (its the clarity part of the definition of the mind, with the full definition being clarity and knowing)...to then say that that is all which exists is very dangerous. even in mindonly where some accept no external objects, they nevertheless

still distinguish between objective physical form and the subjective mental aspect of colors and shapes in an eye consciousness.

so...still missing that link between sautrantika and the jump into emptiness. it cant just be "imputation this", "imputation that", since sautrantika already accepts imputation. in fact theyre the ones who invented it in a sense, thanks to Mr Sautrantika Dharmakirti

krodha wrote:
Why do you feel it's dangerous to claim the "mental aspect" is all there is? Whether it's all that is, is truly ultimately irrelevant, it's all conjecture. It's the classic phenomena vs. Noumena argument. If such a noumena does exist there is still no way to ever "know" it. What is experienced directly is what-is. There is no objective physical form and subjective mental representation(of said objective physical form). These are simply imputations. If these imputations continue to govern ones perception then they remain lost in duality and true emptiness can never be accessed. The idea that one is subject to structures and laws of some world outside of themselves is innately defeating.. Like a victim saying "well I can only do so much since I'm confined to these limitations". In truth there are no limitations, there are no natural laws of outer or inner, phenomena and noumena etc.. You give these notions power. You are the source of their solidity and presence in experience, they're 110% imputed. So your question of how you go from selflessness to emptiness within the confines of your view is impossible.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: What do you call this practice...?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
shes Wangdors student and he's a beast, dude straight up stopped my thoughts one time for almost 5 mins I couldn't think even if I tried to...

padma norbu said:
This isn't a loaded question or anything, I'm just curious... would you say that this ultimately had much effect on you and if so, how? What I mean is, this could be a short-lived thing which gives you faith, etc. and you look back and go, "wow, that was awesome" and never forget it, but the effect itself may have worn off... OR, perhaps forever after that, it was much easier to access thought-free awareness and like that. Know what I mean? Just wondering.

krodha wrote:
You know, that's funny I hadn't really thought about it before.. I have just always treated it as an experience which instilled a genuine faith that there's immense power and truth to the teachings and the fruit they can bare. It legitimized stories you hear of siddhis and such. But presently in my experience I actually can access thought-free awareness at the drop of a dime and usually for as long as desired. I just always attributed this to regular sitting meditation and cultivating presence in daily life exponentially. But you're right for all I know that experience with wangdor could have played a major role. It was

odd because it was unexpected, he speaks Tibetan and has Lena translate and the teaching was being given in a loft apartment actually which was packed with people lining down the stairs to the door. I was on the stairs so I couldn't even see him but Lena said he was going to give an empowerment and he started a moderately paced singing type mantra and all mental activity just stopped until he finished. The teaching was the flight of the garuda but I have no idea what he did or gave at the end. So I'm not sure if that experience and the diminishment/ability to willfully subdue thought are related but it could be. I try to disregard this, though it is useful for maintaining presence and awareness... I actually feel like an ass for talking about it for some reason, I'm a quiet and humble(not to imply I'd even consider it something to brag of) person and I know that is imperative conduct to maintain and follow in relation to ones path. Interesting though.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: What do you call this practice...?
Content:
padma norbu said:
DAKINI WISDOM (instructional dvd)
DESCRIPTION:
The Tibetan word for the Sanskrit dakini is khadro, which means "sky goer" or sky dancer." In this DVD, Chagdud Rinpoche explains how a spiritual practitioner can liberate thoughts and emotions in the basic space, or vast sky, of mind's true nature through the realization of emptiness. This process of freeing the mind's poisons as they arise is the swiftest path to liberation.

http://www.tibetantreasures.com/DVDs-Dakini_Wisdom_DVD.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
$5 DVD with any purchase... probably worth it, eh?

Sounds familiar, but I don't see the word I'm looking for in the description.

krodha wrote:
Umm.. Dunno what you'd call it but that's the main practice for rapid progress. That's the beginning of resting in the natural state. It's still slightly dualistic.. You acting as the aperture and allowing phenomena to self-liberate, but it's the solid start. Call it contemplation, call it uninterrupted non-meditation.. But pretty much if one isn't doing that at all times or working towards being able to relax into that effortless self-liberating state, they're on a slower path.

I remember Lama Lena a year or so ago at a retreat said Dakinis are representations of our thoughts.. And emotions are reflections of thought. So naturally this dakini themed practice is geared toward thought and emotion work. Whether or not that's true about Dakinis I'm not 100% sure but shes Wangdors student and he's a beast, dude straight up stopped my thoughts one time for almost 5 mins I couldn't think even if I tried to... Which is just some siddhi stuff but that coupled with the caliber of their teachings

certainly seems validating. I could be wrong and just allowed myself to be swayed by magic though for all I know ha!

That's the same style practice ChNN champions and says is of utmost importance (that and guru yoga of course).

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...
Content:
catmoon said:
Did you mean to say "cause" instead of consequence?

The idea that Dharma is the cause and Dzogchen the result can't possibly be universal, simply because the are billions of Buddhists who are not Dzogchenpas.

Namdrol said:
All Buddhas are Dzogchenpas.

catmoon said:
Would that include the Mormon Buddhas?

krodha wrote:
All the Mormon Buddhas! Except for Mitt Romney... Because he's a Mormon sh*thead. Zing! Politics and religion in the same post, this thread just became officially inappropriate for dinner table/first date discussion. You've been warned out of compassion to avoid slappings from mothers / potential lovers.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 12:31 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
krodha wrote:
The eternal dance of Namdrol and gad rgyangs... I love it

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 1:09 PM
Title: Re: from selflessness to emptiness
Content:
5heaps said:
... thought IS awareness, thought IS consciousness. Nothing appears to consciousness, consciousness IS these appearances...
visual objects ARE the colors and shapes.... and colors and shapes ARE vision. There isn't "seeing" and "objects which are seen", the objects are the seeing.

again this is all just straight up sautrantika, and i am not in disagreement with any of it

furthermore, whether or not the particles are intellectually known at the time of seeing an object is irrelevant...because as i already said, they are not ascertained by an ordinary consciousness. nevertheless, they do appear to ordinary consciousness since the object which the ordinary consciousness can ascertain is in fact made up of particles.

at the root of emptiness is the dismissal of actual physical and mental ultimates....and therefore the dismissal of markers and identifiers. however, giving up markers and identifiers completely feels too much like giving up the object completely, so i only want to dismiss overly-real markers and identifiers. again....how to do that....how to move from selflessness to emptiness..... to simply say that base forces/particles arent there _at all_ is wrong. even mindonly people who negate external objects completely still accept that type of physical form in their own qualified context

krodha wrote:
Why are you afraid of giving up the object? In my opinion you're holding onto a few presuppositions about the nature of experience that are poisoning the well in a sense. You're insisting that consciousness acts as a flashlight in that when it shines on an object, the object is experienced but when it isn't shining on the object the object is still there but somehow off screen or something. So you're saying that there are substantiated physical objects made of particles that exist separately from awareness? I'm not sure what to say it sounds like you want to have your cake and eat it too, I'm afraid you're setting up barriers for yourself. There are far too many dualities in the schematic you're proposing to navigate to the place you want to be. Everything I mentioned above; the "straight up sautrantika" stuff will successfully dismiss actual physical and mental ultimates if they're applied to ones experience beyond the intellect. Because if the root of emptiness is essentially the dismissal of markers and identifiers (as you said), you'll obviously have to dismiss the markers and identifiers to establish emptiness. I mean, right off the bat; objects are dependently originated, on so many levels it's ridiculous. Everything is empty.. including emptiness itself, and emptiness teachings are undoubtably a process of giving up the ghosts that plague one's perception. We're talking about inherent existence versus conventional appearance. So you can dismiss objects' inherent existence and still know they have conventional existences. It's not as if 'poof' the objects will disappear, you're just not going to take them a seriously as you would, you'll know they're empty. If you want to take it further there are ways to fuse experience into it's natural state of timeless awareness, that will actually destroy physicality experientially, but that isn't achieved via intellectual understanding (except on rare occasions perhaps). These are all processes to remove ignorance. It is our own ignorance that makes the world and objects seem real.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 10:13 AM
Title: Re: from selflessness to emptiness
Content:

5heaps said:
thats pretty good but constituent particles are in fact experienced any time you experience a fire hydrant. likewise constituent movements of mind are experienced when you experience an ordinary emotion etc. they are both experienced in the sense that they appear to consciousness (though they are not ascertained as being 'this' and 'not that')

krodha wrote:
The constituent particles are experienced? So prior to the day you went to school and/or read a book which informed you of particles and atoms and what-have-you, you knew 'things' were constructed of particles? My 3 year old certainly doesn't know of particles, if I asked him what a table was made out of he'd say "I dunno"... maybe once he goes to kindergarten he'll reply with "it's made of wood"... and someday down the line he'll say "it's made of particles". These are learned ideas, they are not inherent in experience. You presently do not see particles, you only know they are present at a subatomic level and therefore that knowledge governs your perception. Presently all 'you see' is shades of color and shapes (which bordering colors imply), that is all vision consists of. Kinesthetically you feel sensation attributed to muscle contractions, you feel tactile sensations when you touch things... soft... hard.. rough... smooth.. hot.. cold. Do the colors, shapes, kinesthetic feelings and tactile sensations communicate that particles are present? No. Your present experience consists ONLY of colors, shapes, feeling, auditory noise etc.. Now this is the kicker; there are not 2 separate parts to vision (1. the act of seeing and 2. objects seen), visual objects ARE the colors and shapes.... and colors and shapes ARE vision. There isn't "seeing" and "objects which are seen", the objects are the seeing. Colors and shape implies seeing, you never, ever, ever at any time experience unseen colors or shapes... they are one process... one appearance. The 'external' field of objects IS vision and is therefore your own display. You are looking at your own state. Awareness reflecting itself to itself in it's totality... timelessly. It is an ocean of being. Tactile sensations are the same way... not 2 processes, the touching of the object IS the object, the singular kinesthetic sensation of the objects weight IS the objects weight, and there is no object apart from these sensual appearances... again it is your own display. And we already discovered that there is no "you" for the display to belong to... so it is timeless awareness or consciousness... wisdom... whatever you want to name it.. in-and-of-itself. Same goes for hearing, same goes for taste, every single aspect of experience without fail is your own display... know this thoroughly, know it innately... divorced from intellect, be it, and be free.

There are no constituent movements of mind. The 'mind' is ONLY the apparent movement. There is no mind apart from thought, and thought itself conceptualizes a compartment or container called 'the mind' to belong to. Likewise there is no thought apart from awareness/consciousness... thought IS awareness, thought IS consciousness. Nothing appears to consciousness, consciousness IS these appearances... and there are no appearances, only consciousness. Consciousness alone IS. Lucid and clear, unobstructed and pure timeless nondual perfection.

Don't believe any of what I'm saying just look at your present experience, investigate empirically... it is self-evident and undeniable.

5heaps said:
so, therein lies much of the problem
there does seem, from the very beginning, to be a marker or identifier on the side of the object regardless of the fact that your following proofs are correct asunthatneversets. however, since they did not address the problem of physical and mental ultimates from the beginning it is of no surprise to learn that sautrantika who do not accept emptiness nevertheless have no problem asserting and accepting your reasonings (ie. there is only fresh moments of time a chain is only a mental synthesis, subject/object conceptual division, "Externality" vs "internality").

krodha wrote:
There are no physical and mental ultimates. There never was a beginning in the ultimate sense. Physical, mental, beginning and notion of eventual end, were seemingly born with the first imputation of selfhood. These notions have merely become so subconsciously engrained into you through incessant reification of duality that to conceive experience to be any other way seems absurd and counterintuitive. The marker and identifier is your own intimate state, the compelling notion that there is a marker or identifier on the side of the object is your own radiance, you are it. Your being is the unparalleled birthless and deathless principle which saturates what-is.

catmoon said:
besides the imputations and your sense impressions, what can you know about this allegedly external object?

5heaps said:
without external form (or nonexternal form if you are mindonly) a consciousness/sensation would be utterly impossible. so too with conceptual categories such as cheap or expensive, heavy or light. after all, heavy and light as conceptualizations and heavy and light as actual things are very different things

krodha wrote:
It seems utterly impossible, but disavow the reigning paradigm you champion and it's there to see, you just have to know how to look. There is no external or internal, these notions are based on identification with 'the body' as it is, the bordering line between "internal" and "external" is imputed as the surface of the skin. You are not the body or in the body, the body is in you, as you, and "you" is a concept, which is a thought, which is a sound, which is awareness, which is self-liberated the very moment it appears to itself in this primordial non-arising.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 5:10 AM
Title: Re: Great Rock Band Ever! Greatest Song Ever!
Content:
Namdrol said:
This is completely Buddist in sentiment:

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

krodha wrote:
Haha whenever I think of Motorhead I just think of Lemmys giant wart on his face... also funny that if you google image search "Lemmy" you only get photos of him.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 4:48 AM
Title: Re: from selflessness to emptiness
Content:
5heaps said:
these are only impressions existing inside a persons mind, and have nothing to do with the external physical particles.

krodha wrote:
Externality and constituent particles are imputations as well, at no point during the experience of a fire hydrant does the experience itself claim to be external. And in direct experience constituent particles are never experienced either (unless under a microscope, but that experience would not be the same as looking at the fire hydrant on the street, one only infers that it's the same via imputation). It's direct experience that is the key point, every moment is fresh and brand new, as if it's the first moment that ever existed... we only form a causal chain of happenings and time via imputation of memory which is also always ever fresh and brand new. Also, experience never suggests that impressions exist inside a persons mind, this is also imputed. In your direct experience the 'sound' of a thought and the 'sound' of someone speaking are the same and occupy the same space, neither are internal or external. Mind is also never experienced, the seeming appearance of a consecutive number of thoughts in a sequence of time makes it seem as if there is an entity called the mind, there is no mind, only thoughts, and thoughts lack a thinker. Physicality is also never experienced, we only accept a story of the physical and impute this onto experience, for instance when you touch something, you believe a story that 'you' are 'touching' a 'thing'... the actual experience is only one sensation.. just a single tactile sensation. You can play a game with this by touching something and rubbing it lightly, if you shift attention to the object then the sensation becomes the touching and feeling of the object, if you shift attention to your finger the sensation becomes the feeling in your finger, there is only one touch sensation, the shifting of attention and intention creates the nature of the sensation via imputation. Or another one; if you rub your thumb and pointer finger together, shifting attention to the thumb it's your thumb doing the touching, shift your attention to your pointer finger and it's your pointer finger doing the touching, in truth neither are touching, a tactile sensation simply appears in awareness, and the sensation is in fact awareness itself.

5heaps said:
emptiness is primarily a statement about those external objects, and not one's internal impressions,

krodha wrote:
The impressions themselves dictate external and internal, self and objects, apart from the impression none of these can be found, experience is whole and beyond any designations.

5heaps said:
because sautrantika selflessness already explains internal impressions [and more] (ie. theyre imputed, we already know that)

krodha wrote:
Everything is imputed. No thing exists apart from imputation.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 7:13 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
justsit said:
This must be a guy thing...

samdrup said:
It's not....I'm a guy, and I think It's dire!

krodha wrote:
Certainly an acquired taste... but to each their own! I love all genres of music, and can see the similarities in composition and progression between songs like these posted above and classical piano works (for example). I enjoy the creative energy and passion that any piece of music is product of. Also refreshing to see lyrical subject matter which is of substance in my opinion, it's quite evident that these individuals are very in touch with themselves. I'm glad they express their spiritual and metaphysical passions by writing about them lyrically to music they enjoy, it's truly amazing that sound can be arranged, composed, ordered and manipulated to create melody. The math that is involved in some of the time signatures these bands use is also undoubtably impressive. But in the end whether or not it's considered dire or incredible is truly a matter of opinion... and luckily for us, coming from our separate but unified backgrounds in the dharma, this fact is made even more apparent due to our infallible knowledge that beyond imputed notions everything is already flawless and perfect.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
krodha wrote:
Psycroptic from Hobart Australia

Technical death metal.

PSYCROPTIC - REMOVING THE COMMON BOND
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Manipulation of evolution
Against all that is natural
A course uncharted
Creating that which was once revered by all
Becoming the one to oppose what has always been
The Pinnacle

Reconstructing the elemental nature of Life
A transcendence with no recourse
Time, no longer the restrictive force
Time, no longer the constant
The pendulum has stopped.

By removing the balancing factor
I rise about the homogeneous
We are equals no more
With the common bond of death removed

I stand alone.
Alone in Power.
Alone in Stature.
Alone.

Time is now irrelevant
The invisible structure long ago destroyed
I cannot undo what has been done
A selfish dream that has turned
Into an unwanted reality
Waiting for that which will never come
Without an end, how can "Life" exist?

Now I Just Am
I Am Eternal

I am Nothing

PSYCROPTIC - INITIATE
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Stripped of all that is unique, it is redundant
You have joined us, Welcome...
Embrace the new freedom of which you have never felt
Embrace the Nothingness
The sinister burden of individuality lifted
Embrace Us

You need struggle no longer
We offer what you have long yearned for
You will become complete
Now part of our family
Revel without our created monotheistic system
All else is false

You have chosen what is right
You have chosen what is true
You have accepted the inevitable
Adorned with the sacred cloth
You are now our brothers and sisters
Forget your past, repent
We forgive you

For you knew nothing else
Pure savages now tamed
We will guide your future
Together we move toward
All outsiders must fear us

Icons of dissent must fall, the great unclean herded
Those suitable, welcomed... Failures, discarded
Our invitation needs no reply
Vengeance awaits the chosen who doubt, refuse or mock.
We insure this, you will insure this
We cannot be faulted, we are immaculate
Values bond us closer than blood
Our family is ever growing
We will continue to do what is right:
Cleansing the Profane

PSYCROPTIC - (OB)SERVANT
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Waking each dawn if it was the first
Sleep eroding all trace of a past
With only vivid dreams intact
I foresee all that will become
A prophet unaware... A reluctant oracle
I remain naive and innocent
Tainted only by the knowledge of a sinister future.
Memories: For me they are Non-Existent
The concept is alien

Carrying clouded prophecies for the future
I see time moving in the opposite direction
Visions becoming clearer as they move toward fruition
Each second sees another vision fulfilled

A mind overwhelmed
All knowledge I possess dissolves as time passes
A mind purged
The future cannot be changed
With mine or your actions,
Every act has already occurred
The future is complete, all outcomes final

You cannot choose.
Unchangeable.
Unbiased.
Exact.

So without a past,
How can I be defined?
I do not possess a 'life', I only exist
My mind a window I wish I could shatter
Not free to choose a path to travel
As I already see its end.
With a perpetual view into the void that will become
I am the Observer to the Future,
Watching the crumbling timeline unfold in reverse.

PSYCROPTIC - EPOCH OF THE GODS

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Using universal time theories to ratify their religion.
These elite toil, to advance comprehension - Of space and time.
Although; out for the benefit of 'outsiders'.
Only their sanctuary shall profit as they understand, the true purpose of life:
To become a god, to become omnipotent -
This is life's work, yet completion will be fatal.
Psychologically unbalanced leaders in knowledge,
Unwittingly preparing the termination of 'reality'.
Yet with no malevolence towards others of their kindred…
Simply focusing on the will of the sermon.
Time movement is their goal such dedication rarely witnessed!
The only motivation in their myopic minds an individual craving for a subconscious need,
Allows philosophical faults to be unseen thus far created revolutionary scientific:
And technical advancements that that would be the awe of all.
Their concealment from society however, masks such glory,
Playing fundamentalist cult like spiritual insanity.
The word of their messiah eludes to their intentions yet she is no more than,
A charismatic jester of the modern world.
Emittfihs her synonym -
The name of true insanity time must be unbalanced to reach true enlightenment
For it is a cage that enslaves us all.
Restricted in thought we are not.
For we seek what others only dream,
Try as they might, those un-enlightened will not understand
The secrets and power that await in the shifting of time we must strive against ill-informed resistance
To acquire the chalice of a higher spiritual awakening!
Time must be stopped to achieve their purpose; A crazed thought.
Impossible of course?
Yet their methods could be plausible if their timeline theories are correct,
This 'cult' could succeed in reversing reality itself,
Cataclysmic events beyond mental, comprehension.
Reversing the evolution of that universe itself!
Using, advanced quantum physics and light frequency radiation to achieve the task.
Accidentally covering the mysteries of time, but believing it to be true celestial intervention.
Theories, when, exercised, will follow a destructive path.
Transgressing timelines and interfering in matters of dimensional construct…
The Objective: To find the dawn of time itself and prevent it from commencing!
Only then will they reach.
Their goal…

Omnipotence!
A fascinating presumption, that only time will reveal...

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 7:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
krodha wrote:
Neuraxis from Montreal Quebec

Technical death metal

NEURAXIS - AXIOMS
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

The Universal, the Ultimate, the Absolute
The wholehearted desire, in progressive conformity
By the body, by the mental, by the spirit
The logical devotion
Experience of the divine ideals
Spherical application of the incarnation
Infinite progression in three phases
Definite by the splendor of compassion

NEURAXIS - A THIN LINE BETWEEN
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Enigma of a world untamed
To explore the boundaries of what is known to man
Searching for the balance, a road to a fate uncertain

Fragile equilibrium - Hidden in a subtle disguise
Perfectly crafted to appear solid - A divine mask of conformity

Rules applied in the past, centuries of deceit and masquerade
Has rendered humanity thoughtless, forbidden to evolve

Tormented by the question

A conscience trapped in a maze

The abyss lies before
A mystical vortex of infinite depth
At the edge of unreason
A knowledge blurred
Through a mysterious horizon

Face the obvious, the acceptance of the fact
This universe…devoid of answers
Face the obvious, the acceptance of the fact
The puzzle within, impossible to resolve

This fear of the unknown
Is common for every mortal
An ocean of contradictions
With every waves, darkens
Frozen at the bottom

Thirst for knowledge
Insatiable desire to comprehend
This quest for truth leads a path unsecure
Dangerously stands at the border of chaos

Paradox at the end of the equation
…The unbreakable wall
Paralysis after a lifetime of reflection
…An endless cycle
Inevitably returns to where it all begins

To stand in the middle
At the origin of the struggle
Where fiction surpasses reality
Enlighted by a dream
The idea that spawns the beast
The thin line between
Genius and maniacal

Enigma of a world untamed
To explore the boundaries of what is known to man
Searching for the balance, a road to a fate uncertain

Fragile equilibrium - Hidden in a subtle disguise
Perfectly crafted illusion to appear solid - A divine mask of conformity

Rules applied in the past, centuries of deceit and masquerade
Has rendered humanity thoughtless, forbidden to evolve

The abyss lies before
A mystical vortex of infinite depth
At the edge of unreason
A knowledge blurred
Through a mysterious horizon

Face the obvious...the acceptance of the fact
This universe, devoid of answers
The puzzle within, impossible to resolve

No words to explain...the splendor of eternity
No images to describe...the horror of infinity

This fear of the unknown
Is common for every soul
Afflicted by solitude
Desperate in the absence of certitude

Thirst for knowledge
Insatiable desire to comprehend
This quest for truth leads a path unsecure
Dangerously stands at the border of chaos

Paradox at the end of the equation
...The unbreakable wall
Paralysis after a lifetime of reflection
...An endless cycle
Inevitably returns to where it all begins

To stand in the middle
At the origin of the struggle
Where fiction surpasses reality
Enlightenment through a dream
The idea that spawns the beast
The thin line between

NEURAXIS - THOUGHT ADJUSTER
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Actuality of the primal source incarnate amongst the souls
The true promise of eternal career imprisoned within the mortal mind

The general developmental stages of being
Designated as thought changers, called thought adjusters, referred to as thought controllers
Disconnected with the stages of progress in mind duplication
Widespreadly known as the pilot
That lights every soul which comes into the world
The Adjuster is eternity: man is personality
Will never know tranquility from the time of their bestowal
Until the day of their release to start upon the natural death of their subjects
Those who do not pass through the portals of natural death do not even experience this temporary rest
To represent, to be, the energy of the highest order of time and space
Fundamental works of the transfer
Elevating the mortal minds
Translating the souls up to the spiritual heights of achievement
Capacity and potential
Will wisdom have an opportunity to function?
Indwell minds of whose intimate natures, fully apprised
Indwell minds of whose intimate natures, fully apprised
Exhibit the worship outreach
Spiritual perception
Prospects of reverential development
Combined intellectual and spiritual powers
Associated to produce the strength of human character

NEURAXIS - MONITORING THE MIND
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Center of all things and beings
As a creator, as a controller
Lastly as an infinite upholder
Dawns upon mankind
Once supreme ambition, just one consuming desire that is to become
As they are in their spheres of supremacy
This attainment is the certain way of all progress
Achieve this destiny in all that pertains
Replete in their sphere of infinity and eternity
Refuse to coerce or compel (the submission of the free wills)
Once becoming truly conscious, discover the majestic and indwelling presence of the controller
Accordance with enlightenment, accordance with the method
Infinitely more than reality idealized
Merely a concept, potential of righteousness

Not a synonym for nature
Natural laws personified
A transcendent reality...
Concept of supreme values
Not a focalization of spiritual meanings
Reasonable to logic, plausible to philosophy
Essential to beliefs, indispensable to any hope for survival

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 7:28 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
krodha wrote:
Meshuggah from Umeå, Sweden

Metal with technical off-time signatures

MESHUGGAH - RATIONAL GAZE
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Squint your eyes to see clearly. Blur reality to make
it real
Let focus go from your deceiving eyes to know what's
been concealed
We've all been blinded - Subjects to visual
misinformation
A systematic denial of the crystalline

To see the fine grain, to read the hidden words
The context of parallel truth - Devoid of
fragmentation

Our light-induced image of truth - Filtered blank of
its substance
As our eyes won't adhere to intuitive lines
Everything examined, Separated, one thing at a time
The harder we stare the more complete the
disintegration. -Dissolution

Eyes re-opened, Reasoning focalized, Receptors
activated

Perspectives distorted
The ladder beyond our grasp
The twin-headed serpent forever hidden
Where's the true knowledge -
Where engines of the sane & insanity merge
The clarity. The unity

Reality untouchable, transparent, invisible
to our fixed, restricted fields of vision
Existence taken for granted. -Absolute

Possessed, owned, controlled
By the common sense-infected rational gaze
Onward forever we walk among the ignorant
Never stray from the common lines

MESHUGGAH - OBZEN
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

A state of perfection, immersed in filth
Equilibrium obtained
Pure in devotion to all things unwell
This sweet zen of our ill condition sustained

A new belief-system
Salvation found in vomit and blood
Where deprivation, lies
Corruption, war and pain is god

Balance
Harmony found in the sickly, the vile
Unflinching eyes, joyous and gleeming
Intense in their need to watch things die

A new belief-system
Salvation found in vomit and blood
Where deprivation, lies
Corruption, war and pain is god

Decay, disgrace, disgust - our state of zen

The grime of contempt and degeneration,
Sticky, foul and pungent

- The sediment of our creation
We flourish in this bloodred soil

MESHUGGAH - PINEAL GLAND OPTICS
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

How come I shiver, hurt and bleed,
If in dreams i cannot truly feel
Who would dare say, who would claim
This hallucination isn't real

Synaptical glitch looking glass
So enticing, real and free of lies
Prodigious, omnifarious
It nourishes, it feeds my starving eyes

Artificial the catalyst, organic its progeny
Voracious spectral offspring - so sweet in its hunger
Unbound this new vision, optical regenesis
Threatening, so complete in beautiful deformity

These authorative visions order my collective senses,
My questioning, doubtful, rigid self to kneel
A Judas syndrome in effect - former self the deceiver
Its denial the wretched kiss that kept this in disguise

Cast off - the conceiling veil, the rational cloak of doubt
Torn off - the restraints, the blinded's shackles
Burned away - the agony, the fear, the grief
A new set of eyes cleansed by a new belief

MESHUGGAH - DEHUMANIZATION / SUM
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

A new level reached, where the absence of air lets me breathe
I'm inverted electrical impulses. A malfunctioning death-code incomplete
All things before me, at first unliving glimpse undeciphered
Its semantics rid of logic. Nothing is all. All is contradiction

Grinding, churning - the sweetest ever noises
Decode me into their non-communication
A soundtrack to my failure, one syllable, one vowel

A stagnant flow of endings. Un-time unbound. Merging to form the multi-none
A sickly dance of matter, malignantly benign. Greeting the chasm - unbearable, sublime

Vision will blind. Severance ties. Median am I. True are all lies

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 7:10 AM
Title: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands
Content:
krodha wrote:
Saw Astus post that he was interested in other Buddhist influenced metal bands in a thread a few pages back... thought I'd share some..

Decrepit Birth from Santa Cruz California... technical melodic-death metal

DECREPIT BIRTH - METATRON
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Born into this world
Under an early sun
A mortal man of the ancient kingdom...earth
Walking in the dream of the vine
The lucid path of vision
I see a garden of shadows with no way out
Within the worlds of my dream
I seek the essence of my being
I transcend the realms...unknown before
Dimensions open before me
Absorbed/dissolved into the light of
Universal understanding
Cursed to live forever...burning from inside
My flesh is turned to fire...my eyes to blinding light
Awakened in my dream to the sound of my own scream
Metamorphosis...transformation...mutation
Who am I...what am I
Reaching out with my mind
Seeing the mysteries

Touch the origin
My mind transcends mortality
Displaced behind the prism of light
Falling into the eye of the paradox
I become the center of time
I am the balance…I am the eye
I am reborn…beyond the body
Beyond the pattern…beyond horizons
Beyond the light…divinity
Knowing the secret of creation
The universe within the flower of life
Five patterns of existence
Vibration of eternity
Past futures…emerge from the present
Lost forever inside my mind
I am eternal
Foundation of time and space
One becomes one inside the circle
Bearing the ancient scrolls of existence
I am destiny

DECREPIT BIRTH - POLARITY
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Parallels exist within
Reflection of time and space
Inside of dimension
Dualities evolving from a
Single-cell universe within the molecule
Within this dimension
Of my creation
In the blinding light of darkness
I remain one/we become one
Constant fluctuation
Two suns born
Born of the atom
Symbiotic opposition
Recreation of life changing
Individual…sovereignty
Absorb the other…fusion
Conception of time's vibration collapses within
Ancient forces of opposition

Eternal balances of existence
Aeons...futures...past...evolution
Internal axis of resistance
Pre-embryonic magnetic core
Creation of all worlds inside
Existence of thought
Reaches beyond...forever
Harmony achieved through unity
Within the spectral fields of light...called time

DECREPIT BIRTH - SYMBOSIS
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Eternally connected to the energies of existence
Subconscious link of consciousness
The golden light that makes us all one soul
One thought
One beginning
One center of focus
Pasts, present, futures
Existing in the moment
Sequences of existence inner-twine
Feel my light touch thee
The dreams of life awaken inside
Transcend the lies
Live for your dream
Open your mind and see
One soul, one thought, one mind
Evolution of understanding
Attain the wisdoms
Knowledge eternal
I reach out and touch your mind
I reveal the secrets before your eyes
Look into my eyes and you see yourself
I look into you and I see god
We hold the keys to the wisdoms
To the secrets and mysteries within
Witness the light of the new worlds
Evolution of consciousness
Converging the ancient forces
Behold the thought universal
Eternal unity of energies...

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 6:13 AM
Title: Re: Understanding emptiness
Content:
Konchog1 said:
So, why do I label a car as car? Instead of a lion. I see it as a machine not a giant animal. Wouldn't that mean there is something from the car's own side to make it a car?

5heaps said:
perhaps we can for the moment agree that there is something on the side of the object--but what is that thing? is it "lion" or "car" that is coming from the side of the object?

yadave said:
Wait, don't tell me .....

.....

Car!

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
No Dave, sorry... the correct answer would have been "a Blue 1986 Nissan 300zx Turbo with gray leather interior".... keep practicing

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 1:37 AM
Title: Re: Blue Tārā
Content:
krodha wrote:
Ekajaṭī is also known as Blue Tārā

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ekajati

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:32 AM
Title: Re: Aalaya and Neutral awareness
Content:
Daniel Arraes said:
Can one say that, according to Dzogchen, Aalaya (kun-gzhi) and the neutral awareness (shes-pa-lung-ma-bstan) are the same thing?

Namdrol said:
No, they are different. The ālaya is ignorance.

krodha wrote:
I've seen ālaya roughly translated to (or said to represent) a sort of storehouse or warehouse consciousness, is it due to this notion that it is essentially ignorance?

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 9:32 AM
Title: Re: Conventional/Ultimate Valid Cognitions
Content:
krodha wrote:
A valid cognition on the conventional level would just be the most accurate description or representation of ultimate cognition one can convey using concepts. Conventional or relative truths always correlate with the use of linear thought processes and language. So in truth, a 'conventional truth' or valid conventional cognition is never really a "truth", just an accurate account of the ultimate.

A valid ultimate cognition can never really be known apart from the experience itself. It's like describing the taste of an apple. The verbal, conceptual description is the conventional. The actual, sensual taste is the ultimate or absolute truth. The description of the taste obviously never properly captures the actual taste. In terms of peak experiences or realizations in the dharma, a metaphor of attempting to describe the color red to a man blind since birth can be used. Having never seen before the man would have no reference level with which to gauge your description. So the same principle goes for those attempting to describe ultimate truths or cognitions in the dharma as well. A nondual experience or liberation or what have you can be described conventionally, but the ultimate cognition or nature is only to be actualized in your own experience.

If thought or reasoning are being implemented to understand or break something down it's always only conventional. An experience of an ultimate cognition is just direct sensual experience divorced from/prior to translation or interpretation in thought/language etc.. And an ultimate truth or experience in reference to a realization or liberation will be explicitly evident beyond any doubts. When those things pop up more often than not you won't have to ask, it is just an innate intuitive certainty.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 8:46 AM
Title: Re: Transmission on the Internet
Content:
Sönam said:
No one simply notice that all what happens (or not) was simply our circumstances, that we hear what we were supposed to hear, at the right place, at the right moment.

Sönam

Mr. G said:
No, I noticed it Sonam. However, it doesn't mean we become fatalists, for improvements can be put in place for the future

krodha wrote:
Agreed, I think it's just constructive criticism... Undoubtably nothing can be done to change the circumstances regarding the nature of the connection in these past days, and if this is how the situation will remain for the time being we can all understand and accept that. However, for the sake of Rinpoche taking the time to teach and for the benefit of all interested in learning (in addition to those who work hard to make it all possible) it seems addressing the connection is only logical.

The point is to properly deliver the teaching. Just like the implementation of translators who are there to help in communicating better, the implementation of a proper system to deliver the message over the web is also a pertinent issue.

So I agree we all only heard what we were supposed to hear, because what we heard, is what we heard. Worrying about that is a futile endeavor. As you already said though, there's nothing wrong with improvement!

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 5:25 AM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:
krodha wrote:
I'll tell you what, that connection this morning was shot. Jeopardized assimilation of the whole teaching going on for anyone who wasn't in the same room as Rinpoche. I resorted to just remaining focused and open to rinpoche because I know he was putting it out there to be received. I do hope whatever the nature of the problem is with the connection gets resolved. Other than that it's been an informative and interesting retreat!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, February 5th, 2012 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:
krodha wrote:
I woke up for the start and put headphones on and then fell back asleep eventually and Norbu was in my dream giving the teaching and when he started the transmission Ron Paul was there repeating everything he said in deep voice overtone chanting, and his hair looked like docs from back to the future, it was pretty epic.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 1:14 PM
Title: Re: 2 types of selflessness
Content:
sangyey said:
Of the two - 'me' or 'mine' which one of them is the more grosser and which one of them is the more subtler?

krodha wrote:
Me and mine are two aspects of the same thing. Can't have one without the other. If you use fire as a metaphor the 'me' and 'mine' would be the flames and the heat. I'm not sure which would be considered more subtle and which is grosser. The most important thing is finding out what the 'me' and 'mine' depend on. Much like fire depends on fuel, you need to investigate what the 'me' and 'mine' rely on for fuel. Remove the fuel and extinguish the fire.

Cut the root of a tree and the leaves will wither; Cut the root of your mind and samsara falls.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 1:04 PM
Title: Re: 2 types of selflessness
Content:
White Lotus said:
for example when i look at my hands there is no sense of 'mine' whatsoever; whereas in the past there was.

krodha wrote:
That's funny, when this first happened to me the very first thing I remember was looking at my hands (I was driving) and being like "what the f*** are these?" And then I remember being amazed that I had ever thought there was anyone here at all. It made me feel like I had been living a lie.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
tomamundsen said:
Well, from my understanding, ChNNR doesn't have his students do ngondro and just directly starts teaching Dzogchen. However, the lama I'm practicing with teaches anyone who isn't going to die within a short period of time to do a ngondro and holds off on the Dzogchen teachings.

krodha wrote:
Being that one could die at any moment this idea of holding off on dzogchen unless someone is declared terminally ill is a strange idea in my opinion. Any of us could die within a short period of time... today... tomorrow... a month from now... not everyone has the luxury of knowing when death will come for them. If you have the interest in the dzogchen teachings then you're ready in my opinion, why delay the inevitable?

Also being that you have access to ChNN's teachings, again I'd say take advantage. Rinpoche's health has unfortunately been a bit of a rollercoaster the past couple years... all of our time is limited and the opportunity to receive his teachings is not guaranteed to last or endure through your ngondro. There's no harm in listening to him now, it can only be beneficial.

tomamundsen said:
He gave an analogy about how you need a special jewel container to hold a snow lion's milk and how the ngondro transforms us into this special jewel container so that we can receive Dzogchen teachings without them just immediately slipping through our grasp.

krodha wrote:
Part of the ngondro is to show your dedication and genuine interest in the teachings. The ability to complete it shows maturity and readiness to understand Dzogchen. Otherwise an immature mind with no discipline may interpret dzogchen as a green light to throw caution to the wind and act however they'd like and/or fall into nihilism. One has to be ripe to properly receive these teachings, so look at ngondro as assured and expedited ripening. The special jewel container is discipline, maturity, dedication, compassion and an overall readiness to know Dzogchen for the benefit of oneself and all other beings. Again your interest shows readiness in my opinion, just listen with a humble mind and open heart and you cannot go wrong.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:32 AM
Title: Re: 2 types of selflessness
Content:
sangyey said:
Thank you.

And then these two ways of looking at self, i.e., 'I' or 'mine' belong to selflessness of persons?

krodha wrote:
Yes but just as TMingyur said above, the implications associated with the selflessness of the person(i.e. subjective self) are directly related to the emptiness or selflessness of other-than-the-person(i.e. the objective world). Because to posit the inherent existence of a "person" or "I", automatically creates everything that is not the "person" or "I". Self goes hand in hand with other, they're mutually interdependent co-arisen concepts. Just as black goes with white, up with down and left with right. So it's a package deal, if

you're a self then there is automatically stuff in experience which is not you by default, it's a dichotomy. Removal of the self(subject) automatically removes the world(object). This notion of separation which dominates experience is the basis for suffering, it arises from avidyā or ignorance of our true condition. The purpose of the dharma is to remove this delusion.

There is no self, but when that truth is conceptualized and believed to be true, it is automatically falsified, because the very self that statement and idea attempts to negate is reborn through attachment or aversion to that concept or belief. So seek to comprehend these truths but hold them lightly, and when the time is right let go... apart from attachment and aversion you are unborn.

All dharmas are like reflected images, clear and pure, without turbulence, ungraspable, inexpressible, truly arisen from cause and from action.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 5:31 AM
Title: Re: 2 types of selflessness
Content:
sangyey said:
The phrase ' self and that which belongs to self ' does this refer to me and mine respectively? And if so then i assume they would both belong to the classification selflessness of person?

krodha wrote:
Yes refers to "I and mine" or "me and mine".

"Self"(I) meaning the personal subjective entity or sense that one is located 'here' within-the-body or as-the-body(and sensations/sensory perceptions, thought, memory etc.. which are attributed to embodiment).

And then "that which belongs to self"(mine) referring to appearances which are attributed to self volition; such as "I am doing" "I am seeing" "I am feeling" "my thoughts" "my actions" etc... and imputed objects the self is believed to possess; such as "my body" "my car" "my house" "my arm" etc...

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 10:54 AM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:
padma norbu said:
heehee, I should do this retreat just so you can all see just how bad the results can be... but, seriously, thanks again for the info. Will steer clear of this one for sure.

krodha wrote:

Why steer clear? It's not often opportunities like this come up, even if you receive the wang, lung and tri and don't do the practice at this point in time it's still good to receive the teaching... you may change your mind in the future and then you're already locked and loaded. Not everyone has access to teachings like this, or teachers like ChNN, you have the opportunity, I'd say take advantage of it. Authentic teachers are few and far between and life is delicate and can be lost at any moment, now is the time!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 12:54 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
swampflower said:
1. "What is there to change?"...Everything

krodha wrote:
You're absolutely right from a conventional point of view.

Devoid of locus, there is nothing to objectify, Rootless, they(things) have no fixed abode; they arise totally from the cause of ignorance, utterly devoid of beginning, middle and end. - Nagarjuna

swampflower said:
2. "Change must move against a stagnant background to be change."...Change is the passing away of something that has arisen and the arising of something new from something that has passed away. There is no "background" necessary...except for emptiness.

krodha wrote:
Yes again you're correct but my statements were geared towards very subtle and minute details of experience in the theme of abandoning false imputation. I was attempting to frame the way change seems to arise in experience via the use of projected thought and memory. Again, yadave was interested so its really just for conversational purposes because he seems to enjoy discussions like these as much as I do. And emptiness being empty itself cannot serve as a substantiated or fundamental background.

swampflower said:
3. "To further negate the change of color; in our direct experience we never experience an unseen color." ...We experience "unseen" colors all the time. Ultraviolet gives us a sunburn. Infrared keeps us toasty warm. These wavelengths of light are color although unseen by humans.

krodha wrote:
True but again I'm attempting to convey a certain perception of experience. I'm covering all my bases in a way so yadave can try to understand what I'm attempting to describe. In the picture I'm attempting to paint; ultraviolet being imperceptible would not be a part of what I'm describing, I'm only using elements of direct sensual experience...

what directly appears. So ultraviolet isn't a direct part of experience. There is direct evidence of contact with ultraviolet light as you said which would be a pain and a hue of redness appearing. But we'd only be concerned with those arisings and not the projected cause... Even though the projected cause arising as thought would be an aspect which could be integrated at a later time once one had a firm handle on the basic view. But like I said in that long description on the previous page where I was talking about salt I'm really only discussing what is immediately sensible. Not mediately. Same goes for infrared, that would be a mediate quality. So being unseen by humans, and absent in direct perception they aren't part of the discussion and view of experience I was portraying.

swampflower said:
This all seems far afield of the questions of emptiness.
Emptiness is not effectively intellectualized and analyzed through proposed theories of perception.

krodha wrote:
Yes somewhat, I think it's been agreed upon that this thread has evolved into a slightly different beast than it started as but we all seem to agree that it's remained productive and insightful. I started early on in this thread with my sentiments on emptiness, what you're reading lately is just my attempts at clarifying my points for yadave, I did originally go quality by quality to show how they are dependently originated in ones experience.

I'm not sure how you can say emptiness teachings are not effectively intellectualized and analyzed through proposed theories of perception, unless a proper teaching or discourse comes about how else would one arrive at a perception of emptiness? There are rare events where one gains insight from a peak experience spontaneously but that is rare. To add, everyone learns differently and everyone possesses different capacities for the teachings so what works for one person may not be appropriate for another. There is no staple approach to this type of thing, and I am certainly not claiming any authority in what I say. If it helps someone that is great! If not that is also perfectly ok. It makes sense to me so I'm only trying to share my view. It's validity or invalidity lies with you.

swampflower said:
These posts seem to be arguments against emptiness as a Buddhist understanding of reality.
As the Heart Sutra says "Emptiness is form; form is emptiness. Emptiness is non other than form; form is non other than emptiness."
It makes no sense to try to separate the two. Stated another way... There is no form without emptiness; there is no emptiness without form.

krodha wrote:
Interesting that you interpret these posts as being arguments against emptiness as a Buddhist understanding of reality. I would disagree but after all we are only sharing opinions and I respect yours.

Your other way of stating that(there is no form without emptiness...) is one way to interpret it; Conveying the natural dependency of form on emptiness in a positive-negative relational dichotomy. I however was approaching "form is emptiness" from the standpoint of form being precisely emptiness. And "emptiness is form" from the standpoint of 'emptiness being precisely form' in that emptiness as a concept IS form so therefore emptiness is also empty. And you're right it does make no sense to attempt to separate the two... Because they are not two.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 4:42 AM
Title: Re: Shangpa Kagyu Teachings
Content:
lisehull said:
Has anyone read this book? If so, how complex is it? I am thinking of buying a copy but don't want to confuse my little brain.

Lise

krodha wrote:
Sometimes confusing the brain is a good thing! Dedication to understanding something like a text which may not make sense at first is always a good thing in my eyes. Causes your perceptions and thought processes to evolve and grow

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 5:12 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
Hey Sunshine,

Your piece is more of a pointing out piece than Candrakirti's SevenFold Reasoning methinks. There is one mod we may want to make, which should be fine since you disclaimed everything at the start.

asunthatneversets said:
The conclusion that the colors are external to us is based on the principle that these colors change over time.
...
But by looking at experience very directly it can actually be ascertained that this "otherness" is never a part of our experience.

yadave said:
This actually makes a bit of a contradiction in the interesting "world" you create. I think we'd need to lobotomize memory as well to prevent one from remembering "change" in whatever sense we focused on, for otherwise, one will "know" something about what

changes, and what does not, and that itself becomes self/other or change/nochange. As Cone said way back in this thread, this distinction happens really early in most animals, probably genetic. Anyway, I'm trying to gather all this into an effable thought and sometimes my brain works better when I'm sleeping (actually, I think I am sleeping) so these issues will no doubt receive further blathering in future.

Now I must return to the ever-satisfying deep sleep state. Hasta manana.

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
Well what is there to change? Since the examination i proposed showed colors are vision, and vision is consciousness, and consciousness is empty. That in-and-of-itself negates the changing display of color. But to go further into it, the notion of change must be judged from a reference point of either less-changing or unchanging in the usual sense. But we found the less-changeful and/or changeless reference point to be inherently nonexistent. Change must move against a stagnant background to be change. There must be something to gauge the change... and we find nothing. Because you're right to know change requires memory to implement as a reference. But this is impossible. We don't have to lobotomize what is already lobotomized. We usually take memory to be an image 'of' a past event. Because we believe ourselves to be entities extended into time and space. This is not the case. A memory thought is always an ever-fresh appearance. It seems to resemble a previous state but it is just an image which appears in the present timeless moment. It is only an image. When the image appears, under the delusion of time we conceive ourselves to be a subject witnessing or possessing this image and then project that it is evidence of a previous event and call it memory. But time must exist as an inherent faculty of experience for this to be the case, and it isn't, because time IS the so-called memory thought as well. And that "memory" thought is only an ever fresh appearance. So there is only ever this timelessness. The past is a thought appearing now, and there is no thinker of that thought(it isn't even a thought either). Thoughts don't point or refer to anything. They just appear. We get in the habit of believing they refer to actual "things" out there in a world, but they don't. We also get in the habit of validating a thought with another thought. For example if a thought(a) appears and then a thought(b) appears which claims thought(a) is true. Thought(a) is already long gone. Thought(b) cannot reach out and touch thought(a). They never appear at the same time. When (b) is present (a) is not. Another thought may appear that says "bullsh*t!"... But that's thought(c). Whatever is appearing now is all that is.

To further negate the change of color; in our direct experience we never experience an unseen color. So a color's absence is never a part of experience. If a color cannot be experienced as absent, it cannot be experienced as present. A color cannot alternate between presence and absence. Having one side of a pair of opposites makes no sense. There are no one sided coins. So neither present or absent applies to color or any other appearance.

I must also sleep now. Hasta mañana. Taking my 3 yr old to the Oakland zoo mañana. Party animals.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 10:30 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
Yes, Cone. It may have been better to keep my mouth shut. Your reply contains so many issues, enough for another thread, and we're already close to crashing the server with this one (woo hoo!). Anyway, stumbling through another read of sunshine's piece and wanted to include this modern article on William Molyneux's Problem for interested readers, future ref, etc.,

http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2011/04/formerly-blind-children-shed-lig.html?etoc " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
That's cool they revisited that! So what are the issues with what cone is saying? Because they fall in line with the entire theme of this thread and are accurate in my opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
catmoon said:
Then there is the interesting case of Virgil, and man blind since birth, who had an operation to remove severe cataracts. The results were not as expected:
Virgil told me later that in this first moment he had no idea what he was seeing. There was light, there was movement, there was color, all mixed up, all meaningless, a blur. Then out of the blur came a voice that said, "Well?" Then, and only then, he said, did he finally realize that this chaos of light and shadow was a face -- and, indeed, the face of his surgeon. [...]
Virgil would stare at the cat as it walked around the room, not knowing what it was until it either meowed or jumped in his lap, when he would exclaim "ah! the cat!". The rest of the story of Virgil's journey to learn to see is in Oliver Sack's book, " An Anthropologist on Mars ".

This might be relevant to to the earlier discussion on vision and seeing.

krodha wrote:
Right! It took the auditory and tactile sensations being present for successful identification... I like that it's also about a cat... Very fitting coming from you

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 4:33 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
We, my friend... are concepts.

yadave said:
That's great. Without a subject/object there's really not a damn thing to talk about and that seems incredibly funny for some reason so it must be way past bedtime. Ciao.

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
Well then perhaps look at it this way;
It appears that thoughts arise but there is no thinker. Likewise it appears seeing is happening but there is no seer. And all the way down the line for all the senses. So whatever this is that we label as experience is spontaneously self-appearing. It appears to no one, so to say "we experience concepts" is true conventionally. But in truth the concept in it's appearance as letters or thought or verbal utterance doesn't point to anything. And in fact any-thing conceivable IS a concept. Apart from the conceptual overlay of experience we have the incredibly long breakdown I posted on the previous page having to do with the suchness and one-taste of experience in-and-of-itself. I tried to conceptually get as nonconceptual as I could by making that post experimental with actual experience. But getting back to the concepts, when you think or say "we", the sound "we" just appears and is self-liberated in the very same moment. The error is that via the faculty of memory experience is extended into what appears to be time. And time gives the feeling that there is a subject which experiences an arising such as a concept which is conceived to be separate(from said subject). Time is an illusion. The subject is an illusion. Likewise the object is then negated as well. The concept in whatever form it appears IS experience itself. The notion that "we" experience anything is product of delusion. Experience just "is"... Seamless, timeless and whole in this ever-presence. Another short and potentially confusing way to put it is; the totality of all that is appearing in this very moment is what you are, and "you" are a concept. (And experience is empty.)

Reminds me of what Satan says in Mark Twain's The Mysterious Stranger which is actually incredibly on point. There's a creepy claymation adaptation of this scene in a old Tom Sawyer film you can find on YouTube. But anyways, Satan says:

"Life itself is only a vision, a dream. Nothing exists except empty space and you, and

you... are but a thought"

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 2:30 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
krodha wrote:
Oh and MalaBeads I wrote infinitesimal in my initial response and meant 'infinite' (no way to correct other than this).

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 2:22 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Aside from our conceptualizations about experience, experience itself communicates nothing.

yadave said:
Sunshine, your phenomenological inquiry is amazing, Much better than the Candrakirti Seven Points of Thinking piece we started with. You could write a book. I am going to practice it in more depth and first have a quick question.

Do we experience concepts?

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
We, my friend... are concepts.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 12:41 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
How does internal/external not equate to subjective/objective?

MalaBeads said:
This is slightly off topic but speaks to your question asunthatneversets. Try this: hold your hand in front of your face and ask yourself this question: is your hand inside you or

outside you?

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure what you're proposing is the me with which to gauge an inner or outer with. And even if this alleged me was somehow located; how then could an idea exist inside or outside another idea? And how could they exist simultaneously? If they somehow were to manifest as distinct entities and exist simultaneously, then where could one establish a dividing line? Or where could a container be found one could utilize to place one within so the other remained outside? There are infinitesimal possibilities within the realm of the imagination, and I cannot successfully answer your question.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:46 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

Acchantika said:
Yes, but internal and external does not mean subjective and objective. I claimed you were making this equation. The external is still part of experience.

krodha wrote:
How does internal/external not equate to subjective/objective?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:03 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I'm more concerned with direct experience of salt in it's form readily apparent to the senses.

yadave said:
OK. Salt tastes salty. I am ready.

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
As a quick disclaimer: Faculties that are named and used in making the descriptions and examinations i'm writing about are only temporary and will be discarded at a later point. Something said at one point may be contradicted and negated later on in reference to titles such as, mind, sense-fields, awareness, consciousness, subject, object etc....

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed;
Independent of the conventional, no [ultimate] truth can be found. - Nagarjuna

Ok so throughout this I want to stick with what is sensible. By "sensible" I mean capable of being sensed or that which is perceived by the senses. So audible, visible, tangible, etc... and for this we'll go with what is immediately perceived. Not mediately (through the intervention of something else). For example; when reading a book what you immediately perceive is letters on the page, but mediately or by means of these, notions of truth, virtue, vice etc are suggested to the mind. So though notions such as truth, vice, virtue etc are suggested and signified to the mind by sensible marks with which they have an arbitrary connection with, it would be absurd to designate these(truth, virtue etc..) as sensible things. So 'sensible things' means only what is immediately perceived by the senses and sensible things that we investigate don't include such designations inherently. To add; in instances such as a situation where one sees both red and blue in the sky, and thus it is inferred that there must be a cause for the differences in colors, that cause cannot be said to be a sensible quality immediately perceived by eyesight. Likewise, when one hears a variety of sounds it cannot be said that you hear their causes, and when one touches something hot or feels something heavy; one cannot say with truth that you feel the cause of the heat or weight. Hopefully we can agree that the senses perceive only what is perceived immediately because they do not make inferences.

So immediate sensible qualities include:
Sight - light, colors, shapes.
Hearing - sounds.
The palate - tastes.
Smell - odors.
Touch - tangible qualities.
(And obviously combinations of these.)

The purpose for this is to obviously stay with the theme I mentioned in an earlier post which was based on the premise that experience suggests nothing about itself. Aside from our conceptualizations about experience, experience itself communicates nothing. So staying with what is immediately perceived allows us to remain objective (no pun intended) and allows a mutually shared middle ground (non-conceptual awareness) apart from our contrasting notions about that middle ground. So like I said we're empirically investigating the nature of experience itself, and the emptiness or non-emptiness of an objective field in relation to it's validity in being a substantiated attribute of experience.

The underlying inquiry consists of two contrasting notions which are; does the reality of sensible things consist of being perceived? Or do things in fact exist as inherent exterior objects independent of sensual perception, distinct from, and having no relation to being
perceived? And related notions of objectivity, subjectivity, physicality, etc. Inherent separate existence vs. Empty dependent origination.

You started with salt before so… beginning with salt; inquiring into salts characteristics and attributes we'll look into whether salt exists as an objective independent agent which inherently exists and posses these attributes or the contrary.

Salt as it's usually experienced is predominantly comprised of vision, tactile sensation and obviously taste. I suppose salt can, on occasion be heard and also undoubtably bears an aroma to match it's pungent taste but those senses are secondary. So I think approaching salt sense-by-sense will be appropriate so that we can ensure that each sensory field can be properly isolated and examined. The reason for this is that in my opinion the different sense fields are heterogeneous instead of how they are usually taken to be (homogeneous). So even though they seem to amalgamate and interact to create what appears to be an organized and coordinated experience of reality, they are in fact separate fields which only communicate with one another via inferential projection.

This issue was examined rather thoroughly in a philosophical thought-experiment called Molyneux's Problem which consisted of attempting to understand the level of sensorial coordination one would possess upon immediate recovery from blindness. Taken from wikipedia; The problem can be stated in brief, "if a man born blind can feel the differences between shapes such as spheres and cubes, could he similarly distinguish those objects by sight if given the ability to see?"

The question was originally posed to Locke by philosopher William Molyneux, whose wife was blind:

Suppose a man born blind, and now adult, and taught by his touch to distinguish between a cube and a sphere of the same metal, and nighly of the same bigness, so as to tell, when he felt one and the other, which is the cube, which is the sphere. Suppose then the cube and the sphere placed on a table, and the blind man made to see: query, Whether by his sight, before he touched them, he could now distinguish and tell which is the globe, which the cube? To which the acute and judicious proposer answers: ‘Not. For though he has obtained the experience of how a globe, and how a cube, affects his touch; yet he has not yet attained the experience, that what affects his touch so or so, must affect his sight so or so…’

To which Locke responds in "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding":

I agree with this thinking gentleman, whom I am proud to call my friend, in his answer to this problem; and am of opinion that the blind man, at first sight, would not be able with certainty to say which was the globe, which the cube, whilst he only saw them; though he could unerringly name them by his touch, and certainly distinguish them by the difference of their figures felt.

In 1709, in “A New Theory of Vision,” George Berkeley also concluded that there was no necessary connection between a tactile world and a sight world—that a connection between them could be established only on the basis of experience. He speculated: the objects to which he had hitherto used to apply the terms up and down, high and low,

were such as only affected or were in some way perceived by touch; but the proper objects of vision make a new set of ideas, perfectly distinct and different from the former, and which can in no sort make themselves perceived by touch (sect. 95).

There have been events matching this predicament which actually verified these philosopher's educated speculations; one of them being the case of "a woman who gained sight at the age of 12 when she underwent surgery for dense bilateral congenital cataracts. They report that the subject could recognize family members by sight six months after surgery, but took up to a year to recognize most household objects purely by sight."

So starting with vision; I included a reference image we can both use to avoid conflicting imagery.

(image A)

Salt on a table is a fairly common affair (if one is making a mess) and is good because it entails fairly limited differences in color, which as it ends up is pretty much equivalent to the very sense of vision we're exploring.

My argument to start is going to be that color is exactly vision and vision is exactly color, they are synonymous in nature and manifestation. The common presupposition that the process of visually perceiving an object consists of 'seeing' a 'color' (which exists separately from said act of seeing) is a misnomer. Wherever there is color there is seeing and vice versa. The two go hand-in-hand and you cannot have one without the other. With color we also get 'shape' which is a result of colors bordering each other in various ways. So color also implies shape, and shape likewise will imply color. Ultimately the object of vision is color and therefore shape.

Vision standing alone as an isolated sense is much like Image A posted above. If we attend to the visual evidence in the image alone we get a circular patch of white surrounded by brown. There is no separating line between the colors and vision. And likewise there is no separating line between the colors and you, no evidence in the colors of being "out there" and no evidence of yourself being an observer "in here". The conclusion that the colors are external to us is based on the principle that these colors change over time. So we accept a story that the colors (object) is separate from us even though the basis for this conclusion is lacking in the visual evidence in-and-of-itself. This aligns with my previous statement that experience suggests nothing about itself. Experience instead receives projected conceptual overlay which over time serves to create habitually solidified subconscious presuppositions conveying a compelling sense of separation.

Separation in general is based on spatiality. We usually conceive of two opposite aspects existing on opposite sides of unbridgeable spatial gaps. In truth we never experience spatial externality or independence. These designations are based on the formation of a subtle reference point of a subjective self "here" as opposed to "there".

The feeling of subjectivity is never anything more than a tendency to identify with certain clusters of sensation and project that the remainder is objective and "other". But by looking at experience very directly it can actually be ascertained that this "otherness" is never a part of our experience.

So back to the white salt on the brown table... this image that arises as vision is composed of these colors, we see a white circular expanse of color, and various shades of white within that circular shape. Bordering that we see a brown expanse of color which seems to surround the white, and if we could back up and see a larger image the colors would unfold as we went along.
These colors are all there is to vision. So to examine the 'objectivity' of vision let's examine the 'whiteness' in the image(and you can do this by putting salt on a table in front of you)... speaking specifically about the shades of the 'whiteness' and the particular value of the color. Can we say that the shade itself is salt? Can it be said that wherever you have that particular shade(white) you have salt - and wherever you have salt you have that particular shade(white)? Obviously not. So white itself isn't definitive of salt. Now would you say that there is salt on the far side of that color? Do you directly experience salt behind the white? Because we just established that we wouldn't take the shade of white itself to be salt one should naturally inquire as to whether there is salt behind the white. We'll find that there is in fact no salt to be found on the posterior side of the white. Now on the near side of the color, do we experience any separation between the seeing of the color and the color itself? Attending exclusively to vision and letting go of any arising concepts or beliefs, is there any distance experienced between the seeing of the white and the white itself? You can't see the 'seeing'... so there can't be any distance, the color simply arises. So there's no salt on the far side of the white, and no salt on the near side, and no distance or gap between the white and the seeing of the white itself. Wherever white appears, vision is occurring, there's no access to white without vision, so the objectivity of the salt should melt or fuse into vision itself. The color should disappear into vision, because at that point it makes no sense to say one is "seeing" a "color" in the first place... the two are inseparable. Vision itself means color is arising, they're one and the same. It's not as if you have independent access to colors where you can notice a color out of the visual field and then say now i'm seeing that color, there couldn't be a color unless vision was already there.

Now the idea that there is a bordering line between an internal aspect of the body and an external aspect apart from the body has to be taken into account as well. This 'bordering line' creating the dichotomy of internal/external is based on identification with 'the body'. But the body itself is not separate from vision either, there are other colors and shades which are identified as 'my body' but just like the colors which composed the salt, these colors appearing as a 'body' do not communicate a possessive nature. The colors simply arise no different than any other color in the field of vision. We only impute a notion of 'my body' over these colors. There are other faculties that seem to correlate with vision to give the appearance of a homogeneous cluster of sensations conventionally called the body and we can discuss those separately, but all are merely qualities appearing to awareness as awareness itself. So the notion of an 'subject inside' viewing an 'object outside' is not self-evident in vision. Vision simply appears and is completely non-discriminitive. Another thing which isn't

self-evident in vision is the presence of 'eyes' doing the seeing, we never experience or see our own eyes at any time, even in the act of looking at a mirror we only are ever seeing colors and shapes arise that we identify with as 'me' and 'my eyes' but the eyes appear nowhere within vision itself, we again only accept a story about this.

About this Nagarjuna states: "Through this the eyes, visible forms and so forth, which are described as the elements, these should be known also as [the twelve] sense-fields, and as the objects and the subjects as well.

Neither atom of form exists nor is sense organ elsewhere; even more no sense organ as agent exists; so the producer and the produced are utterly unsuited for production." - Nagarjuna

"In terms of objects and subjects, whatever appears to the consciousness, apart from the cognitions themselves, no external objects exist anywhere.

So there are no external objects at all existing in the mode of entities. The very perceptions of the individual consciousnesses arise as appearances of the forms." - Nagarjuna

So vision is color. You can't even say they arise as mutually interdependent co-emergent qualities because the duality is lacking to begin with. The notion of the duality between observing and observed is a conceptual imputation. A story simply arises and say "i'm seeing white" and we accept this story, but the story is never evident in vision itself. The objectivity of color as an external quality isn't substantiated by experience. Now vision itself doesn't appear separate from awareness, or 'that' which 'knows' vision to be apparent. But that-which-knows is the appearance itself, there is no duality, even to say appearance implies something to which the appearance would appear-to, so what "is" escapes all such conceptualizations (aside from conventional descriptive concepts). So the objectivity of the salt collapses, the objectivity of color collapses, the objectivity of vision collapses as well. We can't say that vision is a 'thing' out there which is separate that we have access to sometimes and not at other times. Vision is awareness, there is no separation and there are no 'objects', all we have is awareness. And this same exercise is done for every sense modality. (Awareness itself must also be refuted as such.)

For the salty taste; my argument would be much like what has been proposed for vision, i saw that namdrol used the example of MSG in showing the appearance of 'saltiness' to not be unique to salt itself. So following the same examination done with vision and focusing on the palate alone one can successfully find taste to be empty as well. I would also add that with your argument being that saltiness is an innate quality with which salt itself is inherently endowed with; if one runs the gamut of taste congruent with other sensory appearances such as heat; it can be seen that an intense level of taste such as spiciness correlates with an intense heat in that at the highest volume of appearance both arise as pain. The pain that arises is in fact the taste. There are not two appearances such as taste and then also pain, they are one and the same. So to posit that an external objective thing like salt inherently contains it's taste would be akin to

claiming it also contains the appearances of pain and pleasure. One also cannot attribute lesser volumes of the same spectrum such as a general mild taste to an object without naturally accrediting higher and lower volumes of that same spectrum. So salt cannot be said to contain it's taste. And taste cannot be said to be anything more than awareness itself and empty. This insight combined with the former which coincides with the experiment done in vision should hopefully annihilate this false designation(of inherent objective existence) apart from mere conventional usage.

Ultimately awareness itself is empty. Because for one to claim that this inquiry has successfully reached a foundation at 'awareness' implies a 'ground' of being of some type where none can be found. Yet conventionally awareness is a clear and proper concept to use in describing that-which-is, for such an awareness likewise cannot be denied.

The Buddha attempted to capture these realizations in The Heart Sutra when he stated: There are no eyes, no ears, no nose, no tongue, no body, no mind. There is no seeing, no hearing, no smelling, no tasting, no touching, no imagining. There is nothing seen, nor heard, nor smelled, nor tasted, nor touched, nor imagined.

Devoid of all real entities;
Utterly discarding all objects and subjects,
Such as aggregates, elements and sense-fields;
Due to sameness of selflessness of all phenomena,
One's mind is primordially unborn;
It is in the nature of emptiness.
- Nagarjuna

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 3:44 PM
Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys
Content:
krodha wrote:
Makes me want to buy a few copies of crystal and the way of light and leave one of each in a random obscure place to be discovered by someone someday... Plant a few seeds. I'd feel like a low grade Guru Rinpoche hiding termas. They'd have to be some asinine weather proof spots, the kinda place where if someone found it they'd know it was left for the sole purpose of being discovered.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:54 AM
Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys
Content:
krodha wrote:
I met someone awhile ago (at the ling I go to) who said their original introduction to the teachings happened when they were visiting Hawaii and were hiking through the jungle

in the middle of nowhere and came upon a old broken down rusty car. They opened up the car and looked through it and nothing was inside so they popped the trunk and opened it up and the only thing inside was the "crystal and the way of light".... Wild.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: Unseen Beings in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
Paul said:
Is there such a thing as a poltergeist in Tibetan buddhism? I seem to remember mention of a type of being with "power over the movement of objects" in a sangcho text and it sounded very similar.

krodha wrote:
I was just reading something about this the other day in regards to the nature of a poltergeist being a manifestation of ones own repressed/suppressed aspects of themselves. Whether it be karmic debts like namdrol said, or just subconscious traits that have been buried coming to the surface it can probably be either. But it makes sense that those aspects of oneself would manifest in order to serve as a release. A kind of catharsis or purification that needs to occur as long as one remains ignorant of their actions which cause build up.

Also made me wonder if these same manifestations of repressed/suppressed aspects would hold true on a collective level. In the sense of the microcosm mirroring the macrocosm. Instances like the earthquake/tsunami/nuclear issues in Japan could be a manifestation of japaneses attitude towards the ocean with over fishing, whaling and horrid activities like you see in films like "the cove" where literally thousands of dolphins are trapped and killed, babies and all. The imprint on consciousness that these activities must cause must need an outlet. So the tsunami and surrounding events could be a poltergeist type phenomena on a major collective scale.

Im not saying this is the case, and i don't mean to offend anyone effected, or downplay the events in Japan by saying they were self inflicted... just some thoughts.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 8:35 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
It is partially untrue, hence the smiley, so it is partially (or largely) true.

krodha wrote:
So how is it partially true or untrue? In your opinion I mean.

yadave said:

You don't seem to notice that your view depends on the paradigm you happen to believe in. You have faith. You are "right."

krodha wrote:
What do I believe in? I've been referencing that view depends on ones reigning paradigm from the beginning of this thread. Other than initial faith to investigate no faith is required in what I'm suggesting. No ones right or wrong, but there is correct and incorrect view in terms of vidya and avidya. I do realize my view reflects the view I'm attempting to convey, I wouldn't be so bold to suggest I'm not subject to the same stipulations I'm bringing attention to in others cases. We are not different.

yadave said:
You don't seem to notice that your view depends on the paradigm you happen to believe in. You have faith. You are "right."

krodha wrote:
I do notice.

yadave said:
That's a neat concept, Sunshine.

krodha wrote:
Yes how ironic we have to use concepts to communicate. My point is that experience itself doesn't suggest such designations. Experience doesn't communicate anything. Only ideas of experience do. So my inquiry would be based on discovering if apart from our ideas we carry about experience, does experience actually resemble our conditioned views? And it's interesting that it in fact doesn't. Our conditioned views don't hold up to earnest investigation in an empirical sense. And experience turns out to have a degree of plasticity of sorts, in that it will reflect how it is viewed and can appear in many ways depending on the varying points of view the one apparent "point" holds.

yadave said:
Now you're talking metaphysics. I was talking about the tree you can't walk through.

krodha wrote:
"Metaphysical" as in what is fundamental to physicality? Or "metaphysical" as in a sarcastic term to label notions which contrast ones accepted paradigm? If that's me talking metaphysics then this whole thread is metaphysic in nature. I haven't deviated from the emptiness of phenomena topic at all, what I'm saying just sounds absurd because its counterintuitive to ones point of view which has been subconsciously solidified through constant reification.

yadave said:
Horsesh*t is fine, Sunshine. I made this a conventional topic some posts back so go for it.

Namdrol and I already analyzed the horsesh*t out of salt, so you may want to use this. Namdrol said I'm not allowed to stop searching at the salt molecule, even though its parts are not salty. I argued that his goal, some "eternal independent essence," was an archaic metaphysical strawman.

krodha wrote:
Constituent parts such as molecules aren't my concern, unless you're as small as a molecule, molecules aren't an obvious part of experience. I'm more concerned with direct experience of salt in it's form readily apparent to the senses.

yadave said:
So our analysis will probably return to what cloudburst is expressing, we will probably argue about what "existence" means, and this will probably be due to there being at least four contexts going on here. It is almost too much fun to fathom. ;)

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
What existence means wouldn't be my concern either. Empirical investigation into what the nature of experience is, is all my analysis would encompass.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 5:09 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

yadave said:
Nonduality is a term made popular by new-age writers.

krodha wrote:
Simply untrue.

All that arises
is essentially no more real
than a reflection,
transparently pure and clear,
beyond all definition
or logical explanation.
Yet the seeds of past action,
karma, continue to cause further arising
Even so-
know all that exists
is ultimately void of self-nature,

utterly non-dual!

- The Buddha

yadave said:
You talk the talk, Sunshine, but consider my dilemma. All I have left is a little prajna. Oh, and cooties. That's it, prajna and cooties.

Magazines like Time and Newsweek periodically run an article on meditation subjects. I recall one where a scientist told the story of waiting for a train one day when his perception of "outside" suddenly collapsed and he felt no separation between himself and the world he gazed upon. The experience passed but he was blown away and it left him with an enormous curiosity about what had happened in his mind. He did not burst out exclaiming "trains don't really exist!"

krodha wrote:
Of course he didn't, you think he'd be taken seriously by his piers? Credibility is king in institutionalized scientific circles. And even at that, just because he had a taste of an altered state of consciousness doesn't mean he had any background to understand the implications of such an experience. There's no doubt experiences like that are compelling enough to cause thorough investigation by anyone who has one. It all has to do with ones views and the paradigm they are raised to believe in. If that scientist had been living in India, Nepal, Bhutan, Tibet, Japan or any other south asian country 7 times out of 10 he would've most likely understood what that experience was.

His perception of "outside" collapsed because there is no inherent external reality. It certainly appears that way and it's useful that it does to navigate and function but in truth it is not so. I rarely use science to back up what i say but even modern science claims that all we experience is a representation in our brains and that there's no absolute way to ever know if there's an external world. And that's just modern science. That isn't even a correct view in my opinion.

yadave said:
I think we all have the capacity for these realizations, our interpretations may still differ, like they do for the texts we study.

krodha wrote:
Undoubtably, it's an innate part of being whatever it is that we are. People across all cultures, across all of time have had these "religious experiences" and they're interpreted in a myriad of ways according to the culture and time you read about them from. And some are sophisticated and accurate understandings with cultures which are based on such an experience, and some are unsophisticated translations of that experience like claiming to be the son of god.

yadave said:
At the end of the day, suffering is not caused by clinging to a tree, tree hugging is probably soothing, suffering is caused by clinging to a self and the Buddhist technology

for dismantling that self is excellent, I have only thumbs up for emptiness of internal phenomena, my main concern here has been the projection of this onto emptiness of external phenoma, of language, and other ancillary things.

People, hummingbirds, and snails must all "go around the tree" to get to the other side. Words and perceptions may differ, but the "tree" is real in this sense and no personal hubris of mine causes this to be so.

krodha wrote:
Internal/external phenomena is a projection of your so-called "internal" phenomena called conceptualization. Your main concern about this being "projected" as emptiness of external phenomena is impossible being that external phenomena is a projection itself. Aside from conventionality; people, hummingbirds, snails and tree lack inherent being. You're right it isn't due to any personal hubris of yours, but clinging to concepts and attachment to habitual patterns which reify that view certainly make it seem like there appears to be a person who does so. And in contrast makes it appear that there's a person who claims he or she doesn't do so due to any personal hubris of theirs.

I agree with namdrol that the apparent solidity of phenomena is directly related to the solidity of one's delusion. The more solid one's delusion is, the more solid apparent phenomena seem.

Pick out an object if you want yadave and let's break it down. I'd like for you to semi-grasp what i'm talking about so I'm not just throwing horsesh*t out on a message board without backing up my statements.

"Just as the Buddhas have spoken of
"I" and "mine" for a practical purpose;
Likewise they spoke too of "aggregates",
"Elements" and "sense-fields" for a practical reasons.

Such things spoken of as the "great elements",
These are fully absorbed into consciousness;
Since they are dissolved by understanding them,
Are they not falsely imputed?"

- Nagarjuna: excerpt from his 60 Stanzas

"In the universal womb that is boundless space
all forms of matter and energy occur as a flux of the four elements,
but all are empty forms, absent in reality;
all phenomena, arising in pure mind, are like that.

Magical illusion, whatever it's shape,
lacks substance, empty in nature;

likewise, all experience of the world, arisen in the moment,
unstirring from pure mind, is insubstantial evanescence.

Just as a dream is a part of sleep,
unreal gossamer in it's arising,
so all and everything is pure mind,
never separated from it,
and without substance or attribute.

....Just as the objective field is absent in reality,
so 'the knower' - in actuality pure mind,
in essence and absence, is like the clear sky:
know it in it's ineffable reality!

....In total presence, the nature of mind that is like the sky,
where there is no duality, no distinction, no gradation,
there is no view nor meditation nor commitment to observe,
no diligent ideal conduct, no pristine awareness to unveil,
no training in the stages and no path to tread,
no subtle level of realization, and no final union.

..... Constantly deconstructing, investigating keenly,
not even the slightest substance can be found;
and in the undivided moment of nondual perception
we abide in the natural state of perfection.

Absent when scrutinized, absent when ignored,
not even an iota of solid matter is attested;
so all aspects of experience are always absent -
know it as nothing but magical illusion!"

-Longchenpa: excerpts from The Treasury Of Natural Perfection

[/quote]
yadave said:
Now you are reifying and rationalizing and comparing yourself to others. Right on.

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
Yes but it's understood that it's merely a product of conventional language implemented as a tool in the context of this conversation for the purpose of communication, and there's nothing wrong with that. I enjoy discussions like these.

I'm only saying I don't blame you for questioning the emptiness of external phenomena. So if you want to pick out an object and start there i'm down to discuss. Maybe starting

with clouds would be good since there's minimal colors involved and a large area.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
... He just uses different terms like "staying in the I AM" ...

Sönam said:
It does not sound very dzogchen ...

Sönam

Namdrol said:
Agreed. Not very dzogchen at all.

krodha wrote:
Perhaps not, I just mean the reference to remaining present. But you're right it isn't a dzogchen teaching but that's where I was saying take bits and pieces and see the correlations. Discard of the rest. Nevertheless I'm all for traditional dzogchen texts and teachings they hold their own undoubtably.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 6:42 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
Astus said:
Indeed, it is his straightforward manner of teaching that grabbed me in the first place. It is difficult to find teachers who don't just repeat the common terminology all the time. Perhaps it is also an advantage that he can teach directly in his native tongue, thus breaking down those cultural and linguistic difficulties.

krodha wrote:
Agreed, I think any nondual teaching can be a great supplement to ones understanding and some teachers are definitely more clear than others. There might be an aspect of Buddhist teachings whether dzogchen, mahamudra etc that could seem unclear that can all of a sudden click by hearing someone put it a different way. Using the teachings as a tool and being able to implement various tools for the job is key, in my eyes.

Other good teachers who helped me are
Tony Parsons
Jeff Foster
Adyashanti

Greg Goode
Scott Kiloby
Rupert Spira
Nisargadatta Maharaj
Ramana Maharshi
Ramesh Balsekar
Atmananda Krishna Menon

I took bits and pieces of everything they say and found the correlations within buddhism and dzogchen and the traditional texts and teachings and then came at it from the position of Buddhism and dzogchen in the sense of what does it say about what these other teachers are saying.. How does it critique their views.. Do they mesh... What works.. What doesn't work. And it's helped my view and experience tremendously.

It's wild, even so called "advaita" teachers like nisargadatta for example; his advice for practice is the exact same as the dzogchen method of being present at all times. He just uses different terms like "staying in the I AM" and he says forget Brahman and all that, it's useless.

It's interesting stuff.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 4:24 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

yadave said:
So my point here is not new, just another way of expressing my concern over the scope of these ideas in today's language framework because, at the end of the day, we appear to end up with odd statements like,

9a. Nothing ultimately exists.
9b. Everything conventionally exists.

and one questions the value of such an empty concept, "ultimate existence," in the first place. Seems that one could leave "existence" alone, conventional, and simply say "things have no essence" which, from what I gather, is an early way of saying "God does not really exist" or "souls don't really exist." But in my daily experience, the term "exists" is not usually associated with "eternal and independent," these latter terms come up in theistic conversations. I had one crafty pastor friend who got around the essence problem by saying "God changes."

(I suppose one could make a case for physical laws like gravity being "eternal and independent" but will leave this for another day.
Dave.

krodha wrote:
It's not an early way of saying things have no essence as in a "god" or "soul" doesn't exist. It's not an "early" way of saying anything of the sort. It's a way of showing the absence of duality. That you think you're a physical body, in a physical world with objects outside of you which are alien to you, but this is simply a misconception derived from our false conditioned perception. The outcome truly is that "you" as a subjective entity are removed completely. And the feeling that there are "things" outside you is removed completely. Whatever it is you would call "experience" is all that's left. But a singular, zero-dimensional experiencing in-and-of-itself. This isn't some philosophy which is left on the level of a humored intellectual contemplation. You seem to want to rationalize it to be that way. I can't say that I blame you being that you have no reference point to gauge it in it's ultimate sense. But it surely isn't a mere "early" way of pronouncing some philosophical notion.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 3:31 AM
Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being
Content:
Paul said:
Here is a talk (in two parts) by James Low:

https://soundcloud.com/simplybeing " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The transcript is here:
http://www.simplybeing.co.uk/articles.php?p=Easy_Does_It_The_heart_of_the_dzogchen_teachings " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I like it - he really is very good at explaining the Dzogchen view in a straightforward way.

krodha wrote:
It's really really basic though, and he still gives credence to dualities of self and other even though he's trying to show the emptiness of the subjective-self, he basically tries to convey that our own views of ourselves is based on external situations and interactions. He even said were pretty much energy going out and energy coming in, which is a wrong view and suggests coming and going and in and out and all sorts of dualities. If dzogchen is being applied correctly there are absolutely no dualities at all. I only read the transcript though so perhaps this isn't his best talk for all I know. It's akin to the tip of the iceberg in dzogchen though I'd say.

He spends an awful lot of time discussing the self to really be attempting to successfully convey the emptiness of the self. But it is important to do self-work(purification) in the beginning for some, I know I had to, in order to dispel some habitual tendencies. So to each their own.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:10 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
The Madhyamaka method of discourse certainly throws a wrench in any sort of conceptual elaboration!

What my brain is wondering here is this concept of Ultimate Reality or Ultimate Existence itself. It is like it contains nothing by definition. And it leads back to my initial post where I asked what "nature of" means and I think,

8. To ask "what is the nature of X?" is to ask "what is the ultimate nature of X?" and this implies one must first discover if X is ultimately existent and then answer "what is that ultimately existent essence of X like?" which has the normal meaning one expects when asking "what does an orange taste like?"

krodha wrote:
In the self-liberation of awareness, causes and conditions have totally vanished. In the instant liberation of awareness, appearances are primordially pure. Such purity does not occur after some time, nor does it come from anywhere else than the very nature of awareness. Awareness is liberated from all extremes of nihilism, eternalism, and so on. The "four alternatives" are to be existent, nonexistent, both existent and nonexistent, and neither existent nor nonexistent. Awareness is liberated from being any of these four alternatives. Since it is of the single nature of the entirety of samsara and nirvana, awareness is "empty of multiplicity".

Thus, since all appearances and sounds remain in the four types of liberation, they are not bound by anything, and they are not liberated by anything. Everything self-arises from it's own state and is self-liberated. Whatever appears is free from the three extremes of birth, cessation and abiding, so reality-itself is self-appearing. Therefore, due to the spiritual mentor's simply pointing this out, once you know reality-itself to be self-appearing, you will realize appearances and consciousness as reality-itself.

In the four types of liberation, nothing is bound by anything, but in the cycle of existence, we are bound by self-grasping: grasping on to a personal self and grasping onto phenomena. However, in terms of their own nature with reference to these four types of liberation, all appearances and sound are not bound by anything, nor are they liberated by anything; so no antidotes are necessary.

The ultimately existent essence of X is like; expansive, boundless, centerless, borderless, beginningless, endless, clear, complete, nonexclusive, dynamic, inconceivable, spacious, unchanging, pure, pristine, unmoved, immaculate, spontaneous, immutable, unsurpassable, intrinsic, innate, supreme, open, free.

Advice From Me To Myself by Patrul Rinpoche
Vajrasattva, sole deity, Master, You sit on a full-moon lotus-cushion of white light In

the hundred-petalled full bloom of youth.
Think of me, Vajrasattva,You who remain unmoved within the manifest display That is Mahamudra, pure bliss-emptiness.
Listen up, old bad-karma Patrul,You dweller-in-distraction.
For ages now you've beenBeguiled, entranced, and fooled by appearances.Are you aware of that? Are you? Right this very instant, when you're Under the spell of mistaken perceptionYou've got to watch out.Don't let yourself get carried away by this fake and empty life.
Your mind is spinning aroundAbout carrying out a lot of useless projects:It's a waste! Give it up!Thinking about the hundred plans you want to accomplish,With never enough time to finish them, Just weighs down your mind.You're completely distractedBy all these projects, which never come to an end,But keep spreading out more, like ripples in water.Don't be a fool: for once, just sit tight.
Listening to the teachings — you've alreadyheard hundreds of teachings,But when you haven't grasped the meaning of even one teaching,What's the point of more listening?
Reflecting on the teachings — even though you've listened,If the teachings aren't coming to mind when needed,What's the point of more reflection? None.
Meditating according to the teachings —If your meditation practice still isn't curingThe obscuring states of mind—forget about it!
You've added up just how many mantras you've done —But you aren't accomplishing the kyerim visualization.You may get the forms of deities nice and clear —But you're not putting an end to subject and object.You may tame what appear to be evil spirits and ghosts,But you're not training the stream of your own mind.
Your four fine sessions of sadhana practice,So meticulously arranged — Forget about them.
When you're in a good mood,Your practice seems to have lots of clarity — But you just can't relax into it.When you're depressed, Your practice is stable enough But there's no brilliance to it. As for awareness, You try to force yourself into a rigpa-like state,As if stabbing a stake into a target!
When those yogic positions and gazes keep your mind stable Only by keeping mind tethered — Forget about them!
Giving high-sounding lecturesDoesn't do your mind-stream any good.The path of analytical reasoning is precise and acute — But it's just more delusion, good for nothing goat-shit. The oral instructions are very profound But not if you don't put them into practice.
Reading over and over those dharma texts That just occupy your mind and make your eyes sore — Forget about it!
You beat your little damaru drum — ting, ting — And your audience thinks it's charming to hear. You're reciting words about offering up your body, But you still haven't stopped holding it dear. You're making your little cymbals go cling, cling — Without keeping the ultimate purpose in mind.
All this dharma-practice equipment That seems so attractive — Forget about it!
Right now, those students are all studying so very hard,But in the end, they can't keep it up.

Today, they seem to get the idea,
But later on, there's not a trace left.
Even if one of them manages to learn a little,
He rarely applies his "learning" to his own conduct.
Those elegant dharma disciplines — Forget about them!
This year, he really cares about you,
Next year, it's not like that.
At first, he seems modest,
Then he grows exalted and pompous.
The more you nurture and cherish him,
The more distant he grows.
These dear friends
Who show such smiling faces to begin with —
Forget about them!
Her smile seems so full of joy —
But who knows if that's really the case?
One time, it's pure pleasure,
Then it's nine months of mental pain.
It might be fine for a month,
But sooner or later, there's trouble.
People teasing; your mind embroiled — Your lady-friend — Forget about her!
These endless rounds of conversation
Are just attachment and aversion —
It's just more goat-shit, good for nothing at all.
At the time it seems marvelously entertaining,
But really, you're just spreading around stories
about other people's mistakes.
Your audience seems to be listening politely,
But then they grow embarrassed for you.
Useless talk that just make you thirsty —
Forget about it!
Giving teachings on meditation texts
without yourself having gained actual experience through practice, Is like reciting a dance-manual out loud
And thinking that's the same as actually dancing.
People may be listening to you with devotion,
But it just isn't the real thing.
Sooner or later, when your own actions
Contradict the teachings, you'll feel ashamed.
Just mouthing the words,
Giving dharma explanations that sound so eloquent —
Forget about it!
When you don't have a text, you long for it;
Then when you've finally gotten it,
you hardly look at it.
The number of pages seems few enough,
But it's a bit hard to find time to copy them all.
Even if you copied down all the dharma texts on earth, You wouldn't be satisfied.
Copying down texts is a waste of time
(Unless you get paid) —
So forget about it!
Today, they're happy as clams —
Tomorrow, they're furious.
With all their black moods and white moods,
People are never satisfied.
Or even if they're nice enough,
They may not come through when you really need them,
Disappointing you even more.
All this politeness, keeping up a
Courteous demeanor —
Forget about it!
Worldly and religious work
Is the province of gentlemen.
Patrul, old boy — that's not for you.
Haven't you noticed what always happens?
An old bull, once you've gone to the trouble of
borrowing him for his services,
Seems to have absolutely no desire left in him at all—
(Except to go back to sleep).
Be like that — desireless.
Just sleep, eat, piss, shit.
There's nothing else in life that has to be done.
Don't get involved with other things:
They're not the point.
Keep a low profile,
Sleep.
In the triple universe
When you're lower than your company
You should take the low

seat.
Should you happen to be the superior one,Don't get arrogant.
There's no absolute need to have close friends;You're better off just keeping to yourself.
When you're without any worldly or religious obligations,Don't keep on longing to acquire some!
If you let go of everything —Everything, everything —That's the real point!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 2:21 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
Or maybe just say "physical?" Then we get things like "no physical 'mind' can be found" (aside from its physical reflection as it flows through the body). Six or one half dozen...

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
Physicality is a misnomer in the ultimate sense as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 6:57 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

padma norbu said:
Also, my other problem with the whole concept of "there is no more power an offering than offering to the Guru" is very simple: just what that means exactly is just a jumbled up mess in my brain.

Namdrol said:
There are four gurus: the guru who gives you introduction is the outer guru; the path practiced is the inner guru; the result realized is the secret guru; rigpa is the ultimate guru;

But without the first, the rest will not happen.

N

krodha wrote:
Is there also such thing as a vajra guru? Who takes it upon themselves to have sole

responsibility of their student's realization? I heard this somewhere.

Besides Padmasambhava of course, I just mean the term used in that other way as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Paul said:
One thing worth remembering is that although Buddhism doesn't classify plants as sentient beings, there are spirits that live in plants, like some form of wood nymph.

The whole plant ESP (if real) does not definitively prove that a plant per-se is a sentient being. Just something I thought I'd throw out there...

krodha wrote:
Well luckily for us, as Namdrol put it earlier in this thread; "Sentient beings occur through non-recognition of the basis"... so classifying what is or isn't a sentient being is at base a byproduct of abiding in the relative condition as it is. On one hand; conjecture, and on the other; delusion... a futile endeavor beyond the fun of contemplating the possibilities... but fun nevertheless.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
But if having a brain were all that was needed to be perfectly free from suffering, then why wouldn't beings be perfectly free from suffering? Why seek food and warmth?
.

padma norbu said:
Also, something I just remembered regarding Namdrol's point of neurons firing (sentient beings) vs. hormones (plants) is that all forms of Buddhism I am aware of consider various spirit beings as sentient beings. Pretas (ghosts) and demons, etc. have less of a body than plants (from the human perspective of being able to examine and compare, anyway). I suppose in deciding about the sentience of beings, we must defer to whatever the Buddhas have said.

I have moved on from Ted Talks about plants and am now watching the fascinating true story of the possessed boy that the Exorcist was based on and considering how it is that a demon might interact with a physical human organism... I don't believe such a spirit creature would have any neural network that we could identify...
Part 1: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dDgoNlOn-hk "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Part 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gUVm8iK8nT4 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
Part 3: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mj1j0Us1CUc "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
Part 4: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LZ-0lPNIBC4 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

...and I am also considering the motivation of the possessor. As has been said numerous times in Buddhist lectures, even those behaving badly are doing so because they believe they will be getting something out of it. I wonder if demons are frustrated beings who know how crazy the universe really is.

krodha wrote:
I just saw this on tv the other day... It's a show about a team consisting of a woman(who supposedly can pick up on subtle residual energies and see ghosts and other entities) and a retired Police detective who do paranormal investigations.

But in this show there's an entity living in the basement of this building which she said would equate to a "demon" pretty much, and it seems to have influenced a murder in the past. She goes into the basement and this thing interacts with her and she describes it... she says these entities are extremely ancient and some are very powerful but they're extremely rare, they can take on any form and influence people to do things and they feed off negativity.

She also picks up on the residual energy left by the killer in the upstairs section of the building, and the killer is actually still alive in prison a few miles away. She says it's rare to pick up on energy imprints from the living but if an extremely emotional and powerful event took place in a certain area it leaves an energetic imprint. They interview the killer as well and he said that the killing was provoked but overall unplanned and spontaneous which made the woman hypothesize that he may have been under the influence of this entity.

At 7:30 she starts to talk about the demonic entity in this video:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aiRnxW-8qb4

Who knows if it's true... seems to be backed up with compelling evidence... your post made me think of it though in regards to a demonic type entity influencing people.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 16th, 2012 at 4:37 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
padma norbu said:
:: kills self ::

Seriously, though, great last few pages. I particularly like the breakdown of the brain

constituents and molecular comparison to a rock. I've had a sense of vague unease at times when others talk about sentient beings and vegetarianism and the idea is always raised that plants are not sentient beings. I always think of the famous experiments which show some sort of reaction from plants in response to negative or positive actions in their presence (not even necessarily to the plant itself). The plants don't have a brain, but the mind isn't found in the brain. In relation to what I've learned and pondered these past couple days about energy, there is something interesting yet unknowable here...

krodha wrote:
That documentary is called "The Secret Life Of Plants" by the way... it's on youtube... it all started with a polygraph specialist who decided to experiment with a plant which was sitting at his desk by hooking it up to a polygraph machine to see what would happen.... and nothing happened... until he looked at the plant and thought "I'm going to light you on fire" and the polygraph machine went crazy... so he did a bunch of other experiments to follow up.

Another one he had a plant next to a contraption where there was brine shrimp in a cup of normal water right above a container of boiling water and he had a timer on the cup of brine shrimp so that it would dump them out into the boiling water. He hooked the plant up to the polygraph machine and left the building and drove a few miles away, he wanted to make sure he wasn't influencing the machine somehow. And sure enough when the cup poured out and all the brine shrimp died the polygraph machine went off again. Plant was upset!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 15th, 2012 at 6:51 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen cosmogeny
Content:
Blue Garuda said:
Fascinating thread with a lot of words I don't fully understand, but the word 'origin', like 'primordial' which sometimes pops up (in terms of wisdom) could leave one with the impression that there is a defined 'beginning' to be found.

I've not seen any evidence yet of this 'beginning' so I'll stick with the continuum I observe all around me - and yes, that 'circular' concept makes more sense to me in terms of this thread. Phenomena do not have to arise from an ultimate origin, only from that which immediately precedes them.

That's my 'twopennorth' (two pennies' worth) from times when money was not formless or in the bardo.

krodha wrote:
'Beginning' isn't the best word because it implies a starting point leading to something other than the beginning (like a middle or end point) and implies time... 'primordial' is better viewed as a fundamental timelessness... always-beginning.... ever-present...

unborn.... though the basis is a point of origin (like a source) the notion of time doesn't apply, time only arises from non-recognition. Likewise viewing it as a 'source' only applies to apparent phenomena arising from non-recognition as well, in the true nature of the basis it is only in-and-of-itself prior-to and inclusive of any distinction.

This is how I've viewed it, however if this is incorrect Namdrol please strike me down (I use informative threads like these to hone and refine my view as well so abandoning wrong views is imperative!)

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 12:38 PM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
And as for the rock; If you insist that's the way it is then only you can allow that view to subside... all I'd ask is you remain open to the possibility. And perhaps do some investigation as to whether the mind is in the body, or the "body" in the mind. Or if either exist at all apart from conventionality, including the rock. I'm not out to convince you of anything. And wouldn't want you to believe me either. Just rest in your uncontrived naturalness and allow your conditioned views and habitual tendencies to exhaust themselves.

Pero said:
Frankly I don't know what to say anymore. If you think a rock has a mind, well then there really isn't anything more to discuss.

krodha wrote:
Frankly that would be a ludicrous thing to think, which is why I said nothing of the sort.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, January 14th, 2012 at 3:15 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
For you, if you got realized, such imputations would fall away. But not for the rest of back home in samsara. Your realization is your own and not anybody elses.

asunthatneversets said:
Its more akin to an analogy of the ocean and it's waves. For the sake of the discussion say the waves could bare sentience. Each wave would only see itself as a wave and remain ignorant of the ocean it's inseparable from. At some point a wave would realize it's part of the entire ocean and was never separate to begin with. But the other waves still under the impression of their sole existence would say "cool man but that's just your realization it doesn't belong to me" it's fundamentally a failure to let go of conditioned views which have become so engrained they seem 100% rational in

contrast to this other perspective which is also true... In fact "more true" but is seen as utterly counterintuitive.

Pero said:
Sounds like Brahman to me.

There seems to be someone else proposing a different point of view. But it's only due to attachment to a current perception that an 'alternate perception' is projected. The rock is not just a rock. If it was... The body would be just as 'lifeless'.
The body is not lifeless precisely because since it has a mind. The rock does not.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't take the analogy too literally(in a metaphorical sense) or strictly.

And as for the rock; If you insist that's the way it is then only you can allow that view to subside... all I'd ask is you remain open to the possibility. And perhaps do some investigation as to whether the mind is in the body, or the "body" in the mind. Or if either exist at all apart from conventionality, including the rock. I'm not out to convince you of anything. And wouldn't want you to believe me either. Just rest in your uncontrived naturalness and allow your conditioned views and habitual tendencies to exhaust themselves.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 2:01 AM
Title: Re: Suffering is happiness ?
Content:
krodha wrote:
That was a profound thing to realize for me too

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 13th, 2012 at 1:41 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
For you things may be inseparable or whatever but that does not mean that everything you see possesses dharmakaya. The conclusion of this idea could be that a rock could get enlightened too for example.

Kai said:
Ooooohhhh, you will be surprised. I had been hearing from Zen people that trees, grass and stones can get enlightened. Whether this POV is purely a Zen koan or they actually believe in it, is still a mystery.....at least to me.

Kilaya said:
I had been around Zen people for a long time, and the only similar teaching I heard was:

"Everything is already enlightened, including trees, etc." This is a symbolic way to say that everything is good as it is, the root of confusion lies in our mind. But when it comes to "attaining" enlightenment, it requires a mind, which pebbles and trees lack of.

krodha wrote:
Also one of the nyams of their practice or realization is that everything around them comes alive... Chairs, rocks, the ground, the sky etc.. Everything feels like ones own body feels right now.. Which is naturally because everything is a manifestation of ones own nature and that is a direct experiencing of that. But not everyone has that nyam.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 4:05 PM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
.

But i was forgotten to mention that Dharmakaya aspect is mostly used in Dzogchen not as that emptiness aspect (above mentioned) ans also as is known in Sutra and Tantra. I suppose that Dharmakaya is even not known in Sutra.

Different Paths maybe?

Mutsog Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
How is it mostly used in dzogchen aside from the emptiness aspect?

And it does seem that it was mentioned in sutra... Although I can't say whether or not it's really used in the same context... Got this from wikipedia:

In the Pali Canon The Buddha tells Vasettha that the Tathagata (the Buddha) is Dhamma-kaya, the "Truth-body" or the "Embodiment of Truth", as well as Dharmabhuta, "Truth-become", that is, "One who has become Truth" (Digha Nikaya). On another occasion, the Buddha told Vakkali: "He who sees the Dhamma (Truth) sees the Tathagata, he who sees the Tathagata sees the Dhamma (Samyutta Nikaya). That is to say, the Buddha is equal to Truth, and all Buddhas are one and the same, being no different from one another in the Dharma-kaya, because Truth is one."

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 7:13 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
For you, if you got realized, such imputations would fall away. But not for the rest of back home in samsara. Your realization is your own and not anybody elses.
As we have pointed out elsewhere, it is true that the Dharmakaya, the dimension of reality, is universal, like infinite space itself. It is one in the sense of transcending all dualities. It is omnipresent and all-pervading and all sentient beings, the enlightened and the unenlightened, equally participate in this single Dharmakaya. But Dharmakaya refers not to mind (sems), but to the Nature of Mind (sems-nyid) and this is a crucial distinction in Dzogchen. Furthermore, the Dharmakaya, which is understood in Dzogchen as the state of Shunyata and the basis of everything (kun-gzhi), is not a mind, let alone the One Mind or the Universal Mind, even though it is the context for the activities of thought. For this reason, the Dharmakaya is compared to the clear open sky, whereas thoughts are compared to the clouds that come to fill the sky. Moreover, there is also the Rupakaya or Form Body, the dimension of form, which is equally the manifestation of Buddhahood and this Rupakaya is always individual in its nature. Therefore, the enlightenment of a Buddha has both a universal aspect, the Dharmakaya, and a particular and individual aspect, the Rupakaya.

~ John Myrdhin Reynolds, bold added

krodha wrote:
Nice description, vajranatha is a beast!

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 6:22 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
For you, if you got realized, such imputations would fall away. But not for the rest of back home in samsara. Your realization is your own and not anybody elses.

krodha wrote:
Its more akin to an analogy of the ocean and it's waves. For the sake of the discussion say the waves could bare sentience. Each wave would only see itself as a wave and remain ignorant of the ocean it's inseparable from. At some point a wave would realize it's part of the entire ocean and was never separate to begin with. But the other waves still under the impression of their sole existence would say "cool man but that's just your realization it doesn't belong to me" it's fundamentally a failure to let go of conditioned views which have become so engrained they seem 100% rational in contrast to this other perspective which is also true... In fact "more true" but is seen as utterly counterintuitive.

Pero said:
This is from your point of view. But the rock itself is just a rock, a thing without a mind, it cannot get enlightened since it does not have the darkness of ignorance in the first place.

krodha wrote:
There seems to be someone else proposing a different point of view. But it's only due to attachment to a current perception that an 'alternate perception' is projected. The rock is not just a rock. If it was... The body would be just as 'lifeless'. The act of perceiving and that which is perceived are not two separate things. And the perceiver is only the ability for 'that' which is the union of 'perceiving-perceived' to be. There is no perceiver. Observer-observing-observed are one which isn't even a 'one' because it is empty cognizance ever-present in the immediacy of that which is called 'now'. Unborn and timeless nondual perfection.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 5:16 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
For you things may be inseparable or whatever but that does not mean that everything you see possesses dharmakaya. The conclusion of this idea could be that a rock could get enlightened too for example.

krodha wrote:
I see what you're saying... But if one abides in their true nature then there would be no "seeing" in the ultimate sense, it would be more of a zero-dimensional empty cognizance appearing as a "rock". The notion that there is a 'rock' is again due to dualistic imputation (conceptual overlay)... So dharmakaya is it's fullness would be a continuum of nonduality which would be inherently void of a self perceiving a rock. It would be like mind experiencing itself.. But the mind isn't a substantial "entity" it's just empty-cognizance. Really hard to convey using conventional language.

But I see what you mean that what I'm describing sounds like if one "thing" is enlightened then 'everything' would be... But the enlightenment is really the falling away of anything which could be said to have attained such a realization and also the negation of 'that-which-hasn't'. All that remains is the fully perfected natural state in it's spontaneous fullness. The imputation of one who would be realized and one who isn't would fall away. So in a sense a rock would be enlightened but it's more along the lines that there's a clear apperceivement that there never was a substantiated 'rock' or self which separately knows the rock to begin with.

But again I'm not saying my interpretation is the truth and albeit my attempt to describe what I'm trying to say may come out wrong, so I'm fully open to critique or discussion.

It's just a matter of coming from an impure dualistic perspective or pure nondual

percption... Conventional and inherent realities... Because your nature is capable of projecting both.. It's a multi-dimensional 'suchness' depending on ones knowledge... So you're correct in one sense and what I'm saying seems to be correct in another. But I'm open to being incorrect even though my view seems to fit (in my eyes).

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 12th, 2012 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Pero said:
Because it is only present in those that have a mind - sentient beings.

krodha wrote:
But then again isn't the perspective that there is a body endowed with a mind just a projection of delusion? Because supposed phenomenal "objects" apart from said "subject" would really just be a play of ones own nature, mistakenly taken to be separate "sentientless" material due to imputation derived from avidya? This is what tulku urgyen was saying in those quotes I posted earlier in this thread; that the supreme 'seeing' is not seeing 'things'. But apperceiving that 'what-is-experienced' is inseparable from the selfless perceiving we mistaken as the "I". And that the "mind" which perceives is only "emptiness" which means "empty cognizance" (according to tulku urgyen) and "clarity" which is the luminous quality of mind.

So it is a empty cognizance which can reveal phenomena to be "pure" and "impure". Again according to tulku urgyen: "impure phenomena is what is experienced in this world. Pure phenomena is when there is no duslistic grasping. It is becoming accustomed to the inseparable, unobstructed, undeluded dharmakaya, in which phenomena appearing have no self-nature." And this goes for phenomena usually mistaken to be "subjective" such as mind, feelings, thoughts and "owned" phenomena such as a body. In pure vision there is no internal-external dichotomy. So perceiving the existence of "sentient beings" apart from "non-sentient phenomena" is a product of impure vision. Someone correct me if I'm wrong but this is how I've understood it to be.. And it makes sense this way in practice experientially as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 4:25 PM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
krodha wrote:
I agree with sonam... The manifestation of qualities which appear to be individual in nature are in truth merely an expression and play of 'that'. Only filtered and translated through a veil of delusion born of attachment and aversion. There appears to be distinction, and suffering proliferates from this pseudo-separation. In truth 'what-is' is unborn and timeless.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 4:18 PM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Namdrol said:
The basis is free from one and many, therefore it is niether individual nor shared.

gad rgyangs said:
are you an individual? yes
does that mean you and the basis are therefore distinct?

krodha wrote:
You seem so certain of individuality! Your inquiry is in fact predicated on this certainty which you boldly reinforced by affirming your own initial question. But is individuality inherently so?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 11:13 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
Sherab said:
Wow, the exchanges are UNREAL.

krodha wrote:
FOREAL.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 11:06 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:

brendan said:
I know, but its cheating.

RIP=Theism

Dharmakaya is only correct on paper.

How is Incest, rape, cluster bombs, abnormal cell growth, etc etc untrue.

Come one its so silly, so there for there is no RIP.

krodha wrote:
What's wrong with saying RIP to someone to show respect? How is it anything close to "cheating"?

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 10:31 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:

brendan said:
Why then did you write "RIP Steve Jobs" on your facebook page when Steve Jobs died?

Namdrol said:
The answer is: I wrote that out of sentimentality because I am fond of his products.

krodha wrote:
And he was a dharma practitioner/proponent! I heard he used to give the zen stare to people during pivotal business interactions and would psych them out. Boss.

I was gonna throw a rip Steve jobs on my Facebook too but then I remembered the dharmakaya wasn't real and saved myself from engaging in such lowly actions...

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 11th, 2012 at 9:57 AM
Title: Re: The individual in dzogchen, independence, dharmakaya
Content:
krodha wrote:
"Mind is empty in essence and cognizant by nature..... the knower needs to recognize his own mind. We then see that there isn't even a hair-tip of something to see. It is as the Heart Sutra said: "No form, no feeling, no perception, no formation, no consciousness, no eye, no ear, no nose, no tongue, no body, no mind" That absence of any concrete substance whatsoever is called dharmakaya. Is there anything more precious in this entire world than dharmakaya?
In the moment of seeing that, there is no 'thing' to see. In this moment that fact or experience is an obvious actuality. The cognizant quality that sees that there is no thing to see is called the sambhogakaya aspect of the awakened state. The mind's absence of any concrete thing, and it's ability to know that it is no thing, are indivisible, like water and wetness, fire and heat, sugar and sweetness. That indivisible unity of these two aspects - being empty and cognizant - is called nirmanakaya. At the moment of recognizing you see that these three are inseparable, and this is the svabhavikaya, the essence-body. This is what i mentioned before: seeing no 'thing' is the supreme sight. In

this world, is there anything more profound than being face to face with the three kayas? Recognizing this fact is the essential point of all practice."

"....space doesn't see itself. Mind, on the other hand is cognizant as well as empty. The empty quality is dharmakaya, the cognizant quality is sambhogakaya and their unity is nirmanakaya."

"The relationship between dharmadhatu, dharmakaya and dharmadhatu wisdom is like the relationship between a place, a person and the person's mind. If there is no place, there is no environment for the person to exist in; and there is no person unless that person also has a mind dwelling in the body. In the same way, the main field or realm called dharmadhatu has the nature of dharmakaya. Dharmakaya has the quality of dharmadhatu wisdom, which is like the mind aspect."

- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 10th, 2012 at 5:26 PM
Title: Re: Yeah, Dzogchen is confusing
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
Sorry, Lhugpa, forgot about your post. Nevertheless, the idea that buddhas can "choose to get amnesia and walk the path again to gain even more knowledge the second time around" is hogwash. Buddhism does not teach this. Buddhism teaches that complete Buddhahood means the eradication of all knowledge and emotional obscurations. Dzogchen further specifies that truly complete buddhahood also means realizing all appearances to be the radiance of one's own state. Thus, nothing more to learn, no talents or skills to further perfect beyond that.

Anyhow, my point still stands - if we want to help PN, we should start by addressing his stated concerns. Telling him to just practice more when one of his main concerns is that the ultimate result of such practice is impermanent doesn't make much sense. We have to explain how and why complete realization of Dzogchen is in fact permanent, unobstructed, uninterrupted.

PN of course had some other concerns, too, but this seemed like the most crucial one.

krodha wrote:
I noticed this reoccurring concern too, and i agree with what you're saying here, although I can't say whether or not there would be more to learn or not. I remember someone asking Lama Lena a question along the same lines the last time she was here, and she said that the depths and dimensions of this really goes as far as one wishes to take it. I take Lama Wangdor to be the "real deal" so her word seems something to trust.

As for this "entity" which is said to transmigrate, if buddhahood is the full and total removal of the misconception of "I", and upon the dissolution of this ignorance ones

true nature exists unobscured shining timelessly in it's fullness, then "that" which buddhahood reveals was never born and thus cannot die.

The feeling of being a separate individual is the product of habitual conventionalities being engrained into ones view to such a perverse level, that the conventionally influenced tendencies then become subconscious conditioning which fully dominates one's perception. So what is mere conventionality is then paraded as inherency and this delusion completely envelops one's perceptions to the point that the unreal becomes a common sensical point of reference which makes apperceiving one's true nature a seemingly impossible task. I think what you're feeling is completely normal PN. But I would agree with Pema Rigdzin in his statement that complete realization of Dzogchen is in fact permanent, unobstructed, uninterrupted.

PN I was in your same position maybe a year and a half ago. I'd come to the conclusion that whatever it was i was seeking wasn't going to be found in dzogchen the way it had been presented to me and implemented in the group practices i'd been attending. I lost faith in it because all i knew of it was ideas which had to be adopted and "believed in".... and for all I knew could be an "opiate to the masses" like you worded. I felt that believing in all this "stuff" that went along with the teaching was no better than believing in any other system of belief. And i didn't want belief, i still feel that belief is slavery... so i gave up on dzogchen, i mean i still thought it was a grand teaching and respected it... I still kept a giant thangka of Ekajati hanging on my wall and i remained open to it but I went a different route for awhile. I dibbled and dabbled in other nondual teachings and philosophies and pursued grokking these other teachings for a bit... until one day i had a really intense experience which pretty much knocked me on my ass... and I had a "f*ck this is what dzogchen was talking about" moment, and i saw first hand what it had been pointing to... and saw that it pointed to pretty much close to the same thing the other nondual teachings were pointing to but just in a different way... and i discovered other dzogchen teachings which were much more clear than those i'd been reading and learning about before... and i learned to appreciate the practices i'd abandoned before and formed a new found love for the teachings.

But it took me deviating from it to rediscover it's amazing qualities in a different light... and that deviation proved to deliver a much deeper and more profound relationship with the dharma, buddhism and dzogchen.

So i think what you're feeling is completely natural, and totally normal, and i can completely relate. But just let it be a signal that maybe a change of some kind is appropriate, what that is i don't know, and at this point I could never suggest that a different teaching would be more appropriate but maybe learning about other nondual teachings and comparing the similarities you find to what you already know could deepen your connection to the dharma. But at the same time perhaps not! You'll know what's right for you... but listen to that feeling inside and do what you need to do... i believe that "something" leads us in the right direction we need to go in to reach liberation... I've personally had waaaayy to many "coincidences" pop up and opportunities arise which i ended up taking advantage of resulting in auspicious circumstances and realizations to say otherwise. But listen to your heart, it knows the

way!

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 12:02 PM
Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
krodha wrote:
Actually i suppose "mental states" isn't an entirely accurate title either due to the fact that those states would obviously be dependent on the presence of a mind. So projections or emanations of avidya... Maybe that's more appropriate. I guess it can be described on different levels depending on the frame of reference. Ultimately something the conventional properties and barriers of language fail to capture. I feel "mental states" is a useful title in it's place though and is a good pointer to start with.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, January 6th, 2012 at 11:08 AM
Title: Re: Hell in Tibetan Buddhism
Content:
thetrouserman said:
I learned from two of my Theravada teachers that hell is a real place of torture that you go to when you die if your karma is bad enough to merit going there. What is the Tibetan Buddhist view of hell? Is it the same?

Namdrol said:
In Tibetan Buddhism, in Mahāyāna in general, it is considered a mental state, but not a real external place.

Jangchup Donden said:
But that's true for the other 5 realms as well, right? (deva, asura, human, animal, hungry ghost)

krodha wrote:
I concur, my opinion would be that they're mental states which are product of dualistic grasping and ignorance of ones true nature. And this is why buddhahood is not one of the six realms of samsara and is absent in depictions of the Tibetan "Wheel Of Life". One cannot attain buddhahood if they're dominated by dualistic perception, they only transmigrate each of the six states and are "reborn" upon afflictions arising relative to the nature of their grasping. The rebirth is moment to moment, anytime the notion of duality arises and compels one to act(create karma) based upon sway of their delusion. And this is why upon becoming a 'buddha' one is no longer "reborn". And why one no longer "suffers" because suffering is a product of one's karmic consequences due to dualistic perception proliferating and becoming more and more compounded and engrained as habitual tendencies mature. You make your life a hell through being trapped in delusion, and ol' buddha was nice enough to give us the antidote for our misconceptions!

States of the mind born of dualism which reign supreme and subconsciously run rampant. Causing you to believe you're an entity who suffers in a realm separate from you who will one day die, and be reborn again in another realm.

Dualism is doubt.
From the emergence of subtle clinging
coarse habit gradually develops.
Food, wealth, clothing, places, companions,
The five desirables, and beloved relatives -
Beings are tormented by attachment to the pleasant.
That is mundane confusion.
There is no end to the actions of dualism.
When the fruit of clinging ripens,
Born as pretas tormented by craving -
How sad is their hunger and thirst.
Through the aspiration of myself, the buddha,
May desirous beings
Not reject the longing of desire
Nor accept the clinging of attachment.
By relaxing cognition as it is
May their awareness take it's seat.
May they attain the wisdom of discrimination.

Through the emergence of a subtle, fearful cognition
Of externally-apparent objects
The habit of aversion grows.
Coarse enmity, beating, and killing are born.

When the fruit of aversion ripens,
How much suffering there is in hell through boiling and burning.
Through the aspiration of myself, the buddha,
When strong aversion arises
In all beings of the six states,
May it be relaxed without rejection or acceptance.
Awareness taking it's seat,
May beings attain the wisdom of clarity.

One's mind becoming inflated,
An attitude of superiority to others,
Fierce pride, is born.
One experiences the suffering of disputation.
When the fruit of that action ripens,
One is born as a god and experiences death and downfall.
Through the aspiration of myself, the buddha,
May beings with inflated minds
Relax cognition as it is.

Awareness taking it's seat,
May they realize equality.

Through the habit of developed dualism,
From the agony of praising oneself and denigrating others,
Quarrelsome competitiveness develops.
Born as an asura, killed and mutilated,
One falls to hell as a result.
Through the aspiration of myself, the buddha,
May those who quarrel through competitiveness
Relax their enmity.
Awareness taking it's seat,
May they attain the wisdom of unimpeded activity.

Through the distraction of mindless apathy,
Through torpor, obscurity, forgetfulness,
Unconscious, laziness, and bewilderment,
One wanders as an unprotected animal as a result.
Through the aspiration of myself, the buddha,
May the light of lucid mindfulness arise
In the obscurity of torpid bewilderment.
May nonconceptual wisdom be attained.

All beings of the three realms
Are equal to myself, the buddha, in the all-ground.
It became the ground of mindless confusion.
Now, they engage in pointless actions.
The six actions are like the bewilderment of dreams.
I am the first buddha.
I tame the six types of beings through emanations.
Through the aspiration of Samantabhadra,
May all beings without exception
Be awakened in the dharmadhatu.

- Tantra of the Great Perfection Which Shows the Penetrating Wisdom of Samantabhadra

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 12:23 PM
Title: Re: rTsa, rTsal, and the Fruition of Trekchö
Content:
Sönam said:
Sound is first ... as explained by ChNN

krodha wrote:
The manifestation of - sound - light - rays - in that order made me think of this video,

which corroborates what the the teachings state about this. And is incredibly interesting.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 8:37 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Beatzen said:
On the one hand, I don't take Alan as an authority on Zen. He's a pioneer for sure, but he was explicitly open about the fact that he was attempting to ameliorate some of the philosophical dead-ends in western philosophy by translating eastern philosophy so it was accessible to westerners. In the end, he's still a philosopher, and not a buddhist.

krodha wrote:
What makes one a "buddhist"? I don't think he ever claimed to be an authority on zen, or claimed to be a buddhist, or anything of the sort, I'd say he knew better. He took more of an all-encompassing approach to eastern thought and it's essential purpose which is to bring about liberation. He described and presented what he knew in a straight-forward manner in order to instill that knowledge in those who were interested. He didn't take himself to be a teacher or guru or anything of the sort and actually despised the thought of having students or followers. At the same time he inspired thousands and got innumerable people interested in eastern thought/philosophy/teachings. Just because he wasn't exclusively a "full-blown buddhist" doesn't mean what he had to say was of any less value, it's not like he was presenting his own far-fetched translation of the teachings. Ultimately he's only whatever you say he is, whether philosopher, or buddhist is of little importance in my opinion... he thoroughly understood the nature of the beast called the dharma and was very much on-point in my eyes.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: Understanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:
One of reasons I like Buddhism is the quote attributed to Buddha where he admonishes students, "Don't take my word for it, find out for yourself!" Stephen Batchelor's "Buddhism without Beliefs" explores this eloquently but I cannot find it online today, maybe a copyright issue. In any case, we're advised to find out for ourselves rather than treating Dharma as Dogma.

krodha wrote:
Check out "Buddhism - The Religion of No-Religion" by Alan Watts you might enjoy that

as well!

gregkavarnos said:
In (overly) simple terms: reject ego, accept enlightenment!

krodha wrote:
Granted you said your statement was overly simple; but only an "ego" would reject an ego... or accept enlightenment for that matter, wouldn't you say?

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 6:33 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Beatzen said:
note about this video link i posted above: Not a "buddhist" teaching, just food for thought. Watch it with an open mind.

krodha wrote:
It's not a buddhist teaching?! Surely it is! It is the epitome and crux of the issue... Alan Watts was an incredible man... funny that i just listened to this video converted to mp3 in my car earlier today.

He's speaking about how in Zen they don't give credence to the notion of a lower(egoic) self/higher self dichotomy(because the notion of either is merely imputation derived from ignorance; avidya) and they cut straight to the point and have the practitioner rest in nonconceptual awareness... dzogchen and mahamudra have similarities to this. You've heard the buddhist saying "you can't get to there from here" or "the shoreless ocean of samsara" it's because the idea that we are this separate little individual who suffers, living in "samsara" seeking "nirvana" is an illusion... and these methods are meant to ultimately deliver a direct innate experiential apperceiving of this being an illusion... which is the release from the illusion... and that is liberation.

So Watts is discussing that "the idea that we are this person who suffers and is seeking liberation" actually feeds the fire of the illusion. By struggling and fighting to "get there" you reify the notion of a separate self. The more you struggle the more the noose tightens around your throat. But at the same time, one cannot simply be passive and do nothing either... one needs to go to the base of the "mind" and sever it, by innately 'seeing' how it functions and what it relies on... what feeds the illusion. Keen investigation and skillful means will reveal one's true nature.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, January 5th, 2012 at 4:36 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
yadave said:

But you said "mind is a collection of thoughts and memories" and "things" are just "concepts or ideas." Make up your mind.

krodha wrote:
I'm not sure if you do understand emptiness to the full extent of it's implications. If it's grasped thoroughly it should give you a "holy shit" moment... it can't be left as merely an idea, it has to be applied empirically to your experience.

There is inherent existence as an actuality and there is conventional existence as an abstractive concept. Apart from conceptualization none of these "things" inherently exist. What I've been saying hasn't faltered or contradicted itself once, you just aren't comprehending what i'm saying because you're approaching it from a position of taking your point of view to be a solidified actuality.

The "idea" of a "mind" is an entity comprised of a collection of phenomena labeled as "thoughts and memories" by the phenomena called thought itself. The existence of this "idea" called "the mind" is dependent on the phenomena called "thoughts" in that 1) as a conceptual entity it is supposedly composed of "thought/memory" and 2) such an idea's origin clearly depends on conceptualization because the idea is not separate from conceptualization. So conventionally speaking, in order to bring about a realization in someone who wishes to apply "emptiness" to their experience in a holistic way, one approaches the presupposed conceptual entity called "the mind" and inquires as to what this notion is dependent on. Within the scope of conventional language we find that this idea is dependent on the arising of the phenomena labeled "thought" by thought itself - in "time" - as a series of consecutive arisings. When I say "mind is a collection of thoughts and memories" I'm conveying that what you take to be "the mind" is merely a concept composed of phenomena labeled as "thought and memory"(by the phenomena 'thought' itself) with the addition of another concept called "time". Time - is an idea... experientially there is only ever this present moment; the past is memory, which is vestigial imprints arising in this present moment. And the future is projected ideation about something that may 'happen', arising in this present moment. So experientially there is ONLY this present moment, which cannot even be called a moment because such a label would imply 'other moments'. "The mind" is actually dependently originated with aid from both of these concepts; time and conceptualization. The idea of a "mind" is dependent on the presence of "time" in order to be a "series of thoughts". The idea of "Time" is dependent on mind(thought/conceptualization). Likewise the "mind" is none other than the phenomena called "thought and memory". There is no entity "mind" as a separate container of thought or memory. Thought coupled with the illusion of time is telling a story about itself called the mind.

But not one of these "things" exists apart from conventional language and/or conceptualization.

And as i said before; when one looks at the mind, you see that the mind is made of constituents called thought and memory. So so far this intellectual deconstructing is dependent on mind(aka thought) and the mind(aka thought) is dependent on that which

the thought is conceptualizing. So there is no mind separate from thought/memory... and no thought/memory separate from that which they(thought/memory) objectify. What is objectified is not separate from the thought/memory... and the thought/memory is not separate from mind. If that can be assimilated thoroughly what's seen is that there's no separation between any of them. And that there are no 'things' (branches, leaves, space) separate from conceptualization. And the collection of conceptualizations (in time; which is dependent on conceptualization) constitutes that which we call mind.

Once 'things' such as branches, leaves, space are seen to dependently exist on concepts (and the concepts dependent on those 'things'). And the concepts are seen to be dependent on mind (and the mind a conglomerate of concepts) one starts to see that a web of dependent origination starts to form and that these different designations are only a product of conventional language. Apart from the conventional language(which is useful!) these 'things' do not inherently exist.

yadave said:
It thinks. I think we've even done this with computers now, cat brains: you put enough neural nets together and it starts having brain waves, it dreams. Remarkable.

krodha wrote:
Consciousness(innate "being") manifests sound-like-phenomena labeled as "thought" which is no different than itself 'consciousness'. What we label as "consciousness" dreams, scans cat brains and all of these things but any activity is never separate from consciousness itself.

yadave said:
Hey, it was your quote. Are you saying that we should accept only some of the Buddha's teachings and you know which ones to choose? I'm telling Greg.

krodha wrote:
It was my quote? How so? Well obviously one should only accept some of the Buddhas teachings, a lot of those teachings were geared towards the people and circumstances of those times, in the frame of those peoples world-view. That being said, the buddha is just a story, the "Buddha" isn't treated like "Jesus" as some deity like actual historical figure which people worship. The buddha was merely a man who woke up, had a realization about the nature of being, and he shared this knowledge. A lot of practitioners of buddhist teachings who had high realizations after the "original buddha" was long gone actually attributed what they realized or wrote down to "the buddha" because the buddha is the symbolism or archetype which represents the awakened wisdom within themselves. The innate "buddha nature" everyone possesses, your pure timeless conscious-awareness. The buddha is no different than your own awareness or consciousness, "mind" whatever label you give it. So yes only accept what is going to work for you, otherwise you're a slave to a belief system scrambling to do things to try and make yourself happy.

"Believe nothing, no matter where you read it, or who said it, no matter if I have said it,

unless it agrees with your own reason and your own common sense" - The Buddha

"Followers of the way (of Zen), if you want to get the kind of understanding that accords with the Dharma(method), never be misled by others. Whether you're facing inward or facing outward, whatever you meet up with on the road, kill it! If you meet the buddha, kill the buddha. If you meet the patriarch, kill the patriarch. If you meet an arhat, kill the arhat. If you meet your parents, kill your parents. If you meet your kinfolk, kill your kinfolk. Then for the first time you will gain emancipation, will not be entangled with things, will pass freely anywhere you wish to go." - Linji

"The cause of bondage is mental construction; give that up. Liberation comes through the absence of mental construction; practice it intelligently" - Annapurna Upanishad

yadave said:
Buddhism is a religion and philosophy encompassing a variety of traditions, beliefs and practices, largely based on teachings attributed to Siddhartha Gautama, commonly known as the Buddha.

krodha wrote:
Something like that... it is a religion of no-religion and if it's merely left as a philosophy entertaining intellectual gymnastics it will not flower in it's full potential. Belief is slavery. Siddhartha Gautama is just a name. You are the power.

yadave said:
I was reading a book and wanted to understand emptiness a little better. I feel this was successful, thank you, and then there's various projections and things flying by in addition which, I suppose, is par for these forums.

krodha wrote:
I think that's great, good for you for seeking out a means to understand it better. Yes i'm sure there's lots of projections and things flying which are par for these forums, know them to only be projections though!

yadave said:
Sorry, I may state a question or position forcefully, as do you, in order to elicit a response, pro or con, but I am not trying to sell anything new, just better understand what is.

krodha wrote:
Well then we're much alike!

yadave said:
We do agree on some things.

krodha wrote:
I would hope so.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 4:25 PM
Title: Re: Own-being cannot be cognized
Content:
krodha wrote:
Your own-being cannot be cognized.

Fire cannot burn itself.

Teeth cannot bite themselves.

The eye cannot see itself.

You cannot outrun your own shadow.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 3:22 PM
Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions
Content:
David Chapman said:
Personally, I don't believe certainty can be found in the opinion of any lama, no matter how "high" they are. So there's no path that has an iron-clad guarantee. ..

Tilopa said:
So you don't have complete confidence in Ngakpa Chogyam or the Aro Ter path?

krodha wrote:
He's just saying the authority of whatever "it" is you believe to be authentic or true is never inherent in "that thing" itself. It's ultimately YOUR OWN belief and opinion that it's authentic. Although most will never admit that and they'll usually even refute it. If you told a Christian that there was no authority in the biblical scriptures themselves, but truly it's his own opinion that it's authoritative he'd most likely scoff and declare blasphemy. If the authority was inherent in the thing itself... Everyone would succumb to it. That is why beliefs and opinions have to be defended, because they don't have any power or value aside from what is projected onto them. Usually you get mass amounts of people projecting truth or falsity onto beliefs and opinions, and the sheer number of people behind the position being taken seems to validate the position to those involved. But fundamentally it's the same principle only on a collective and macrocosmic scale. It ultimately is your own judgement... Validity is lifeless apart from yourself.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 3:01 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:
yadave said:
You are correct. I will try to dot my i's in future and use "idealism" rather than "solipsism" to describe the view that "reality is fundamentally mental, mentally constructed, or otherwise immaterial."

krodha wrote:
Ok, but it isn't "mentally constructed" either, a mental construction would have to originate from a mind.

yadave said:
I did not know you were a guru. Right on.

krodha wrote:
I didn't know I was either, but yes... right on!

yadave said:
I would need you to unpack this for me before I know how to respond.

krodha wrote:
Modern cognitive science and buddhism may have some parallel similarities on a relative level but ultimately they're not of the same nature.

yadave said:
Well, there is no "me" as you pointed out above and my concern was how your (1) and (2) treat the brain as a source of things. I compare the brain to the heart. Some years ago, Israeli scientists successfully coerced stem cells into heart cells and the damn things were beating. It's amazing, they know how to be a heart on the cellular level. Similarly, brains know how to think, brains exude thoughts.

krodha wrote:
I didn't say there's no "you", i said there's no "you" apart from the concept of "you", apart from the conventionality of language the self or agent has no inherent existence. But i suppose that's irrelevant since you're thoroughly convinced you're not equipped with any frame of reference with which to gauge what i'm saying. I'm essentially some guy talking on an internet forum, you can't believe there's no self or substratum, it isn't a philosophy, it requires first hand experience for validation. How can the brain be the source of things?

yadave said:
"Reality" is a word. It is subject to the world's shared definition of it if we are to heed Buddha's advice and "accept what the world accepts."

krodha wrote:
Yes reality is a word, so is every other word on this forum. I'm using the term reality to

describe this "happening" called life. If the Buddha truly believed that one should "accept what the world accepts" then everyone would remain in ignorance.

yadave said:
But it is a new paradigm, my Lord. I think that should count for something.

krodha wrote:
I'm sure that day countless centuries ago when someone declared the world is indeed flat, that paradigm counted for something then as well.

yadave said:
Actually, lots of people are saying "the car really doesn't exist" or "ultimately, the car doesn't exist." It's awful. If this Ultimate Reality is not unreal then the car really doesn't exist and Buddhism reduces to Idealism.

krodha wrote:
Why would that be awful? Idealism asserts that reality is fundamentally a mental construction, again a mental construction would depend on the existence of a mind.

yadave said:
Seems simpler to just say "for Buddhists, the car is not what it seems" and if anyone is curious we explain how the car depends on many factors. I mean, look at the expression "inherently existing". Does *anything* have this property? No? The darn thing (i.e., the concept "inherently existing") is metaphysical to start with yet it litters every other sentence. I appreciate its importance but wonder if we could leave existing language conventions, like "exists" and "reality", out of it and simply say "the car is empty" which has a specific meaning that differs from the notion of "empty space" which is what "nonexistent" brings to mind.

krodha wrote:
Why would this only apply to "Buddhists"? No-thing has inherent existence, every-thing is empty, including emptiness. It's no more metaphysical than believing you're a subjective entity encased in a body experiencing a physical world which is separate from you. And sure say "the car is empty".

yadave said:
The car will pass by and we will see it regardless of whether:

4) We both somehow magically create mental projections of the same blue car moving at the same speed; or

5) The car possesses an external reality / existence that causes us both to experience the same thing.

I'm a Number 5. I think both (4) and (5) require us to grow up in similar environments where there are cars and such.

krodha wrote:
Ok, if you want to believe the car has an external existence have at it! I'm not here to win you over, i have no way to convey to you that essentially all that is, is timeless "consciousness" devoid of duality. Those are just words typed onto a computer screen, I really wouldn't want you to believe what i'm saying anyways in all honesty... adopting that as a belief and attaching to that would be just as counterproductive as insisting any other point of view.

yadave said:
The language is too far from the world. Trust me on this one.

krodha wrote:
Yes that point of view certainly mirrors what you believe to be true.

I don't really understand the nature of this debating going on, refuting what's said, i mean it's all well and good refute what's said all you want it's just a conversation... but what is your perception of buddhism? Are you just here to stir the pot? Because that's great if that's the case, debates of this nature are good to get people thinking and answer questions for not just the ones debating but for others reading it. Or are you just attempting to have someone thoroughly convince you out of your conditioned point of view you've had your whole life? Only YOU can do that. You don't seem to be very "open" to the teachings, insisting the point of view you champion is some kind of ultimate truth.... almost like you're trying to convince yourself that your point of view is correct for reassurance. I'm not here to propagate some belief system or philosophy, the teachings may be presented in that manner but ultimately they're to be applied to yourself and to your experience, empirically, to bring about a change in perception and being. Buddhism is meant to radically alter life in it's entirety. The effects of the teaching are real, the change is real, but you have to want it, and you have to be open to it, otherwise you remain attached to an archaic conditioned point of view which only leads to suffering.... liberation is here for the taking, everyone wants you to know that love, but nobody can save you except yourself.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 6:44 AM
Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions
Content:
David Chapman said:
asunthatneversets, maybe your friend knows something I don't... I've never heard that white=death symbolism, but it could be.

krodha wrote:
Ha yeah i don't know... I told him that you said the white symbolized the natural state and he texted back...

"BTW: To clarify what I remember saying: Red was pu**y blood: White was semen: And Blue was the central channel i.e. the natural state or politically speaking "the real" state

of the union. White is the color of mourning in asian countries like China"

He's a wild man.

But you could be right! If you ever get a chance to ask someone who could verify it's symbolism i'd love to hear what you find out!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 6:29 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
That section where I asked "what your project itself is dependent on" I was just trying to show that the deconstructing and conceptualizing is a thought-based activity, so it's dependent on the mind, as an activity of mind. As you're sitting there looking at the tree, the act of analytically deconstructing the tree into all of those parts you mentioned is an activity going on in your mind; be it via cognitive visualizations or thinking or what-have-you. But i'm not saying that the "things depend on concepts and concepts depend on things", i'm attempting to convey that

1. there are no 'things' apart from concepts or ideas. The concept IS the thing.

2. There's no inherently existing 'thing' there. So there is no tree apart from the conceptualization of 'the tree'.

3. There isn't even a 'you' apart from the conceptualization of 'you'.

yadave said:
Thanks for clarifying. I have no trouble with (3). In fact, (3) agrees, in both meaning *and* language use, with modern cognitive science. The brain is complex and most of what we experience happens prior to "us" "seeing" "it."

As they stand, your (1) and (2) are solipsism.

krodha wrote:
Definition of Solipsism: the philosophical idea that only one's own mind, alone, is sure to exist.

They would be solipsistic if there was in fact an individual(subject) who possessed a mind, which was the center of activity. This isn't so.

As for (3) I'd advise not seeking to compare or validate any of these teachings with findings of modern cognitive science. Sure there may be some parallels on a relative level but modern cognitive science isn't of the same nature. Same goes for 'the brain'. Don't take my word for it, but if you treat the brain as the all powerful source of things, and that you are a product of cerebral processes there won't be much progress made.

Reality isn't subject to materialism, idealism, solipsism or any of these designations, and neither are these teachings. Step outside of the modern cognitive scientific paradigm which reigns supreme in our culture, for it is just that... a mere paradigm.

yadave said:
To hijack a quote from Greg Goode, Ph.D.:
Buddha said:
What the world accepts, I accept. What the world does not accept, I do not accept.

yadave said:
I do not accept us casually saying "that car does not really exist" as we watch it pass by together or capture it with a hidden camera for later viewing. This language is too far from the world. If "shared reality does not really exist" then we must diverge into a lengthy discourse on why reality no longer means existence as it is used in modern science and philosophy. Granted, my existence project may go nowhere since the Heart Sutra is already loaded with "no nose, no eye" rather than "no nose Essence, no eye Essence", but hopefully I'll still get to Rome.

krodha wrote:
We're not saying "the car does not really exist"... it certainly does conventionally. But not inherently. Conventionally, you're projecting "a car" and projecting "two of us" to "watch" it "pass by". Everything in that sentence in quotations is a projection. I'm not sure if this language is too far from the world, or the world is too far from this language. More-so that the world is a product of this language. Again diverging into a lengthy discourse to prove whether this (i guess you'd label it as "un-modern philosophy?" according to your point of view) does or doesn't compare to the notion of 'existence' in "modern science and philosophy"; is again assuming that 'modern science and philosophy' is somehow 'more mature' or 'of greater substance'. This simply isn't the case. You're taking 'modern science and philosophy' to be a 'truth' and then creating a point of reference based on that projected truth. And then using that point of view/reference to judge these teachings and discourses. If you insist the 'truth' is in these modern schools of thought then you're shooting yourself in the foot to begin with. There will need to be a willingness to be open to the idea that these 'modern' paradigms may not be what you take them to be. Otherwise you're not open to reconfiguring how you experience reality, you're shut into a certain mode of thinking, taking that to be 'the truth' and then comparing all to it. Your 'truths' haven't liberated you thus far, maybe try being open to the idea that they aren't 'ultimate truths' but merely a product of the intellectual state of western man trying to prove it's misguided assumptions of a materialistic world. Your road to Rome seems to be crossing the himalayas backwards and naked. While these teachings are trying to show you that you never left Rome to begin with.

yadave said:
I have no trouble saying "the car is empty" -- Buddhism has a patent on "empty" and can say whatever it likes -- and when anyone asks what "the car is empty" means, we walk them through the deconstruction practice, help them see how the car's existence

depends on innumerable factors, help them appreciate how the car is much more than it seems. But the car still exists, otherwise we would not agree it was a car.

Or something like that.

Maybe there is no clear discussion in Buddhism on the elephant in the dream (no external referent) versus the elephant in the waking state (external referent, shared reality).

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
This isn't some mere philosophical pondering one does for fun. The elephant(or car) in the 'dream' is of the same nature of the elephant(or car) in the 'waking state'... and apart from conventionality there is no external or internal. It's the same empty 'screen' images are appearing on(the images being inseparable from the screen), only in the 'waking state' time and space appear to be more solidified due to ignorance. Reality isn't shared between anyone, in truth there is only a timeless display of nondual perfection. But I cannot ask you to believe that, and I hope that someday this apperception dawns upon you for the sake and benefit of all sentient beings.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, January 4th, 2012 at 5:37 AM
Title: Re: pondering the Vajra Cutter Sutra
Content:
trevor said:
In seeing that conceptualizing or thinking doesn't alter my state, I don't feel the need to for it and I don't expect it to make me feel better or expect a solution.

Strangely, I had a few moments of insight where thoughts were just recognized without giving them meaning. Without going into the content, I noticed that every thought plays out automatically, there's no need to do anything with them. I became confident that the thought will play out the moment I first saw it. The moments of noticing the beginnings of thoughts became just a series of uniform meaningless arisings. I was quite surprised at how fast these can occur. I started to notice moments (of clarity?) between arisings and then I found that I don't know how to tell the difference between the moment of clarity and the arising, because the recognition itself is just another meaningless arising. Then I somehow got overly excited about it and it was over Anyway, I wonder if that was the glimpse of nonduality.

krodha wrote:
That's good! However, In seeing that conceptualizing or thinking doesn't alter your state, and that you don't feel a need for it... Inquire into the nature of the one who believes these things.

Thoughts do play out automatically, everything is spontaneously arisen in the frame of considering 'things to arise'. The thought is liberated as soon as it appears. Seeing the thoughts as a series of uniform meaningless arisings is also useful, it's 'seeing' them in their 'suchness' as 'sounds' or 'noise', and eventually they won't be 'seen' as sound or noise and won't even arise or fall but will be timeless expressions of the true nature. But don't let that 'lead' you to seek that, just continue with your investigation. Expect nothing. Rest in those moments of 'clarity' (or whatever name you want to give them) getting excited or thinking they represent 'progress' will be counterproductive, if excitement arises immediately perceive that as a 'meaningless arising' as well, and let it self-liberate, continue to rest unmoved. The 'moments of clarity' will strengthen and 'become longer' if that makes sense, and you're right there ultimately is no difference between the clarity and the arising. But don't believe what i'm saying... just look for yourself... and don't let it 'validate' your conclusions... just continue to rest in that clarity.

Not a glimpse of nonduality, because it seems from how you described it that you still feel "you" are witnessing this 'happening'. What can help with this is to start to notice the habit of assuming there is 'time'... or a 'series of arisings' as you put it. Question this notion of time. Question the notion of 'space' between 'you' and an 'arising'. See that this notion of you(subject) witnessing arisings(objects) depends on these notions of 'time and space' and inquire into the nature of 'time and space'. Or locate 'that' which is untouched by 'time and space' and rest there, all of this falls in line closely to what you've already been saying so don't look too hard.

Apologize if it sounds like i'm preaching or teaching; don't believe a word i say... just look! Investigate empirically.

(All of this is my own opinion, i attach no authority to it.)

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 1:12 PM
Title: Re: The Aro gTér: some answers and questions
Content:
David Chapman said:
Instead of dark robes they wear white which symbolizes death...
This is not correct. The white was originally natural, undyed cotton, which symbolizes the unaltered Natural State, i.e. Dzogchen. (Nothing to do with death! Usually white in Tantra symbolizes bodhicitta. Offhand, I can't recall its ever being symbolically associated with death, although obviously bones are white.) Nowadays the cotton is bleached, which makes hash of the symbolism but maybe looks nicer.
wear ridiculous hats, non-celibate, act vulgar... crazy wisdom type stuff
"Ridiculous" is a matter of perception, but I agree with you about that! However, the hats are again traditional within the Nyingma, and not specific to Aro (except in small details).

Like most ngakpas, most Aro practitioners are non-celibate. (Is there a problem with that?)

Vulgarity is strongly discouraged by the Aro Lamas. (We may fail to live up to that recommendation sometimes.)

None of us, including the Lamas, attempt "crazy wisdom". "Eccentric decency" is what we aspire to.

Best wishes! I'm happy to answer any questions about Aro, as best I can.

David

krodha wrote:
I was just told the white symbolized death from a friend, (who's root teacher is Ngakpa Chogyam) he may have just said that because traditionally in Indian culture i know they wrap their dead in white linen, maybe he was confusing the cultures customs?

"Ridiculous" is certainly a matter of perception! I only used that term to convey the severity in the contrast between the elements of their clothing compared to the non-tantric schools. I can't say i truly believe they're ridiculous... might be outlandish compared to little billy walking down the street with a SF Giants hat but again that's a matter of perception!

Is there a problem with being non-celibate? Maybe, if there was some type of virus which annihilated the population of the earth and the only three people left was myself, an Aro Lama and a pretty lady. And the cure for the virus was to have sex with the pretty lady, and whoever didn't get to her first was going to die... it might be a problem then.

A little vulgarity here and there doesn't hurt... everything in moderation.

Eccentric decency works for me!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 12:02 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

yadave said:
Hi Sunshine,

Forgive me if this is inappropriate, it feels awkward saying "Hi A Sun That Never Sets". Let me know what works best.

Thanks so much for your interesting discussion of emptiness. It reminds me of page 4 in the book I'm reading, "Essentials of Mahamudra",

Khenchen Thrangu Rinpoche said:
It is important to know why we practice meditation. There are two main types of meditation: analytical meditation and placement meditation. The Madhyamaka school has given us extensive, clear explanations of how external things or phenomena are actually emptiness. In analytical meditation we meditate on these reasons and arguments; however it is very difficult to actually meditate on the emptiness of phenomena. In the tantric, or Vajrayana, tradition of Tibet, rather than meditating on the nature of external phenomena, we meditate on mind itself. The technique of mahamudra meditation is essential and unique to the Vajrayana tradition.

yadave said:
Your post is sort of like analytical meditation on steroids. I find this very helpful. Even sitting outdoors, looking at a tree, becoming aware of its branches, its bark, imagining its roots reaching into the ground, and going further, the rings in its trunk for every year, the wood cells, on and on and on. It relaxes me and does alter my perception of this wonderful "tree" in front of me. Is this an analytical meditation? It sure ain't shamata.

krodha wrote:
Sunshine works for me! That is an analytical meditation, separating something into it's constituent pieces by means of mental deconstruction. There's many different types of analytical meditation, and especially in the theme of emptiness. It's good to start off with external objects, and then eventually move to yourself. If you google "Chandrakirti's Sevenfold Reasoning" some good links come up... a guy by the name of Greg Goode, Ph.D has a great discourse on it, the link should pop up in that search close to the top. It's a similar meditation.

yadave said:
I tried to follow your exposition but, in all honesty, I get lost. You sound like someone who is quite knowledgeable on the original arguments surrounding Nagarjuna's life and legacy. From my modern naive perspective, I like Ken McLeod's definition of "mind" as the entire package of internal experience (feelings, thoughts, sense of self, aggregates) so some of your presentation, contrasting "mind" with "thought" and so on does not compute. Nevertheless, I attempt the exercise, I deconstruct my poor tree upward and downward into infinite graphs of bigger and smaller dependencies. At this point my poor tree is so empty you could spit. (Ph-tooeey.) Then I think you ask what my project itself is dependent on (this is an exercise in dependent origination) and you conclude that my project ("things depend on concepts and concepts depend on things?") depends on the tree it is deconstructing? Not really. If I were to continue this exercise, I might say my conceptual project depends on my interest in Buddhism which leads us to basic personality, disposition, genetics, random selection and things that may not have been popular in Nagarjuna's day.

So you lost me, friend!

Regards,
Dave.

krodha wrote:
The term "mind" can actually have a lot of different meanings in teachings like this, depending on who's coining the term. Most, like it seems Ken McLeod did; try to make it clear what they mean by "mind", i should've done the same in writing all that. Mind in the way i presented it is just the thought and memory based "mind". So mind in the way i used it, is a collection of thoughts and memories.

That section where I asked "what your project itself is dependent on" I was just trying to show that the deconstructing and conceptualizing is a thought-based activity, so it's dependent on the mind, as an activity of mind. As you're sitting there looking at the tree, the act of analytically deconstructing the tree into all of those parts you mentioned is an activity going on in your mind; be it via cognitive visualizations or thinking or what-have-you. But i'm not saying that the "things depend on concepts and concepts depend on things", i'm attempting to convey that there are no 'things' apart from concepts or ideas. The concept IS the thing. There's no inherently existing 'thing' there. So there is no tree apart from the conceptualization of 'the tree'. There isn't even a 'you' apart from the conceptualization of 'you'.

Prior to, during and after the conceptualization of the tree; the clusters of sensation which are labeled as 'tree' are actually inseparable parts of un-fragmented fields of sensory perception. For example; the field of vision is only a field.. what is seen 'in' the field is not separate from 'seeing'. You can even say it's 'made' of 'seeing'. So as you sit there looking at the tree... the 'tree' is 'made' of seeing, it's made of vision.. and truly the tree 'is' vision. If you 'touch' the tree, there is no tree separate from the tactile sensation of 'touch'. What you call a tree is made of sensory perception. And sensory perception IS whatever is perceived. They are not separate, they are not two. What you call your 'body' is the same way. It's merely a part of sensory fields and is inseparable from sense perception. So there is no 'body' inherently. This is going to be counter-intutitive to how you normally accept experience to be, but that's the point of these inquiries and teachings. They are meant to bring about a radical change.

Ultimately 'sensory perception' or 'sense fields' will be seen as empty as well. And consciousness, awareness, life, death.... the rabbit hole gets deep.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 11:08 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:

Konchog1 said:
I understand that there are no labels without mind. And that there are no senses without phenomena. And that the mind is empty.

krodha wrote:
But more so that since 'senses and phenomena' are of interdependent origination they

are not two separate things. Same goes for 'labels(thoughts/concepts) and mind(thought-based-mind)'... with any of these pairs, if emptiness is applied correctly, the direct intuitive knowing that the pair is in fact not-two or non-dual, should be very apparent. And this apperception should negate the inherent existence of said 'pair'.

Konchog1 said:
So the following verse means that everything exists due to the labels the mind puts on them but the mind itself doesn't exist inherently? What does subject mean?

22. The manner of all appearances is the creation of one's own mind; the nature of mind from the beginning is free from the extremes of [mental] elaboration. Knowing this, it is the practice of Bodhisattvas not to make mental distinctions between object and subject.

-37 Practices of a Bodhisattva

krodha wrote:
Yes that 'things' exist because of the labels projected by the mind, and the mind-itself has no inherent existence beyond the labels(thoughts/concepts). One way to look at it is; the supposed 'mind' is projecting labels onto seamless fields of sensory perception... but ultimately the notion of 'sensory perceptions' needs to be seen as empty too.

Subject and object is 'self and other'... so you are the subject, or at least you feel you are... you lack inherent existence as well. There's no separation between 'you' and 'what you experience'.

"extremes of [mental] elaboration" in that verse points to how concepts arise in a dualistic schematic... hot implies cold, dark implies light, life implies death, up implies down.... etc..

Every-thing is empty and therefore lacks inherent existence. Things have conventional existence as "labels/ideas/concepts" but beyond their conventionality they are unreal.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 7:17 AM
Title: Re: pondering the Vajra Cutter Sutra
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
but if as you said "it is named thing, because it is not a thing" then what is "it"?

trevor said:
It's just a way of saying, there is no need to say anything more about "it". The point is that the thing is nonexistent. What blows my mind is that not only does this understanding completely stop all conceptualizing, it even burns the bridge, because discrimination itself is treated like that. There's no way back. I just can't wrap my head around it. It's so simple that it sounds like a cheat code to me.

krodha wrote:
But the "thing" isn't nonexistent. It may lack inherent existence, but it does have a conventional existence. The seeing that "things" are a creation of conceptualization is good in that it allows the thought-based-mind to relax and apperceive the illusory nature of clinging and projecting. But completely stopping conceptualization is unwarranted. In seeing the illusory nature of the conceptualizing the "power" or "concreteness" of the projections is taken away... so the "thingness" and "conceptualizing" of experience becomes like a mirage. There's no need to stop a mirage or reify a mirage... it's just a mirage, an illusion. The one who 'knows' this is part of the illusion as well, there is no 'controller' to stop conceptualization. So it's true that there's inherently no-things, but experience is still 'happening'... and upon the dissolution of conceptualization(which should negate previously held presuppositions) inquiry needs to be placed onto the nature of tangible sensory experience which undoubtably transcends labeling.

"All of this is but one's mind," That which was stated by the Able One, is to alleviate the fear of the childish; it is not [a statement] of [final] truth. - Nagarjuna

Dzogchen practice which cultivates 'presence' will ultimately cause "thought" to subside and fall into it's own pattern as an under-current removing it's influence... like a distant background noise no different than other auditory white-noise in experience. And if one is skilled, ultimately a state of nonduality and absence will literally cut any influence. But both are quite different than "seeing through" labels.

my own writing and opinions; except for Nagarjuna quote

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, January 3rd, 2012 at 6:36 AM
Title: Re: The essence of Dzogchen
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Mind, as the non-ego centric mind would be the essence in Dzogchen.

Mutsog Marro
KY

krodha wrote:
The term Mind is used in a myriad of ways, what would constitute the "mind" in how you're using it? I'd say you have to be careful with labels, because the label implies a "thing" (or a collection of things) which automatically creates 'that which is not-that-thing'. Hence the duality of the ego-centric-mind and the non-ego-centric-mind...both

are fabrications of avidya. As conventional concepts they can be good pointers in a given situation where they're appropriate, but ultimately neither can be the essence in Dzogchen, and ultimately both require negation of inherency apart from conventionality. The essence with how Namdrol used it would be a description of the "essential point" of the teaching or the "underlying theme". Like the essential point of collecting bottlecaps is to have a collection. The essential point of Dzogchen is to know your own state. But the essence as in a term attributed to the "base" which is what you deemed as "mind" ...is not mind...or the base. It is empty. And empty is empty.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 2:05 PM
Title: Re: pondering the Vajra Cutter Sutra
Content:
trevor said:
Reading the Vajra Cutter Sutra, my understanding so far is that the illusion of a thing is created by naming it - if the thing really existed, there would be no need to give it a label, because it would be evident even without name. It is named "thing", because it is not a thing. If it really were, there would be no need to make it evident by naming it at all. But that does not mean that we should try to somehow stop labeling or discriminating things, because the labeling itself does not exist (and is named labeling because it is not labeling). So I think that there is nothing to do or not do, one can just relax and the habit of believing in thingness will eventually die off, as it is seen through...

I'd like to hear your thoughts on this, guys.

krodha wrote:
This may be essentially true but if as you said "it is named thing, because it is not a thing" then what is "it"? If by "seeing through" the "thingness" you meant apperceiving that the object isn't it's label, that isn't what this sutra is pointing to(im not sure if thats what you meant). What this sutra is saying is true but if it only stays on the level of conceptualization then it's just another idea. What the sutra is addressing is the illusory nature of the subject/object dichotomy altogether. That the illusion(subject & object) is created by the projection of labels and concepts. The dying off of belief(in the sense of becoming disbelief) would still give subtle power to the reality of whatever "it" is, which is believed/disbelieved in. So the "seeing through" needs to be a complete and total actual apperceiving of the unreality. Yes the labels are useful and only exist conventionally. But again merely believing this to be true is no better than believing in the opposing position. The habitual pattern of projecting self/other (being subconscious at this point) will most likely not die off 'in time' of its own accord. There will have to be effort when effort is required... And when no effort is required that will also be appropriate. But doing nothing in the sense of being complacent wont bring about any change.

I'm not sure what you understand or don't understand so everything I'm saying may be preaching to the choir for all I know!

And all this is my own opinion(I'm supposed to make that known)

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, January 2nd, 2012 at 7:20 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Konchog1 said:
These answers are of course based on my (possibly wrong) understanding so take it with a grain of salt.

1. Emptiness is a quality of things. There is no emptiness without objects. (HHDL's Heart Sutra commentary)

2. Emptiness is a translation. Other translations include voidness. Don't analyze the word. Things are not hollow or lacking in qualities. Emptiness simply means that things are empty of inherent existence. (Emptiness by Tashi Tsering) Not empty of anything else.

3. Correct.

4. Everything exists but not inherently. Not by itself but from conditions. Now you may say "Well duh, trees comes from seeds" but that's a mistake I made. It's deeper than that. Without branches, leaf, space etc. there is no tree. If it existed by itself it still would. Yet, the tree does exist due to conditions. Thus things lack inherent existence. Google Hume bundle theory for a good explanation of this.

5. Everything exists, just not inherently.

6. If things have conditions to exist they do not exist inherently. If things exist inherently they cannot have conditions to exist. These conditions bringing a thing into existence is dependent origination.

If something dependently originates it cannot exist on its own right and is thus empty. Also, because things are empty they must have dependently originated.

7. Sure why not.

8-11. Yeah

Nature of mind is another discussion, it is empty (of course just like every thing else) but in this context it refers to things like Clear Light.

krodha wrote:
It gets a little more in-depth than just seeing that "things" are only dependent on constituent qualities (such as a tree is dependent on branches, leaves, space etc..). There's different "tiers" or levels of the emptiness investigation and it's application to reality. In seeing that nothing inherently exists separate from causes and conditions the

study actually has to descend to the most fundamental of levels in order to have a profound effect, otherwise it merely stays on the level of conceptualization(which is all well and good, but there's "deeper" realizations to be had).

This "emptiness" investigation is seeing that nothing exists separately from causes and conditions. So it's true on a conventional level that a tree isn't separate from it's branches, leaves, space etc... but to leave it at that; you're still left with branches, leaves, space etc.. (for the sake of what i'm trying to describe i'll treat 'space' as a thing) and these are 'things' as well. The evaluation can continue further and further to deconstruct branches and leaves down to their constituent particles(and the particle down to their constituents) but this process never ends and really never leaves the realm of the intellect. All of this evaluation is going on within the mind, fundamentally using concepts which are no different than the 'tree' you began with.

From here it gets closer to what was said above about separating the 'experience' of emptiness from the 'conceptualization' of it.

So what's been said so far is still using emptiness on the tier or level of deconstructing 'things' to constituents which ultimately end up being other 'things'. But what does this deconstructing or conceptualizing depend on? Depends on the mind. And when one looks at the mind, you see that the mind is made of constituents called thought and memory. So so far this intellectual deconstructing is dependent on mind(aka thought) and the mind(aka thought) is dependent on that which the thought is conceptualizing. So there is no mind separate from thought/memory... and no thought/memory separate from that which they(thought/memory) objectify. What is objectified is not separate from the thought/memory... and the thought/memory is not separate from mind. If that can be assimilated thoroughly what's seen is that there's no separation between any of them. And that there are no 'things' (branches, leaves, space) separate from conceptualization. And the collection of conceptualizations (in time; which is dependent on conceptualization) constitutes that which we call mind.

Once 'things' such as branches, leaves, space are seen to dependently exist on concepts (and the concepts dependent on those 'things'). And the concepts are seen to be dependent on mind (and the mind a conglomerate of concepts) one starts to see that a web of dependent origination starts to form and that these different designations are only a product of conventional language. Apart from the conventional language(which is useful!) these 'things' do not inherently exist.

Now at this point one will say "ok but i still see 'things', i still experience these things"... even if they're divorced from the notion of inherent existence on the level of conceptualization, the sensual 'happening' of life and reality is still there. I'm still here seeing sights, hearing sounds etc... so this can't be left at this level.

About this Nagarjuna states: "All of this is but one's mind," That which was stated by the Able One, is to alleviate the fear of the childish; it is not [a statement] of [final] truth.

At this point the investigation reaches yet another tier or level and this is where it really

starts to have a profound effect. The sensual experience has to be investigated. Take the experience of that which we'd label a branch for example; in the investigation of the 'branch' you'll notice that this 'appearance' isn't separate from the sensory perceptions with which it's experienced. The 'branch' is dependent on the sensual experience of it. So the 'branch' is predominantly 'seen' and 'felt'(in addition to the other senses). You can even say the 'branch' is composed of the 'seeing' of it and the 'feeling' of it. Apart from the visual and tactile sensations, there is no 'thing'(branch). So the 'thing'(branch) is dependent on the sensory experience. But for this to be a true application of emptiness both sides of this have to be accounted for. And that comes like this; without the 'sight'(branch) there is no 'seeing'(sensory perception) of it. So the appearance of a sensory perception is dependent on it's percepts(objects of perception). So with this being ascertained; why even conceptualize two different designations(perception, percept)? Both designations are mutually interdependent co-arisen imputations. An 'object' is the cognizing of the 'object' and the 'cognizing' is dependent on the appearance called an 'object'. They are not two different things.

And this goes for every sensory perception.

From here however... the same investigation is directed onto the subject and applied to the position of the 'cognizer' a.k.a. the 'self which is perceiving'. One sees that the appearance of the self(subject which perceives) is dependent on the perceiving... and the perceiving is dependent on the perception. So no piece of the trifecta stands alone or has any inherent existence. They all collapse all the way down and the existence of the triad(perceiver, perceiving, perceived) is merely a conventional imputation overlaid onto a seamless 'happening'.

About this Nagarjuna states: The cognizer perceives the cognizable; without the cognizable there is no cognition; Therefore why do you not admit that neither object or subject exists at all?

From here the next tier or level goes to the awareness, or consciousness, or 'knowing' of this.

About this Nagarjuna states: The mind is but a mere name; Apart from this name it exists as nothing; So view consciousness as a mere name; Name too has no intrinsic nature.

The consciousness/awareness is also of dependent origination and therefore empty.

Time is also of dependent origination and therefore empty.

Emptiness is of dependent origination and is therefore empty.

These investigations allow for one to account for and see the dependent origination of every 'thing'.

And that these 'things' being of dependent origin lack inherent existence.

So if apperceived directly beyond mere conceptualization the reification of these 'things' as being concrete ceases. That includes yourself.... and the knowledge of this. So even though a realization is had, the realization likewise is empty.

I would've broke this down further but i gotta go!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, January 1st, 2012 at 3:26 AM
Title: Re: The essence of Dzogchen
Content:
krodha wrote:
Can't really be captured in words. It's kinda like the taste of ginger or something.. You can describe it to the best of your ability; say it's sweet or strong.. But the description doesn't really convey the real taste. Or another analogy would be trying to describe the color blue to someone who was born blind and has never seen colors. To know the essence in dzogchen is to taste it, experience it, and then integrate that taste into every aspect of experience so it's embodied... But not "embodied"... The words get tricky!

There's other metaphors to describe the essence... A mirror is used, in that the quality of the mirror is to reflect but remain unscathed by that which it reflects. And that it doesn't hold it's reflections. Or a crystal ball is used too. The ball acts as an aperture through which light passes.. And it seems to have the colors of things which are around it "on it" or "in it" but really it just reflects it's surroundings and remains crystal clear and untouched.

So these metaphors attempt to describe your true nature, which is the essence of dzogchen. Other than that, all practices and teachings related to it are only to aid in you discovering this and maintaining it. But he's right up above. You're it... But not you as in the "the story" of you... Not who you take yourself to be.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 2:38 PM
Title: Re: Aro gTér Dzogchen Community of Ngak'chang Rinpoche
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
re: Aro in general: its fun to play dress-up!

krodha wrote:
I was asking my friend about them earlier today after i made this post...

I guess they dress up like that to do the exact opposite of what non-tantra lineages do. Instead of shaving their heads they grow their hair out as long as possible. Instead of dark robes they wear white which symbolizes death... and the blue stripe down the center represents space, the red; menstrual blood, the yellow: nectar... wear ridiculous

hats, non-celibate, act vulgar... crazy wisdom type stuff

I guess Ngakpa Chögyam just put out a book about his main teacher Künzang Dorje Rinpoche called Wisdom Eccentrics

A rare account of remarkable Lamas in the final years of a lost era. The author finds himself the first Western disciple of Künzang Dorje Rinpoche, a highly reclusive master known for mercurial wrath and facility with Dzogchen. He received direct introduction to the nature of Mind through ruthless interrogation on the meaning of the stories from the lives of Lineage Lamas. He is separated from his Lama for thirteen years—but they meet again and their relationship resumes.

In the interim he studies with the renowned crazy wisdom master Chhi'méd Rig'dzin Rinpoche. This wild cathartic sojourn gives rise to further stories—purveying an array of exuberantly startling scenarios.

Wisdom Eccentrics is a clear, accessible narrative set in creative contemporary language. The author's fluent literary account is genuinely heartwarming, hilarious and humane—whilst retaining its power as an alarmingly insightful odyssey into the world of Vajrayana Buddhism.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 6:04 AM
Title: Re: Aro gTér Dzogchen Community of Ngak'chang Rinpoche
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
In a nutshell? They're a bunch of fakes and this is widely known.

krodha wrote:
Oh ok I had no idea that was the general view of them, but of course my experience has always been backed by bias opinion from my friend so that shaped my perception. I go with ChNN. What makes them fake? I'm just curious.. I hold a fairly moderate and indifferent view of them aside from what seemed positive in my brief experiences. But I also chose to not pursue any type of relationship with their lineage so there was something that didn't vibe with me although I can't say what that was. So my inquiry isn't contentious in any way whatsoever, but what makes it fake?

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 31st, 2011 at 5:30 AM
Title: Aro gTér Dzogchen Community of Ngak'chang Rinpoche
Content:
krodha wrote:
I usually attend practices in the community of ChNN but I saw on another thread that

someone wrote "that explains alot" in response to a quotation from a Aro related site. I took "that explains alot" to be a sarcastic statement (however i could be wrong). I was wondering what people's perceptions are of this lineage?

Taken From The Aro Site:
Ngak'chang Rinpoche (Ngakpa Chogyam) is the reincarnation of Aro Yeshé, the son of the extraordinary female visionary Lama Khyungchen Aro Lingma, who founded the Aro lineage.
Between 1970 and 1984, Ngak'chang Rinpoche spent extended periods in the Himalayas receiving teachings and transmissions from many of the most revered teachers of the Nyingma Tradition. During this time he accomplished all the traditional practices, and received all the necessary empowerments and transmissions, of a Nyingma Lama. Hailing from a financially disadvantaged background, he funded his trips entirely through factory work and manual labour in Britain. He completed—in varying sections—four years in solitary retreat – often living in extremely basic conditions with little to eat.
With the encouragement of his Lamas, he began teaching in 1979. In 1989, he was awarded a doctorate in Tibetan Tantric Psychology from the University of West Bengal. He has been a visiting lecturer at the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology in California and has contributed articles to several books, journals, and magazines on the subject of Vajrayana Psychology. He has given several keynote presentations at international psychology conferences for the British Psychological Society, and the Association of Transpersonal Psychology in the USA
Ngak'chang Rinpoche is the author of six books, many co-written with Khandro Déchen. He is a Vajrayana calligrapher, poet, thangka painter, multi-talented Vajrayana craftsman, and exponent of Yogic Song and Lama-dance.

Taken From Wikipedia:
Aro is a lineage within the Nyingma tradition of Tibetan Buddhism (Aro means "taste of the primordial A" in Tibetan). It has several unusual characteristics. The terma on which it is based teaches all Buddhist topics from point of view of Dzogchen, and so is characterized by uncommon simplicity. The lineage is entirely non-monastic (Ngagpa), and so emphasizes householder practice and non-celibate ordination. All of its contemporary teachers are ethnically non-Tibetan.

The Dzogchen point of view permeates Aro. The lower yanas (Sutrayana and Tantrayana) are re-presented in Dzogchen terms, and take on its characteristic style of simplicity, clarity, and expansiveness. Enlightenment needs only to be recognized, and is not produced by artificial means. Aro is therefore primarily concerned with bringing meditative awareness into ordinary life, rather than with elaborate, intellectualized, and time-consuming liturgical chanting. For Dzogchen, the ultimate practice is "living the view," i. e. experiencing and acting in the world as non-dual.

The Aro lineage is based on the Aro gTér, a terma or "revelation" of Khyungchen Aro Lingma. The Aro gTér has several distinctive characteristics: it treats all Buddhist subjects from point of view of Dzogchen; as a consequence its practices are simpler

than the elaborate sadhanas typical of Tantric Buddhism; and it includes practices of semde and longde as well as the more common men-ngag-de. These characteristics make it particularly suitable for those with jobs and families, and therefore limited practice time, which accords with the Aro lineage's non-monastic orientation.

I've personally had limited experience with Aro. My "mentor" however considers Ngakpa Chogyam to be his root teacher (due to Ngakpa Chogyam giving him direct introduction) and attends their practices regularly (in addition to ChNN's community). I attended one practice and it was quite different than the practices at the Ling I go to for ChNN's Dzogchen Community. All of the mantras, chanting, singing is in english and there's more of an interactive discussion and atmosphere. It's very formal which isn't good or bad but wasn't what i was used to. I also attended an empowerment by Ngakpa Chogyam for the Owl-Headed Dakini. (From Wikipedia: Within the Aro gTér, the Sutra of the Owl-Headed Dakini (Wylie: 'ug gdong snying thig mkha' 'gro mdo; Sanskrit: Ulukha-mukha Dakini Upadesha Sutra) treats the major topics of Sutrayana from point of view of Dzogchen. It includes unusual presentations of the Four Noble Truths and Eightfold Path, and of the Five Precepts. The Five Precepts are said to have inner meanings at the level of Dzogchen.)

Ngakpa Chogyam is a really charismatic and engaging teacher (in my experience) and the community overall seems to be great... He has quite a few books out and they're easily read and present simple and effective teachings which could definitely serve as a great supplement to anyones practices and/or understanding of Dzogchen...

So with all this in mind i was wondering why the mention of this lineage got a "less-than-desireable" response?

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 7:22 AM
Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung
Content:
krodha wrote:
Also makes me wonder if such conclusions by Jung were projections of his own 'shadow' (which was what his own work was based on). I remember another story about Jung i read, about an entry in his personal journals where he had been asking around in the 'metaphysical' community to see whether anyone knew of someone 'who truly knew themselves'. He wrote that someone told him there was a man in India by the name of Bhagavan Sri Ramana Maharshi who knew himself, and that he should go there. But Jung said he never went, because he was afraid of what he might've found out.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 7:00 AM
Title: Re: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung
Content:
krodha wrote:

I'm just trying to say that during that era, when the west's exposure to eastern thought was in it's infancy; mistranslated text like Evans-Wentz' which ultimately led to a prominent western psychotherapist like C.G. Jung denouncing the profundity of those teachings... has to have sustained some sort of residual effect in certain circles.

I mean, i commend Evans-Wentz for his effort and passion in translating those texts but they're ultimately wrong and spread falsity. And such an influential character like Jung deciding that the teachings were not credible or had nothing to offer and stating that to be so has to have had an effect.

I know my friend was learning of Buddhist philosophy in his psychology or philosophy class (one of the two) and it makes me wonder if he'd even be receiving credible information... if the information had been derived from Evans-Wentz or Jung's conclusions.

Ultimately it doesn't matter, those who take interest and seek the truth will find that in the teachings. But it's unfortunate that there's a possibility of someone thinking they understand what the teaching is about and even deciding it's not worth their time based on the conclusions of Jung, for example.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 30th, 2011 at 4:26 AM
Title: Erroneous views on Dzogchen of W.Y. Evans-Wentz and C.G.Jung
Content:
krodha wrote:
Evans-Wentz played a pioneer role in the study of the literature of the Nyingmapa and Kagyudpa schools and produced a series of early texts(1919, 1935) in collaboration with Tibetan Lamas who were familiar with the oral traditions. At that time European scholars had little knowledge of any Eastern literature or concepts. Evans-Wentz himself came from a background of Vedanta and Theosophy, and working under assumptions derived from these schools of thought subsequently led to many mistakes in his translations of the Tibetan teachings. He didn't know how to read Tibetan, never visited Tibet and never lived as a monk or under the guidance of any Lama. His letters and diaries only indicated a rather formal relationship with any Lama he worked with. The Tibetan texts he collected were roughly translated by the Tibetan Lamas who knew english and then those translations were further reworked and edited by Evans-Wentz over a couple of years. He approached the texts from the standpoint of modern neo-theosophy and occultism, Neo-platonic philosophy and modern popularized Advaita Vedanta which all erroneously led him to assert that the essential teaching of Dzogchen is the existence of a metaphysical entity which he called "the One Mind." And the purpose of Dzogchen was to somehow "merge" with this "Mind". C.G. Jung based his studies off of Evans-Wentz' information which led him to state that there was in fact nothing profound in the teachings of Tibetan Buddhism. He further evaluated the "findings" of Evans-Wentz, subjugating and comparing them to his own views which only served to proliferate the mistranslations. He grievously misunderstood concepts used in the teachings such as the Dharmakaya which he mistook for khunzi or

"storehouse consciousness" which he equated to the unconscious in modern psychotherapy. He mistranslated Dharmakaya as the aspect of our minds which is able to retain vestigial imprints (memories) which then have the ability to subconsciously dominate our perceptions. And that the purpose of infiltrating this aspect of ourselves was to account for these subconscious perceptions so that they can be brought to conscious attention and therefore no longer act as subconscious projections. So he took the aspiration of attaining this state of "nonduality" (which he again misinterpreted as accounting for dichotomous conceptual extremes in our experience) for attaining some kind of perception-less state of unconscious blankness. He spoke of the Tibetan philosophies and teachings with great disdain and said they had nothing to offer the west.

I'm sure during those times the ripple effects of these awful mistranslations took a prominent place in the west's perception of these teachings. And I know times are now different with the large accessibility to proper teachings and Lamas who spread the true Dharma.

But I can't help to think that these early mistranslations still hold a place in influencing the perceptions of those who only study Evans-Wentz and C.G. Jung.

And I can't help but to suspect that there has been further mistranslations based on Evan-Wentz' and Jung's writings.

Not that they truly matter anymore due to the real teachings being readily accessible like i said but....

How much do you think these early mistranslations actually had/still have an effect?

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:
krodha wrote:
I can see how you got that from what I wrote though. Both statements were meant to stand alone. Maybe an "and" in-between both would've been appropriate. Yes not very clear... But now clarified

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 25th, 2011 at 3:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:

asunthatneversets said:

And also be keen on distinguishing Dzogchen from the lower vehicles. Don't get caught up in the bullshit.

Namdrol said:
Lower vehicles are not bullshit.

N

krodha wrote:
Whoa! Never said the lower vehicles are bullshit... What's going on in this thread?! I'm in the misconstrued twilight zone

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 5:56 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Don't get caught up in the bullshit.

treehuggingoctopus said:
Oh, do I hear someone's voice in this one

asunthatneversets said:
Never become fooled into thinking "I get it"... because truly you can't "get it" conceptually. It can't be known within the traditional confines of acquiring intellectual knowledge. But the more concise the intellectual understanding; the more concise the pointing out is. So it's a thin line and this is where skillful means will help. Ultimately it's just like all those sayings though, just as the eyes cannot see themselves, just as one's teeth cannot bite themselves and just as fire cannot burn itself... you will not be able to intellectually understand the real meaning.

treehuggingoctopus said:
I know that your intentions are as pure as they can be. Still, I can't help thinking: are we really entitled to offer public advice on receiving direct introduction/recognizing the state? Would one be entitled to do so simply because one is a long-term practitioner devoted to the teachings?

krodha wrote:
That wasn't my intention I think I was just trying to convey the limits of the intellect in the teaching. I don't think anyone's entitled give advice on direct introduction unless they're a teacher. But even at that advice on direct introduction would be leading the student. Everything I writes just my opinion... Take it with a grain of salt

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 9:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:
krodha wrote:
I actually never said "don't look at the finger"... that would be an ignorant statement. I said reading and understanding intellectually is all well and good in it's place.. because it is.. my point was just don't fixate on the finger, as in don't become too attached to it. But you're right, if you dont know where to look or the nature of what it is youre looking at, so you can be discriminative you're stuck/lost. It's a thin line.

And do make sure you revisit what you've read as you go along, because a lot of times in the beginning you might have difficulty assimilating a certain text, which at a later time when revisited is understood much more clearly. And that's due to the fact that statements and texts will start to either mirror your own sentiments or will describe your own experience, and that will validate your own path. A clear/concise intellectual understanding is incredibly important and serves as an unparalleled supplement to practice in that way.

So don't get me wrong, an intellectual understanding can be very useful. I mean, personally I consumed texts like a wild fire in the beginning, and i still appreciate them just the same. But one needs to know when to/how to divorce the experience from the intellectual understanding. And beware of a misinterpreted intellectual understanding acting as a suggestive force, because ultimately that obviously becomes counterproductive.

"Just as the Buddhas have spoken of "I" and "mine" for a practical purpose; Likewise they spoke too of "aggregates", "Elements" and "sense-fields" for practical purposes. " - Nagarjuna

And further, once the 'moon' (which the finger was pointing to) is identified in actual experience. There still needs to be keen discriminative openness to the practice. As you progress things will become subtler and subtler, and the tricks the mind will play to reinforce the conditioning will become subtler and subtler. So that's where fixation becomes an issue, on whatever level. Everything will come apart, and everything you once knew will be turned on it's head. This is the point ChNN is making in that quote you have as your avatar "It wasn't until later that I came to realize that I hadn't really understood anything at all."

"For those who are suppressed by false knowledge. And grasp the untrue to be true; In them arises from attachment; a series of grasping and contentions" - Nagarjuna

Never become fooled into thinking "I get it"... because truly you can't "get it" conceptually. It can't be known within the traditional confines of acquiring intellectual knowledge. But the more concise the intellectual understanding; the more concise the pointing out is. So it's a thin line and this is where skillful means will help. Ultimately it's just like all those sayings though, just as the eyes cannot see themselves, just as one's

teeth cannot bite themselves and just as fire cannot burn itself... you will not be able to intellectually understand the real meaning.

And also be keen on distinguishing Dzogchen from the lower vehicles. Don't get caught up in the bullshit.

"Dzogpa Chenpo is the fortress of view, It's paths and stages are completed instantly. It is not comparable to the lower yanas" - Garab Dorje

"This (Dzogpa Chenpo) is the only resultant yana and it is the summit of all the yanas. Except for this one, other yanas are accompanied by accepting and rejecting, defending and negating; And are created by mind. They are the stairs (leading) to this yana. All the different tenets, divisions of yanas and the paths and stages - by accomplishing the great confidence in this realization - will be perfected in the equalness state without efforts." - Mipham Namgyal

*Edited like wild

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 8:00 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Study
Content:
krodha wrote:
Studying and taking notes is all well and good in it's place, but only serves to build a mountain of intellectual knowledge for one to become attached to. Everything in those books is "the finger pointing at the moon"... don't fixate on the finger, look where it's pointing.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 24th, 2011 at 5:28 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
mint said:
Is CHNN'S Music for the Dance of the Vajra supposed to be used as a learning tool, or is it simply an experiment in exotic world music?

I'm trying to find a recording of SOV so that I figure out its intonation, etc..

krodha wrote:
It's used as a support to remain in contemplation while in movement. Just as the ganapuja stimulates all the senses so you can incorporate/integrate them into contemplation. Movement(tactile sensation) with the mudras, auditory sensation with the bell/drum/mantras, taste with the food, smell with the incense, visual with the mudras/visualizations.

Song of vajra dance and music is the same type thing. Support to remain in contemplation. So you can eventually remain in constant nonmeditation.

Just listen to the song of vajra in it's suchness. As white noise almost. Let it pass as a reflection and remain as the mirror.

The sound of traffic and people bustling in the streets is the song of vajra... Integrate integrate integrate

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 22nd, 2011 at 5:00 PM
Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche's "Crazy Wisdom" & the Steinbecks
Content:
krodha wrote:
I am happy that I am a free Yogi.
So I grow more and more into my inner happiness.
I can have sex with many women,
because I help them to go the path of enlightenment.
Outwardly I'm a fool
and inwardly I live with a clear spiritual system.
Outwardly, I enjoy wine, women and song.
And inwardly I work for the benefit of all beings.
Outwardly, I live for my pleasure
and inwardly I do everything in the right moment.
Outwardly I am a ragged beggar
and inwardly a blissful Buddha.

- Drukpa Kunley "The Saint of 5,000 Women"

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 21st, 2011 at 7:49 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
mint said:
So, when a person enters nyamnyid and/or lhundrub, does the pain typically associated with getting hit by a brick cease? Is this due the dissolution between subject and object, realizing that the energy of getting hit by a brick is the same sort of energy as having sex, etc.?

krodha wrote:
I'd say don't even try to form an idea of what any aspect of fruition would be like. Holding the expectation negates abiding in the base and is actually a projection of mind. See that an expectation of a 'future' event (or state) is just a presently arising thought, and the presently arising thought is merely an empty play of the primordial nature. Which as Namdrol was pointing out above, seems to arise, seems to abide, and seems to fall...

but does it? Be here now. The base is ever-present.

But for the sake of conventional conversation; upon the dissolution of duality, the qualities(characteristics/properties) which constitute a brick or pain would be empty expressions of the primordial nature. Putting it into words becomes clumsy because one has to use descriptive language which conveys elements of experience which are absent in the base. Even now, our language actually conveys elements which are not present in experience. Alan Watts gives the example of the famous 'it' in "it is raining"... what is this 'it'? It's just a convention of language. All language is like that, it populates experience with 'things' which are not evident when investigated empirically. Some are harmless, like the 'it' in 'it is raining' and some are very powerful and become engrained subconsciously like 'you' and 'me'.

So for this reason a nondual experience cannot be described accurately at all. But to ignore that fact for a moment, and attempt to frame an answer to your question in a clumsy way which ultimately misrepresents the actuality of what it would be like: you would BE the pain, and the pain would be a play of your nature, but 'you' would be absent so the pain would appear to itself and any notion of it being an unpleasant or pleasant experience would not arise. I mean, we can't even comprehend how profound a state that is at that point. That's why you read all these stories of miracles and 'powers' because the constructs of space and time, subject and object are no more. But THE MOST IMPORTANT THING is; do not strive for that, don't want or wish for that, don't expect that, in practice if miraculous experiences such as visions or experiences of nonduality arise view them with an attitude of indifference... do not care, never think you have achieved anything. Know that all is a play of the primordial nature, reflection on the mirror, if something miraculous arises and there's an inkling of achievement correct for that immediately and remain unmoved. Just remain in the base and there will be no limit to your practice. Don't postulate any kind of notions about what the culmination of effort would be like, because it's coming from the perspective of ignorance(avidya). Humility and earnestness are of utmost importance.

*All this is my unfounded opinion

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:

Namdrol said:
No, generally speaking sentient beings have no idea that they are in bondage or suffering from some kind of mistaken perception about anything. The Rosary of Pearls explains:

Having been gripped by the apprehending subject and apprehended object
in the aggregates, elements and gateways,

one remains in samsara itself for a long while,
within the belly of the three realms
one is placed in the prison of name and matter, [352]
bound by the chains of ignorance,
covered with dense black darkness of samsara,
attached to the spicy taste of passion,
one is bound by the noose of confusion,
tormented by the hot fire of hatred,
one's head is covered by pride,
the gates of jealously are locked,
surrounded by the armies of resentment and so on,
tied about the neck with the noose of apprehending subject and apprehended object,
stuck in the swamp of past traces,
one's hands are shackled with ripened karma,
the mother of karma is joined with her child,
one following the other just like a water wheel,
alternating between good and bad bodies,
born in different forms,
and through heightening one's self-grasping
one sinks to the bottom of the ocean of suffering,
one's heart is grabbed by the goad of the evil destinies,
one binds oneself with the enemy, afflictions.
Fire appears as water to hell beings,
as hunger and thirst to hungry ghosts,
as fog to animals.
the aggregates, gateways and elements appears as the five elements to humans,
those are also pleasurable, painful and neutral,
as weapons and armor to asuras,
and as desirable things to gods.
For example, just like a rapidly spinning fire wheel
one abides continuously in samsara for a long while.
Such various appearances are like seeing a snake in a rope
since what isn't there is held to be there,
both the outer and inner container and contents form,
and if that is investigated, it is a rope,
i.e. the container and contents are already empty
the ultimate with the form of the relative.

krodha wrote:
True, good observation. I made the statement coming from the perspective of one who had already formed a relationship with the teachings and didn't account for the fact that this is not the case for most.

Namdrol said:
Delusion is not a part of the basis and is not fundamentally pure.

krodha wrote:

Because otherwise one would mistakenly assume that the delusion is the basis and remain deluded, so distinction is necessary... that makes sense.

Namdrol said:
Dzogchen states that basis is free from ignorance from the very beginning. All of our deluded experience comes from not recognizing the basis itself. There is no ignorance in the basis. The Transcendence of Sound states:

“Ignorance” is not possible
in the essence, the wisdom of original purity.

The Letterless states:
Since my self-originated wisdom is pure of delusion from the start, it is beyond the extremes of being and non-being.

Also the Luminous Clarity states:

The essence, the wisdom of original purity,
is free from the stain of ignorance

The Rosary of Pearls states very clearly:

The mere term delusion cannot be described
within the original purity of the initial state,
likewise, how can there be non-delusion?
Therefore, pure of delusion from the beginning.

krodha wrote:
I'll have to watch how i present what I say and make those necessary distinctions because you're right otherwise it's like you're giving someone license to be complacent and delude themselves further into thinking they're not deluded, which is dangerous. Thanks for pointing that out!

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:

mint said:
So this is what is meant by there being no actual sentient beings to liberate. Sentient beings are the reflections of mind's energy and the mind itself is empty, being only further energy.

So, in actuality, my mind's perception of other people learning and teaching Dzogchen is all just a play of energy of the primordial nature like a motion picture spontaneously

manifesting on the big screen of mind.

krodha wrote:
From the perspective of avidya(ignorance/dualistic perception) the notion that one is in 'bondage'(samsara) governs one's point of view... which is then projected onto 'others' who are also in 'bondage'. With the notion of bondage(samsara) the polar idea of 'liberation'(nirvana) automatically comes into being because it's a mutually interdependent co-emergent concept.

From the perspective of vidya(rigpa/nondual perception) the innate knowledge that the 'one' who was in bondage(samsara) was a misconception is made apparent beyond a shadow of a doubt. This apperception literally removes the point of reference(subject) which was used to project the appearance of 'others'(object) in need of liberating. So it isn't that one reaches a 'state of liberation' which was originally conceived from the perspective of the apparent 'bondage', but ascertains that the notion of 'bondage' is a misconception which is dependent on a subject which is illusory. And this knowledge automatically negates the notion of liberation(originally conceived conceptually from the perspective of pseudo-bondage by the pseudo-subject), and that is liberation. It's deeply intuitively perceived that samsara and nirvana are both equally unreal projections of ignorance, and that the seeker is the sought, and when this happens, the individual disappears along with the projected others.

Dzogchen cuts straight to the point and states that experience is fundamentally pure from the very beginning. All that "is" is a spontaneous play of the primordial nature which is itself empty.

So it isn't 'your' minds perception. And clinging to the notion that there are 'no others' or 'no self' is actually a subtle trap and trick of the avidya. Accepting or rejecting the notion that there are 'no others' or 'no self' is exactly the same as accepting/rejecting the notion of 'others' and 'self'. Because both are 'ideas' held in the pseudo-mind, and attachment or rejection to ideas, concepts etc creates the pseudo-self which is a symptom of the apparent thought based entity called the 'mind'.

Dzogchen accounts for this error by discouraging futile attempts at intellectually understanding and states that ALL is a reflection of the base and is inseparable from the base... phenomena is a projection(reflection) of the noumenon(primordial nature) which is itself empty. Experience is viewed in it's suchness without attachment or aversion. And if one has a keen eye, as stabilization in suchness escalates these ideas and concepts we're attempting to discuss are innately apperceived experientially and the nature of experience is altered dramatically.

But bottom line is this can't be understood intellectually. So don't believe any of it, just LOOK at experience empirically and it will 'do the work' for you. Until it dawns experientially treat all as conjecture and take refuge in the actuality of life unfolding in the immediacy.

So your question of the objectivity of a brick, or objectivity of pain from a brick hitting

you on the head is conceived from the spontaneous play of the primordial nature mistakenly identifying in relativity with specific elements of it's own 'play' via the projection of conception and attachment to those concepts/specific elements through habitual conditioning. This creates the pseudo-entity. Avidya arises from this identification. It is this pseudo-entity which suffers pain and bondage and seeks liberation. 'I' cannot possibly suffer because 'I' is not equipped with any instrument with which sensation could be experienced. And the base cannot suffer because the base is itself empty and suffering is a reflection of itself. Any experience, pleasant of unpleasant, can only be experienced by the mis-identified phantom object called 'me'.

*This is my own opinion, I declare no authority in any of it and it is open to being dissected, trashed, ridiculed, examined etc...

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 20th, 2011 at 1:09 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
mint said:
Is it possible that all beings and all things have an energy field because all things are nothing more than the play of energy, light and insubstantial color?

krodha wrote:
While this is somewhat off topic in regards to the nature of your question(in the context of the dharma); you should take a look at some 'kirlian photography'. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kirlian_photography It's a method used to photograph the energy fields generated by living entities and other objects. You might find it interesting... they did kirlian photography on human subjects and had them produce different emotional states and their energy field(aura) which surrounded them changed colors with each emotion.

Obviously a different notion than rolpa/tsal but your question reminded me of it.

Youtube: Kirlian Photography Explanation
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qDOi1BLoN3U

Youtube: (Kirlian/Aura-Photography) -of raw foods
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suBjc9rIFNY

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 10:08 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
krodha wrote:
Oh and there's also a book called

"Healing With Form, Energy And Light: The Five Elements In Tibetan Shamanism, Tantra And Dzogchen"
by Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche

which might be a good read if you're interested in learning more about the energetic aspects of the teaching.

I think he has some vids on youtube discussing them too.

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 9:43 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Question: If you realize that everything is your own vision then how can you help other beings? What is the answer?
LTN: The answer is that you help them because they are self-vision. Beings are also self-vision. Inherently helping them is not possible.

mint said:
Thanks for posting this. Based on what I just read, to make sure I comprehended it fairly, in this very moment where I think that I am typing a response to this thread on my computer, seeing the computer and the text on the screen as something separate from me, this is all just a play of energy by the primordial nature, right? And it is avidya which attaches itself to these reflections of energy?

So, when I think I see Namdrol offering sound advice on how to practice Dzogchen, there really is no Namdrol or advice separate from the primordial nature? And the things that I mistake as being Namdrol and sound advice are really nothing more than the reflections of the energy of my primordial nature? So, even ChNNR is really nothing more than a play of mine own energy emanating or manifesting from the primordial nature (samantabhadra)?

So, this would mean that the reason why my girlfriend would share a similar karma to mine, the reason why we have a relationship, is because our individual mind streams have crossed in the primordial nature? The reason why we seem to exist to each other is due to the play of interlacing energies?

krodha wrote:
Conventionally speaking that is a fair comprehension. But you who would comprehend are a reflection as well, so this comprehension can't be held. If the comprehension is attached-to it gives rise to 'you' and 'other than you', likewise if it is rejected it gives rise to 'you' and 'other than you'. The primordial nature doesn't accept or reject any 'thing' because nothing is separate from it. It just spontaneously manifests.

So it's not like your individual mind-steam crosses paths with your girlfriend's individual mind-stream. This is why what Lopon was saying regarding the recognition that nothing exists separately from thought(concept) is key. And that turning back to investigate the source of the mind and thought is key. Because neither can be found, there's only the primordial nature which is itself empty.

This all has to be done experientially that's why attempting to 'understand' becomes problematic. The base(primordial nature) is free of the 4 extremes(existence, non-existence, both and neither), the recognition of the base is more of an innate knowledge(not intellectual) like one knows they're alive, by 'being' alive. What 'appears' is a timeless manifestation of the base and is not separate from the base, but nothing can be said about what 'appears' since being the same as the base it's free of the 4 extremes. That metaphor; like a bird flying through the sky leaves no trace. Is how appearance manifests as a reflection. Like it flows from nothing to nothing - constantly - and is ever-fresh and new... but the notion of 'time' is only in mind, and mind is empty - so 'fresh and new' is empty - 'flow' is empty - 'constant' is empty. But those empty notions help to "point" from ones current perspective (which is avidya).

So this is why the practice is experientially resting in the primordial nature at all times, all day, every day.

'I comprehend this... fairly' is experientially a thought(i.e. noise/sound/play of energy/reflection - inseparable from the base) which manifests and is immediately self-liberated.

The nature of phenomena is nondual,
but each one, in its own state,
is beyond the limits of the mind.
There is no concept that can define
the condition of "what is"
but vision nevertheless manifests:
all is good.
Everything has already been accomplished,
and so, having overcome the sickness of effort,
one finds oneself in the self-perfected state:
this is contemplation.

- Vairocana

(For the record: What is NOT in italics is my own attempt to describe the indescribable and convey the futility of doing so... I was told to say so... I declare no authority in any of it... <--- pig)

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
krodha wrote:
"....Mind (citta) and mental-function (cetasika), in and of itself, comes into being in three stages.

[First stage:] The accumulation of vestigial-imprints (vasana), derived from the formative impulses (samskara) [of Creation], proliferate [from the first moment onwards] and evolve; when the [compounded] power (prabhava) of that has ripened [i.e., has obtained 'critical intensity'] then Mind-in-itself (cittatva, the essence of citta) manifests forth (abhasa) as subject and object, or in other words as Subjective Being (atmabhava, Tib: lus) and Existence, which nevertheless has no more 'reality' than the life in a pile of bones.

[Second stage:] Identification (lamba) with the activity of the continuum (santana) of evolving imprints (vasana) results in the formation of the 'psychic monad' (manas), experienced as a 'self' (atma), which it is not.

[Third stage:] As a result, the obscuring effect of the impulse-to-come-into-being (samskara) produces a subtle diminution-of-awareness, giving birth to a specific local consciousness.

Through the power of mind combined with the continuum, ensuing conceptual-constructions (kalpa) further negate realization. From that [i.e., from the above three modalities], having the nature of a contaminant (asrava), conceptual-constructions of self (atma) and phenomena (dharma) become serially reiterated...."

"Therefore, from the first instant (ksana) of [the continuum of] mind (citta), the subjective Being (atma-bhava) and all phenomena (sarva-dharma) are present. From the cathectic-functioning of mentation (cinta) there proceeds the appearance of origination. Yet no phenomena exists for either ordinary people or for enlightened Saints other than the continuum (santana) of their own mind (citta). The whole diversity (vicitrata) that exists for the six types [of sentient beings] is just their own internal-contemplation (samadhi)."

"Because there are no boundaries, a focus-of-attention (prabhana) and a locality (sthana), cannot exist. How then can conscious perceiving [i.e., the 'act' of consciousness] arise? Therefore mind is separate from the alternatives of existence and nonexistence, and is neither one nor many. In that the Enlightened state of the Blissful Ones is not [objectifiable], the deceit of appearance (abhasa) is like a magical apparition. In the same way [as Enlightenment is not objectifiable], so also, immaculate Gnosis, and the pure continuum of goodness (kusala) that is the Source of Reality (dharmadhatu), are misconstrued as having an existence, and hence as being objectifiable [i.e., an object separate from consciousness]."

"Since neither the meditator nor the Source of Reality exists, there can be neither uncertainty nor certitude of view. Thus, if one enquires into the conception of

"Existence," even as an apparition it is without an independent-nature (svabhava, own-nature). Consequently, even this nonexistence, depending as it would on existence, is not; nor does the nonexistence of nonexistence exist! Since all finite concepts are negational, the concept of "middle" (madhya) is equally negated, and so one should not even try and abide in a Middle View (madhyamaka). However, just as the Lotus Lord of the World (Padmalokisya, i.e., Avalokitesvara, the Bodhisattva of Compassionate Love) does not reject even one [sentient being], but sees all [beings] alike and equal, so too should one understand that even to see [all as] a deceit is itself a deception."

"When there is no identity [of phenomena], everything that exists is the Source of Reality itself. To know this is the Supreme Yoga of the Arhats! Just as space (akasa) is not substantial - it is just a name - positive (kusala) and negative (akusala), being inseparable, never arise."

- Manjusrimitra (Bodhicittabhavana)

Author: krodha
Date: Monday, December 19th, 2011 at 7:23 AM
Title: Re: Questions about energy
Content:
mint said:
I don't know much about this topic so I don't know how well I'll be able to follow along this topic after I start it, but I'll try to follow for as long as I can.

Some new agey folks talk about all beings having a so-called "energy field." When they say this, I think what they are saying is, quite simply, that all beings are energy. Sometimes they like to throw in Eastern words like "chi."

I'm not really sure what to make of this so-called energy field, nor am I sure how it may possibly relate to Dzogchen. Bear with me as I butcher what Dzogchen has to say about the relationship between the essence of the base and the energy of the base per Dzogchen. From what little I've read, the energy that manifests as thoughts, dualism, and samsaric experience finds its root in the base, our primordial nature.

Now, here's where I'm getting confused. Rather than formulate my concepts, I'll just ask questions:

Is this energy "real" - in the sense that, though it is the manifestation of my primordial nature, it has the ability to affect me, help me, harm me? Is there any objectivity to a brick, for instance? Is there any objectivity to a brick hitting me in the head? Or is it all just a manifestation of energy from my primordial nature?

Second question, is there any objectivity to the people in my life? Or are they manifestations of energy, as well? If everything is to be viewed as if in a dream, then are all the experiences that I imagine as real simply a play of energy/imagination? For instance, if my girlfriend is telling me a secret while a train is rolling by and birds are

chirping nearby and I'm thinking about lunch, is there any objectivity to what is happening or is it all just a play of energy of mind (sems)?

Third question, is there any relation between the so-called energy field that the new agey people talk about and the energy that Dzogchen talks about? Is it possible that all beings and all things have an energy field because all things are nothing more than the play of energy, light and insubstantial color?

If there are any texts that I can read which might clarify any of my confusion, I do own the following books so feel free to reference page numbers or other texts that I might consider:

Song of the vajra
The crystal and the way of light
Concise commentary on the short thun
Precious vase
Fearful simplicity
The mirror
Dzogchen the self perfected state
As it is vol 1

Thanks for bearing with me!

krodha wrote:
"From the point of view of bodhicitta (the natural state), you cannot explain the difference between the base, energy or the reflections. That is because it's nature is emptiness (i.e. the natural state) and to emptiness there is no distinction between them. For example, in the ocean itself, the clearness of the water (energy) and the reflections in it are not different from the water - they appear but they are not beyond the water. If you look from the point of view of reflections (i.e. individual things) there is no contradiction either. From that perspective you can see that the ocean and it's clarity and reflections are distinct from one another. However, according to the natural state none of the reflections has a real base. There is no inherent existence in them."

"The energy to reflect (tsal) is a property of the ocean, so the reflections (rol pa) and the energy are unified in it's nature (gzhi). Sometimes only two terms are used: gzhi (the base), and tsal (reflections), these two referring respectively to the capacity to take reflections (subject side) and the reflections themselves (object side)."

"You cannot say the natural state is empty or has reflections or whatever. Like water which is also wet it is both things at once - neither term captures this reality, which is beyond words. You can't say it is empty because it is not graspable - if you say that it is empty you try to enter the state whilst grasping the concept of emptiness. The real fact is beyond all concepts."

"Nothing exists beyond the natural state. Earth is not independent of the natural state;

visions are not independent visions. Everything is a vision of the natural state. The natural state is like a single point; the natural state is like where birds fly - behind there is no trace. If you understand this point you will realize that the natural state is the creator of all things - the king of creators."

"What is reflected in the mind does not independently exist; both internal and external are spontaneous reflections in the natural state. To do this is a natural quality of the primordial state, but it does not mean that these reflections are solid, independent and inherently existent. They arise from the natural state and go back to it; it is our ignorance that grasps them as independent."

"...[Lists a series of things you can imagine or envision] ...Finally dissolve all visions into the natural state. What is left? Then dissolve even your thought itself into the natural state so there is nothing left. Then you will realize that everything is made by thought - everything comes from there. You have to realize how things are created."

"The result is seeing that everything is created by your thought. Once you finally realize this you can check back to find it's origin. All things are created by your thought and mind - and if you look back to the source of your thought and mind you will find that is disappears. It dissolves and goes back to it's nature. That is the limit; every individual thing is dependent on the mind."

"All vision is like a dream. In a dream, a vision is just a vision to the mind, even though whatever appears looks like real material to the dreamer. It is just the same when we are awake. All appearances come from the karmic traces - they all come to the mind. Apart from mind nothing exists at all. The difference between dreaming and awakening is just in time - that is all."

"All the visions come from themselves and are seen by themselves. Everything is the reflection from itself. There are no objects inherently. Everything is the 'Great Vision' therefore there is no way to help others.
Question: If you realize that everything is your own vision then how can you help other beings? What is the answer?
LTN: The answer is that you help them because they are self-vision. Beings are also self-vision. Inherently helping them is not possible."

- Lopon Tenzin Namdak (Heartdrops Of Dharmakaya)

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 1:09 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Your nature escapes all distinctions... but for conventional purposes of communicating with one another; awareness, or consciousness, or innate cognizance, uncontrived wakefulness, (whatever label you wish to use) all serve to point to one's nature.

Center Channel said:
Maybe for you.

I prefer more precise terminology which I outlined twice.

krodha wrote:
That's good

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

Namdrol said:
Academic, if you have not distinguished the two.

N

krodha wrote:
Most definitely.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:45 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Understand that Dzogchen is a teaching which is meant to reveal your primordially pure enlightened state which has been absolutely perfect since beginningless time.

Namdrol said:
You really don't understand Dzogchen yet. But that's ok. Eventually you will. In the meantime, make sure that you pay attention to karma.

N

krodha wrote:
I respect your opinion.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:31 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The starting and ending point is the same space of awareness.

Namdrol said:
Nope. There is a huge difference between mind (citta) and vidyā.

N

krodha wrote:
I'd replace 'huge' with 'monumental'.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 10:29 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
Right now, and from now on, I would like to ask you to make clear the difference between your opinions and Dzogchen teachings coming from qualified teachers. Most of us are careful and try to do that. Informally, of course. It's a request, not an admonition or anything of the sort, OK? If I say something about Dzogchen and you ask me why do I say it, I can say who taught me that way, what is my experience and my opinion. Is that alright with you?

krodha wrote:
That's fair, I apologize if anyone else has felt i'm overstepping my boundaries in speaking.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 8:43 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Center Channel said:
Everyone's nature is the inseperability of clarity (i.e. mirror-like) and emptiness (i.e. can't point to the mirror with your finger).

By recognizing one's nature, one gains knowledge (rigpa).

Thus there is NO place for the word "awareness" at all

Ka dag certainly does not translate to awareness.

Neither does lhun grub.

So what word is being translated as "awareness" ???

krodha wrote:
Your nature escapes all distinctions... but for conventional purposes of communicating with one another; awareness, or consciousness, or innate cognizance, uncontrived wakefulness, (whatever label you wish to use) all serve to point to one's nature.

The inseparability of clarity and emptiness attempts to describe the attribute free quality of your conscious presence. It is clear and luminous in that it shines forth illuminating experience which is clear and fully apparent. While the emptiness points(as you stated) towards the fact that when you try to locate this awareness(or conscious presence) nothing that is a tangible quality one can point out can be found. So this is why it is said to be your unborn nature. It is timeless in that it is ever-present, and it transcends the extremes of existence and non-existence. It is primordially pure in that since beginingless time it is unassailed by any occurrence. Pristine and clear in that nothing obscures it's presence. It is vast in that nothing escapes it's touch in this present moment. And spacious because as an aperture for experience, it can be represented as a space which remains untouched as it allows that which appears in it to 'be' without effecting it's fundamental nature.

Kadag translates to 'primordial purity' and Lhun grub represents interdependent origination.. even though it's considered illusory in Dzogchen.

"all these (configurations of events and meanings) come about and disappear according to dependent origination. But, like a burnt seed, since a nonexistent (result) does not come about from a nonexistent (cause), cause and effect do not exist. What appears as a world of apparently external phenomena, is the play of energy of sentient beings. There is nothing external or separate from the individual. Everything that manifests in the individual's field of experience is a continuum. This is the Great Perfection that is discovered in the Dzogchen practice.

- Manjusrimitra (Bodhicittabhavana)

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 8:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Pero said:
Well a piece of shit and a candy bar are the same "at base" too.

krodha wrote:
Yes the same principle, in other indian traditions a metaphor is used of mistaking a rope for a snake. At first it appears to be a snake, but as you approach it you find out that it was a rope all along.

Here's the video of your metaphor...
and bill murray achieves enlightenment at the end.
(*Edit - The video embedding is disabled, it's "Caddyshack - Jaws!" on youtube)

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 7:40 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
It is the same cognizant awareness at base.

Pero said:
So they are not the same. Thanks.

krodha wrote:
It is the same. I'll use a symbol to try to convey it.

Take a look at this image:

If you look at it as if you're looking from above it looks like a pentagon with three lines which intersect in the middle.

But if you look at it from a side perspective it appears as a 3 dimensional cube.

Both are the same image. Only your perception is switching between the two "states".

At 'base' the image is the same.

But with the shift of your perception; the image takes on different appearances.

Experience is like this.

And the shift in perception between dualistic and nondual awareness is the same as this image.

Edit* image was way too big

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 7:22 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Pero said:

The same awareness as what?

kirtu said:
Ordinary awareness and enlightened awareness are the same awareness.

Pero said:
I have never seen or heard that anywhere myself.
It's just enlightened awareness has been obscured by the habit of ignorance.
Well then, they are not the same are they?

krodha wrote:
It is the same cognizant awareness at base. The "ordinary" aspect of it(avidya) is due to habitual patterns of identifying with certain aspects of experience which obscure it. And the illusion of dualism(a subject and object relationship) governs experience. When these obscurations are seen for what they are(which are mostly projections) that same awareness appears as everything(vidya/rigpa). The starting and ending point is the same space of awareness.

"If you simply recognize your essence, you are immediately face to face with the three kayas. It is so simple that it is actually incredibly easy. There is no way you could miss it. The problem, in fact, is that it's too easy! It's too close to oneself. Some great masters have said the fault lies in not that it is complicated, but that it is too simple. People don't trust it. They think "This is just my present state of being awake, so what use is it? It's not very special. I want something astounding, something totally different. Something that is far superior to this present state of wakefulness. Something with amazing lights and great splendor". And they ignore their present natural state of mind and hope that something extraordinary will happen, maybe coming down from above. They are right; the present state is not that special. But by sitting and hoping like that, they turn their backs on the innate three kayas."

"The phrase 'single sphere of dharmakaya' refers simply to this original wakefulness."

- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche (As It Is Vol. 1)

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 6:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Pero said:
This is why awareness sucks as a translation of rigpa. That is talking about Rigpa, not ordinary awareness we all have.

krodha wrote:
It's the same awareness, only the perception has been altered. If you don't want to believe me, that is ok. I don't blame you, i'm just some joe schmoe on a message board

It's not the type of thing you can be convinced of... convincing you would mean you just adopted a different belief anyways. The experience of the altered perception is required... that becomes the 'torch of certainty'.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 6:25 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
You weren't conscious when you were born? You weren't awake and aware? You weren't alive? Perceiving? Seeing? Hearing? Touching? Tasting? Smelling?

You can't be serious with that statement! I'll just go ahead an assume you're associating the term 'awareness' with the notion of 'awareness in it's full state' but when i say awareness...
That plain old boring awareness which you just claimed you didn't have, but allowed you to be awake and type your response = the dharmakaya... it just isn't apparent, which is why dzogchen is a method to realize this.

Pero said:
You seem to be contradicting yourself.

Anyway, I'm afraid that plain old boring awareness is not the dharmakaya at all. But is just plain old boring awareness which everyone has to smaller or greater degrees.

krodha wrote:
Maybe this text not coming from my mouth, but mirroring my sentiments will clarify what i'm trying to convey a little better.

Now, when you are introduced (to your own intrinsic awareness), the method for entering into it involves three considerations:
Thoughts in the past are clear and empty and leave no traces behind.
Thoughts in the future are fresh and unconditioned by anything.
And in the present moment, when (your mind) remains in its own condition without constructing anything,
awareness, at that moment, in itself is quite ordinary.
And when you look into yourself in this way nakedly (without any discursive thoughts),
Since there is only this pure observing, there will be found a lucid clarity without anyone being there who is the observer;
only a naked manifest awareness is present.
(This awareness) is empty and immaculately pure, not being created by anything whatsoever.
It is authentic and unadulterated, without any duality of clarity and emptiness.
It is not permanent and yet it is not created by anything.
However, it is not a mere nothingness or something annihilated because it is lucid and present.

It does not exist as a single entity because it is present and clear in terms of being many.
(On the other hand) it is not created as a multiplicity of things because it is inseparable and of a single flavor.
This inherent self-awareness does not derive from anything outside itself.

Within this (intrinsic awareness), the Trikaya (Triple Bodies) are inseparable and fully present as one.
Since it is empty and not created anywhere whatsoever, it is The Dharmakaya (Dharma-Body).
Since its luminous clarity represents the inherent transparent radiance of emptiness, it is the Sambhogakaya (Reward-Body / Utility-Body).
Since its arising is nowhere obstructed or interrupted, it is the Nirmanakaya.
These three (the Trikaya) being complete and fully present as one are its very essence.
This is the real introduction to the actual condition of things.

When you are introduced in this way through this exceedingly powerful method for entering into the practice,
(You discover directly) that your own immediate self-awareness is just this (and nothing else),
and that it has an inherent self-clarity, which is entirely un-fabricated.
How can you then speak of not understanding the nature of the mind?
Moreover, since you are meditating without finding anything there to meditate upon,
how can you say that your meditation does not go well?
Since your own manifest intrinsic awareness is just this,
how can you say that you cannot find your own mind?
The mind is just that which is thinking:
And yet, although you have searched (for the thinker), how can you say that you do not find him?
With respect to this, nowhere does there exist the one who is the cause of (mental) activity.
And yet, since activity exists, how can you say that such activity does not arise?
Since merely allowing (thoughts) to settle into their own condition, without trying to modify them in any way, is sufficient,
How can you say that you are not able to remain in a calm state?
Since allowing (thoughts) to be just as they are, with out trying to do anything about them, is sufficient,
How can you say that you are not able to do anything with regard to them?
Since clarity, awareness, and emptiness are inseparable and are spontaneously self-perfected,
how can you say that nothing is accomplished by your practice?
Since (intrinsic awareness) is self-originated and spontaneously self-perfected without any antecedent causes or conditions,
How can you say that you are not able to accomplish anything by your efforts?
Since the arising of discursive thoughts and their being liberated occur simultaneously,
how can you say that you are unable to apply an antidote?
Since your own immediate awareness is just this,
how can you say that you do not know anything with regard to it?.....

.....When you look upward into the space of the sky outside yourself,
If there are no thoughts occurring that are emanations being projected,
And when you look inward at your own mind inside yourself,
If there exists no projectionist who projects thoughts by thinking them,
Then your own subtle mind will become lucidly clear without anything being projected.
Since the Clear Light of your own intrinsic awareness is empty, it is the Dharmakaya;
and this is like the sun rising in a cloudless illuminated sky.
Even though this light cannot be said to possess a particular shape or form,
nevertheless, it can be fully known.
The meaning of this, whether or not it is understood, is especially significant.....

.....How wonderful!
This immediate intrinsic awareness is insubstantial and lucidly clear:
Just this is the highest pinnacle of all views.
It is all encompassing, free of everything, and without any conceptions whatsoever:
Just this is the highest pinnacle among all meditations.
It is un-fabricated and inexpressible in worldly terms:
Just this is the highest pinnacle among all courses of conduct.
Without being sought after, it is spontaneously self-perfected from the very beginning:
Just this is the highest pinnacle among all fruits.....

- Padmasambhava (Self Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness)

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 5:50 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
ronnewmexico said:
Well....." i suppose it's my nature "...what nature is this....I find no such nature. Is this yours only?

krodha wrote:
I guess i should have worded it "i suppose it's IN my nature" like i'm predisposed to engaging in activity like that. I mean your nature conventionally... in a personality sense. For example; it's in some people's nature to go to bars and get drunk and fight people. And it's in others peoples nature to do charity work and help others in need.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
When you were born, you did have awareness?

Pero said:
No and that's the same for every other normal human.

krodha wrote:
You weren't conscious when you were born? You weren't awake and aware? You weren't alive? Perceiving? Seeing? Hearing? Touching? Tasting? Smelling?

You can't be serious with that statement! I'll just go ahead an assume you're associating the term 'awareness' with the notion of 'awareness in it's full state' but when i say awareness... i mean awareness, plain old boring awareness. Awareness = having knowledge or cognizance.

Awareness synonyms: aware, cognizant, conscious, awake, alert, watchful, vigilant, sentient.

You're clearly a sentient being endowed with awareness, otherwise you'd be lifeless.

That plain old boring awareness which you just claimed you didn't have, but allowed you to be awake and type your response = the dharmakaya... it just isn't apparent, which is why dzogchen is a method to realize this.

Understand that Dzogchen is a teaching which is meant to reveal your primordially pure enlightened state which has been absolutely perfect since beginningless time. It is a direct path because it goes straight to the crux of the issue and introduces you to your innate perfection, so you can know it, and then integrate it into your experience. Which isn't acquiring something new. It's a shift in perception which allows what has always been there to shine in it's unimpeded glory and fullness.

You're working under the assumption that you are something like a caterpillar who one day is in chrysalis and then you become the butterfly. But this teaching says you are already a butterfly and this fact is only obscured by your own habitual behaviors and conditioning.

You aren't a normal human... YOU AREN'T ANYTHING YOU CAN CONCEIVE YOURSELF TO BE. That which you truly are, you cannot know, you can only BE. So abandon all your ideas of what you are. And seek to know the nature of this awareness... the luminous clarity which shines on experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 4:03 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
ronnewmexico said:
Seems true enough..but this..."i just like to inspire people and get people going

I don't get that..why that?

What would make one think such a thing is necessary?

krodha wrote:
It isn't necessary, i suppose it's my nature. If i engage with another, discussing subject matter that sits close to both of our hearts. And we both can mutually benefit from the conversation and enjoy having that conversation. And we both can learn new things about the other person and ultimately ourselves. It's a beautiful thing.

I would love to inspire anyone. And I love when they inspire me. That is the fire which burns inside all of us. What drives us to evolve and chase dreams. I have a 3 year old son, I love when he sees something new for the first time, or witnesses something I do that he wishes to do, it's the unfolding of life and the seed which grows to be the passion with which activities, people, places etc.. are loved.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 3:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I mean in truth, these ideas like merit and rebirth are just ideas. They aren't tangible aspects of reality, one chooses to believe or disbelieve them based on opinion.

wisdom said:
They are tangible aspects of reality. Dzogchen, the natural state, is NOT a tangible aspect of reality, that's why its unconditioned, non conceptual, and so forth.

By the logic that its just an opinion and so therefore it doesn't matter what anyone does, thats nihilism.

krodha wrote:
When you were born, did you know of merit and rebirth? No, you later learned of these ideas and then attached to them taking them to be truth. A person living in the bible belt in midwest united states learned of christianity and attached to that taking it to be truth. It is your own opinion that notions of merit and rebirth have any authority. There is no authority in merit and rebirth as ideas.

When you were born, you did have awareness? It has been with you your whole life, and is 100% undeniable... The authority of your awareness is IN the awareness itself. Because without it, there would be NOTHING. It is a tangible aspect of reality because you cannot deny it's existence, but it is also intangible because if you look for it you cannot find it. This is why it is known as 'empty'. You cannot say it is, and you cannot say it is not. It transcends all notions of it, and is at the same the the source of those notions, and those notions themselves.

It's not that it doesn't 'matter' what anyone does. The value of an action, which designates how much it matters is imputed onto that action. In reality it just manifests by it's own accord. Something which has value to you, or matters to you. May not matter to someone else, or have value to them.

You only say it's nihilism because you want to insist that things 'matter'. But you cannot escape from the fact that you wishing that things matter is merely your own desire. Galaxies will collide and stars will burn out, people will die and the world will turn. It isn't seeing that it doesn't matter what people do. It's understanding that life unfolds as it does... things happen as they happen, and resisting the fact that the world is a spectrum of events which are later interpreted as 'good and bad deeds' brings suffering. It is being able to flow with life.

I myself never said "so it doesn't matter what anyone does" you are projecting that onto the possibility that your opinion may be nothing more than an opinion. Because you identify with that feeling and want it to be real. It makes YOU who you are... what you are. You want it to matter what people do because you want life to have meaning and purpose.

The meaning and the purpose, and what matters and what doesn't matter; are only what you say they are. Otherwise you have the natural state, unconditioned, non-conceptual, and so forth.

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 18th, 2011 at 3:21 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Let me first say i genuinely appreciate the time and thought you put into responding. It hasn't been easy to frame answers to these questions in a way that can clarify but i did my best. Don't believe anything i say, just please apply it to your present experience and look. Investigate.

Dechen Norbu said:
Indeed, but your experience of it is real.
Let me try to put it in another way. Imagine you dream with tasty strawberries. You taste them and they are delicious! They smell delicious too! You can pick them, play with them, eat them and have a pleasant experience. Now, when you wake up, your precious strawberries are nowhere to be seen!
And it's not because you ate them either! Those strawberries were never real in the first place. Nevertheless, your experience was quite real.
The same goes for your life. It's dream like. You find that out when you die. The fact that duality is ultimately unreal, doesn't mean your experience of duality is unreal. At least not more unreal than those delicious strawberries you had so much fun with in your dream.

krodha wrote:
Yes the experience is real, however the perception had of the experience is what needs adjusting.

Dechen Norbu said:
I beg to differ. It's acknowledging a fact, not giving it power, not even subtly. We live dualisticaly. The point when you no longer live dualistically is enlightenment. All actions of body, speech and mind are perfectly integrated.

krodha wrote:
I see what you're saying, although I personally wouldn't call it a fact, but coming from your point of view i understand and can respect that it certainly seems to be a fact. What I'm trying to convey by saying that your statement subtly gives power to the illusion; is that at base, the nature of dualism is the presence of a subject-object dichotomy, so the presupposition(which granted is due to conditioning) that experience is exclusively dualistic actually reinforces the seeming duality. The idea that an individual can(at some point in time) attain a state of nonduality is spoiled by the notion that there is will be an individual who will populate that nondual state. By definition an individual(subject) automatically suggests what isn't that individual(other). They are mutually interdependent co-emergent qualities. So this subject is never going to reach nonduality, and that is because the subject automatically creates object. To reach a state of nonduality, it needs to be seen that what is taken to be a subject is a misconception, and what is taken to be objective is a misconception. The 'nondual' state is THIS state RIGHT NOW. Only the perception of right now, is altered dramatically.

Dechen Norbu said:
Then a worm is enlightened, I suppose, according to your ideas. Avidya, primordial ignorance, is the source of dualism. Not thoughts. If you remain in instant presence while thinking, thoughts no longer convey separation as you say. Key point again, integration. Sometimes people fail to understand such a simple concept. Recognize your natural state and slowly train to integrate every action without losing by distracting yourself.

krodha wrote:
Yes avidya is the source of dualism. And you're right the thoughts can't be the source of dualism because the thoughts have no authority aside from the authority imputed upon them by the seeming individual. But thought and conceptualization is the separating factor when avidya is apparent. And you're right, if you are in instant presence, thoughts no longer convey separation. But they truly don't convey separation right now in this moment either. There is no worm apart from sensory qualities and no sensory qualities apart from awareness.

Edit* Fuggit

Dechen Norbu said:
Language and karmic vision arise because of that notion, that has primordial ignorance at its root. It isn't language that causes avidya. It's a consequence of it (although it is a

complex process, not a direct consequence). It may reinforce our ignorance though. I'm not sure if that isn't what you mean.

krodha wrote:
Yes, it is the main reinforcing agent... coupled with the notion of time.

Dechen Norbu said:
I think "The Supreme Source" should be restricted... you reinforce this idea of mine.
I don't know what to say, really. IMO, you say some good things there, but then you also say some really bad ones, perhaps because of context. That makes me wonder if you really understood what you read. Hey, maybe I just don't get you, friend.

krodha wrote:
Yeah i'm not sure about the supreme source, i own it but haven't really read much of it. I'm not parroting something i've read. I'm trying to describe a state of being that is so simple yet ridiculously hard to describe using conventional language. A lot of what i say are statements i would actually contradict or negate as the process moved along, because what is ended up with is an experience which transcends anything you can say about it. I also wish you could get what i'm saying. I suppose some things i say could be interpreted as "bad"... i just like to inspire people and get people going. I don't know about any books being restricted, the knowledge will sink in to those who are ready to absorb it, the problem with dzogchen is that it's so radical.... and in many cases completely flips other aspects of the teachings on their heads, that it can become a dangerous ideology in the hands of someone who isn't mature enough to grasp it. They may interpret it as a means to live lawlessly and do whatever they want. It is a radical message. That is why it was kept 'secret' as a higher teaching. Only those mature enough to handle it were 'let in' on the secret. That's why you had teachers and students out in the jungle transmitting teachings orally, whispering through bamboo chutes. One website puts it this way "I suspect that they understood perfectly well that there is no Law of Karma. Their real concern was not that Dzogchen was wrong, but that it is administratively inconvenient. The important thing was that it not be taught to the masses - because the masses' belief in the Law is, supposedly, what keeps them in line. Often a compromise was reached: Dzogchen was permitted, but only if it were kept Very Secret, and taught only to the elite.

Dechen Norbu said:
Edit:
PS- Don't take my words in the wrong way, OK? Your practice and your understanding is yours alone and I'm not in your mind to understand if you are making confusions or not. I'm just saying what it looks like to me. Just be careful to understand the teachings properly and be sure you have them in the correct perspective. Keep in mind this Padmasambha's quote that goes more or less like "Although my view is higher than the sky, my actions are as fine as grains of flour."

Best wishes.

krodha wrote:
Definitely haven't taken your words the wrong way. I can see where it's missing the mark, it's just hard to explain to clarify.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 6:20 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
I'm not Nandrol, by any means, but let me share my thoughts about what you say.
I don't see the contradiction...

"by affirming the law of cause and effect of positive and negative deeds, they would cover my true condition with conjectures"

The true condition is not the effect of any cause. If people try to access it based on any causal principle, they'll never discover it. It can't be caused by something neither it is dependent of anything.
However, while we live dualistically, causes and effects affect us. So, if by accumulating bad karma and ripening its effects we have a life experience that doesn't allow us to recognize our true condition, we better be careful and avoid generating further negative karma.
So I don't see the contradiction. Does this address your point, Adamantine?

All the best.

krodha wrote:
But the issue remains that the seeming duality is unreal. So to say "while we live dualistically" is subtly giving power to the illusion and presupposes that at some point one will no longer be living dualistically. Thought is the only thing that conveys separation. There are no 'objects' aside from thought. Thought cuts up seamless fields of sensory perception because thought is by nature linear and fragmented. Were conditioned by thought and language because it's the only means we have to communicate and for that reason it's a beautiful thing. But it's a double edged sword, because it gives rise to a notion of separation. We become conditioned to identify with a certain cluster of sensations.. Visual and tactile that we call the body. But apart from seeing and feeling there is no body. Apart from hearing there are no sounds. And tactile, visual, auditory sensations aren't separate from awareness. And they only ever arise in the immediate moment. So in truth sensory perceptions is again another abstraction created by conceptualizing. The sensory fields are awareness.. Or consciousness.. Or the base or whatever label you want to give it.. It's beyond it. And it doesn't exist in time it only exists 'now'.. You can't even say 'now' because that implies 'not now'.. Which is why it's timeless. But the point I'm making is that duality is an illusion. There's no entity or character to get to there from here. There's only the nondual reality. Most are just

conditioned to project duality and separation habitually. But it's a dream. We dream a person, we dream a world, we dream time, we dream it all. You are the supreme source dreaming you're this person. And the dreamed person is trying to find the source which is impossible. It's here and it's now. All that was born was a concept and all that dies is a concept. You can die today and shine in your full glory as luminous timeless nondual vastness. Stop accepting the unreal to be real, find what doesn't come and go and stay there. You aren't in the body, you aren't in the mind, they are in you. And 'you' is an idea arising timelessly in awareness as awareness. Yet 'awareness' is still another idea. You're already 'that'.. Don't seek to become, just seek to understand why it isn't apparent.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 17th, 2011 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

Adamantine said:
N, I generally completely am in agreement with everything you state above and is how I have been taught but having just read a passage in the Kunjed Gyalpo, perhaps you could clarify the seeming contradiction for me?

This is from the "SUPREME SOURCE" translation from ChNN and A. Clemente Pg 140
"Do not make my teaching known to those who follow the vehicles based on cause and effect! If you do, by affirming the law of cause and effect of positive and negative deeds, they would cover my true condition with conjectures, and for a long time they would lose any possibility of meeting me."

krodha wrote:
This is exactly my point thank you for posting this. For those who give power to the notion of time, positive actions, negative actions etc... They obscure the innate nondual nature of their ever present awareness. You can't find it in time. Because the would be finder is an abstraction. Likewise deeds appear before the awareness which allows them to 'be'. The awareness is nonconceptual, only thought judges. And thought coupled with the illusion of cause and effect(time) gives the false appearance of an individual. Really all that is.. Is only awareness(and not even awareness because that is a label). Good, bad, time, self, no-self etc.. Are all conjectures and giving power to the conjectures obscures the innate ever shining awareness which is the source of everything(and everything). Even though everything is a conjecture as well because the source or base is all that exists.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 3:52 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?

Content:

Namdrol said:
The potion you are missing is that as long as you are under the influence of afflictions, you will engage in actions. Actions will result in suffering. The purpose of accumulating merit (from a Dzogchen perspective) is to maintain higher rebirth in samsara and create favorable conditions for meeting the teachings, and of course, to dedicate it to others.

krodha wrote:
That's the very same thing I've been saying in this thread so I'm not quite sure how I've been missing that. But that is all secondary to what Dzogchen is pointing to anyways... your innate and uncontrived awareness which is ever present is prior to and inclusive of all is the starting and ending point. I mean we both understand that accumulating merit and implements of that nature belong to mahayoga and anuyoga... the atiyoga is the instantaneous and spontaneous self perfected state. These other practices are supports and are all well and good in their place... but if taken to be a definitive aspects of dzogchen they obscure the fundamental principle of the teaching. The seeming reality of the individual is the seed of the ignorance which obscures one's primordial awareness from being present in it's full form as the nondual reality. The individual is an abstraction, so actions which benefit the illusory individual only reinforce the abstraction.

Accumulating merit (which is an adopted notion in and of itself) to maintain a higher rebirth (another adopted notion) in samsara doesn't free one from samsara. It's the golden cage.... but still a cage. Dzogchen is saying the cage is illusory. So why not investigate why one takes the cage to be real? Instead of polishing the cage.

Namdrol said:
What you are veering towards is a sort of "Dzogchen" nihilism that will just ruin your path.

N

krodha wrote:
Nihilism? How do you interpret anything i'm saying as nihilism? I never denied the existence of anything. All that's being said is that taking part in actions which deepen and develop a delusion seems counterproductive... but to each their own... no path has been ruined here.

I mean in truth, these ideas like merit and rebirth are just ideas. They aren't tangible aspects of reality, one chooses to believe or disbelieve them based on opinion. And to boot they aren't even an integral part of dzogchen.... it stands with or without them. Awareness however(which is integral to dzogchen), is plain as day and requires no belief, it cannot be denied and it's certainly free of the four extremes, so i'm not sure where you're getting nihilism. I'm just saying affirming or denying aspects of the belief system

which surrounds the teachings... and attaching to or rejecting whatever stance it is that one takes... is missing what dzogchen is about. All i'm doing is approaching the teaching empirically and experientially and questioning this paradigm that reigns supreme of marrying dzogchen with the lower yanas and insisting that's the only proper implementation of it.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 10:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Right, so what i'm saying is that for those who fail to recognize their nature, they enter into actions and give credence to these notions such as karma, merit and rebirth which only serve to reify the seeming duality... thus never escaping from samsara.

Namdrol said:
You can not think yourself out of ignorance. You can not declare, "I am perfect" and then expect to awaken.

What you have to understand is the basis. The reason the basis is called "the basis" is because it has not been realized.

N

krodha wrote:
Very true and that isn't what i'm suggesting at all. Thinking "i am perfect" is exactly the same as thinking "i'm imperfect".

What i'm saying in the above statement, is that if one hasn't understood the basis, adopting these other notions only solidifies the relative state. And by acting in accordance with actions which attempt to generate positive karma and rid oneself of negative karma. Partake in activities which gain merit. And believe oneself to be a lasting individual agent which spans life cycles by adopting the idea of rebirth. The illusory subject is only reified and solidified.... and then the subject continues to take part in said activities to eventually attain liberation at some point in time which is impossible. All of these notions, karma, merit and so on(the way they are presented) say to the person; if you do these things you'll be in a more auspicious position to attain your goal, and that simply isn't true. Because the motivation is by nature automatically negating the spontaneously perfect nature which is timelessly present. One's attention isn't put on awareness but on the individual which is a misconception derived from conditioning. So the conditioning just continues. The person continues on with the idea that they can "get there" eventually. So yes you can't think yourself out of ignorance, but you truly can't act yourself out of it either. Because the ignorance is due to the very same habitual patterns of mind that those notions are based upon.

Author: krodha
Date: Friday, December 16th, 2011 at 3:46 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
Maybe you view this present life as more concretely real than you realize, which is why you are framing this issue in terms of "being physically reborn into another physical realm" vs "psychological rebirth." Dzogchen does not suggest such a dichotomy, but rather that this life we're living now is truly no less dream-like than the dreams we have in our sleep, and that the realms we are reborn into are likewise dream-like.

Paul said:
Nice.

Personally, I don't see why people make the distinction between this "being physically reborn into another physical realm" vs "psychological rebirth" - they're exactly the same process. And it's not like traditional teachers only ever stick to one either. Karma dictates your mental states and also will dump you in different realms. I am of the opinion that Dzogchen shows 100% that the mind isn't a creation of the body and so just limited to one existence - in fact other lives become a necessary logical result...

krodha wrote:
The distinction is made because for those who haven't assimilated the teaching via direct introduction and need to 'understand' better. Adopting a notion of physical rebirth vs psychological is akin to dismantling a house with a spoon vs a wrecking ball. They are much the same process but that is my inquiry; some don't realize that. I'm not sure if you mean mind(thoughts) or mind(consciousness) but it doesn't have to be an opinion. The body is most definitely merely a projection of mind(consciousness) and is empty.. It's a picture on a screen. And being that time is a projection of mind(thoughts) and mind(thoughts) is a projection of itself they're all empty. There cannot be a necessary logical result derived from empty projections. The delusion you take as mind(thoughts) which is all 'you' are just wants to stay alive... and projecting a lasting existence that spans a course of time is a perfect way to ensure of that.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 5:11 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
Pema Rigdzin said:
As if holding fast to the belief in the unreality of cause & effect and rebirth, or holding fast to any belief at all, wouldn't equally veil the natural state?

Maybe you view this present life as more concretely real than you realize, which is why you are framing this issue in terms of "being physically reborn into another physical realm" vs "psychological rebirth." Dzogchen does not suggest such a dichotomy, but rather that this life we're living now is truly no less dream-like than the dreams we have in our sleep, and that the realms we are reborn into are likewise dream-like. I've read ChNN speaking about existence in the six realms as "karmic vision" which I feel really conveys the way there is a seeming reality - a seeming concreteness - to existence, whether in this life or another, but yet it's always simply our deluded experience.

And again, Dzogchen upadesha features a preliminary practice with the express, literal purpose of destroying the illusory seeds for illusory rebirth in illusory samsara's six realms by illusory Dzogchen practitioners.

krodha wrote:
It equally would, which is why i'm saying why propagate either extreme? I'm truly championing the empirical and experiential which doesn't communicate either extreme.

I'm proposing that for those who take rebirth to be physical (instead of focusing on the more subtle aspects of themselves which are reborn momentarily) the reification of the physical is what breathes life into the notion of the physical. If one starts to attack aspects of their habitual patterns and make this more of an inner journey which seeks to understand these projections which solidify 'physical' and then dismantle the 'psyche' as well it seems much easier to me. Experience reflects what is projected upon it. Whether one has fully integrated and experiences life to be no more real than a dream... or experiences life as a physical thing depends on the level of projection going on(the former having eradicated projection altogether).

The six realms are "karmic vision" because they are product of your state of mind. But the rebirths are going on moment to moment. One dies and is reborn every time conceptual thought subsides and then rises again. Because the individual is a projection of thought. That being the case... If you've created karmic circumstances which deliver an undesirable life situation and you reject it and become angry... you are reborn in the asura or wrathful realm as 'anger'. If you are pious and think yourself to be on a pedestal compared to others(based on your circumstances created by your actions) you are reborn into the god realm as an egotistical person. If you crave experiences which you think will fulfill you seeking materialistic possessions and are never satisfied you're reborn into the preta realms as a hungry ghost with a large belly and a small mouth that can't satiate you. If you're driven by blind lust, rage and primal instincts ignoring reasoning that could aid you you're reborn into the animal realm. Any action you make to get out of samsara, will land you in one of the six states. Realization/buddhahood is not one of the six realms. Because one cannot "get to there, from here". It cannot be 'produced'. It is uncontrived as we both said above. And this is why it's called the 'shoreless ocean of samsara' and one is bound to the cycle of rebirth eternally.

Seeing the six realms as states of the human mind and human emotion starts to put the teachings in a perspective that brings it closer to home. Because this whole process is

an inner process, an inner journey. As long as the idea of 'inner' still exists in one's experience. Because you're right dzogchen doesn't suggest any dichotomies, it suggests nothing except your timeless perfection. Experience also suggests nothing. It's only projected ideation, thought, opinion, belief, translation which suggests and hinders.

One can see right now, in this moment, the non-concreteness of experience if they altered their perception. They can see that they've always been free. The life we're living now, truly is no less dream-like than dreams we have in our sleep. Both are products of mind. But seeming separation is solidified by habitual patterns of conditioning... and the plot continues to thicken.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 4:12 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:
Making the view the main point (first its ascertainment, then fully integrating it into all one's waking and non-waking moments) is the antidote to being bound by the acknowledgment of the temporary "reality" of karma, rebirth, etc.

Respecting the fact that as long as one's lack of realization leaves one vulnerable to seemingly real samsaric experience, that one must govern oneself in such a way as to avoid the lower states of samsara, is the antidote to bringing about a samsaric existence which will likely prevent one from actually realizing Dzogchen directly. In other words, one doesn't shoot oneself in the foot by throwing attention to karma to the wind, and with it the circumstances conducive to actually realizing the view one so cherishes intellectually. The authentic view - which is not actually a view because it is completely uncontrived and non-conceptual - will eventually exhaust the mind and all its thoughts and habits altogether. But one must bring one's rigpa to sufficient strength for that to happen. If one brings rigpa to sufficient strength, then mind and samsara are no problem (for oneself).

*edited for clarity

krodha wrote:
Yes that is the antidote.

I never said throw attention to karma to the wind. I'm saying understand karma as action one partakes in which is enacted to create a desired outcome in time. The act of 'desiring an outcome' ignores the reality of karma as a law of co-emergent interdependent origination(mutually arising and contrasting attributes of experience which naturally compliment each other). Again, partaking in actions which give credence to notions which are in fact the very notions which bind one to the cycle of samsara. It's still being binded to samsara no matter how you cut it... whether it's a

higher state of a lower state fails to make a difference eventually. The point is to not be in any of the six realms, buddhahood is not in any of the six states for a reason, and that is because it isn't a product of mind. I can understand attempting to create fair conditions so that one isn't trapped in undesirable life situations. But if one merely keeps up a schedule of generating auspicious karmic conditions for themselves, they remain bound.

The view cannot be cherished intellectually, you either know it, or you don't. If you've had a taste, you understand it's nature, and what is needed to fully integrate it is understood beyond doubt. Yes it's absolutely uncontrived and non-conceptual. And yes it does exhaust the mind and habitual patterns, as i said in another post... it knocks your socks off. And the mind and samsara being contrived conceptualizations which pale in comparison to the strength and vastness of your true nature are undoubtably not a problem.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 3:49 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
One of the cornerstones of this teaching is seeing that things aren't as we're conditioned to take them to be. But these presuppositions such as karma, merit and one who is born over and over only solidify the notion that we are what we're originally conditioned to think we are. I don't know if this makes any sense but i'm trying.

Pema Rigdzin said:
One must respect and acknowledge the relative for as long as one is subject to it, even when one intellectually knows it isn't true. For instance, the primordially true nature is not split into self and other, and is beyond extremes of existence and nonexistence, and therefore it is not sustained by food or anything else. But relatively, your experience is that of a sentient being whose fleshly body requires food, water, and shelter from the elements, or else it will die. Regardless of your primordial nature, if you stop tending to such fundamental yet illusory, relative needs, you will die.

Furthermore, to say that a cornerstone of this teaching is "seeing that things aren't as we're conditioned to take them to be" means to really "see" or know this directly, as in actual realization, not merely through reasoning or belief. Firmly believing that karma and rebirth are illusory does not stop them from happening. Dzogchen tantras acknowledge this fact, which is why, for instance, we have the inner rushen of purifying the six realms, the explicit purpose of which is to make it impossible to be reborn in a samsaric realm.

krodha wrote:
Well undoubtably, i never proposed ignoring such relative conditions.

And yes i mean really "see" or know this directly as in actual realization... reasoning, belief and intellectual gymnastics, will not deliver the authentic truth.

As for "firmly believing" that karma and rebirth are illusory, that wasn't the message i was intending to convey. What i was saying, is that for those who hold fast to the concrete reality of such 'rules' or 'laws', the natural innate primordially pure nature(beyond extremes) may be veiled. I was inquiring into the nature of believing karma to be some form of cosmic retribution that attaches to you based on good/bad deeds. And rebirth as a 'physical' rebirth and not a psychological state(which makes more sense in applying the teaching to experience). The six realms being states(realms) of the mind instead of actual physical realms. Actually making it impossible to be 'reborn' into one of those states which proliferates samsaric experience.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I'm simply saying by believing you are not perfect from the beginning, and have to seek this "state" you are bound by your own effort. It creates an impossible task and you become your own worst enemy. It's like walking out your front door and setting on a journey to find the planet earth, when it's underneath your feet the whole time.

mint said:
I think I understand what you are saying. The only "effort" involved in Dzogchen is the effort of letting go, the mind still clings to object of "letting go;" therefore, the effort seems circuitous and flawed. However, as the teachings themselves seem to suggest, the remedy is pure motivation, the accumulation of merit, purification of the obscurations, in conjunction with bodhicitta.

krodha wrote:
Yes in a sense, but you're right it isn't even letting go but more of a reconfiguring of perception. Which I guess is letting go of old habits in a way, but more like seeing that those habitual patters were dependent on a misconception. It's like the saying "I once was blind, but now I can see". The remedy is the motivation to investigate and be open. And the purification of obscurations is accounting for presuppositions, conditioning and habitual patterns which obscure and bringing them to your conscious attention so youre no longer a victim of them. And yes in conjunction with bodhicitta(relative) because seeking liberation for yourself(a self that is born of the same presuppositions and habitual patterns) is a natural safeguard because an illusion cannot attain an illusion. Which absolute bodhicitta reveals this giving birth to true unconditional love and compassion.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

asunthatneversets said:
Seems to only obscure and delay any assimilation in my eyes. I've never understood (aside from helping with ascending conduct) the presence of these notions in dzogchen. Your nature is primordially pure and perfect from beginningless time, which is what dzogchen points towards.

Namdrol said:
But you did not recognize your nature, and so, under the influence of ignorance, you fall into duality and enter into actions, thus never escaping from samsara.

Another way of putting it that I noticed in a Dzogchen text the other day "Vidyā is seeing the substance of the mind. Avidyā is not seeing the substance of the mind". We mostly continue in a state of avidyā.

N

krodha wrote:
Right, so what i'm saying is that for those who fail to recognize their nature, they enter into actions and give credence to these notions such as karma, merit and rebirth which only serve to reify the seeming duality... thus never escaping from samsara. True Vidyā and Avidyā are the same pointers. But all i'm saying is that believing that you are an individual who takes on karma due to good or bad actions just continues to breathe life into dualism, samsara and avidyā. I guess it's hard because it's really counter-intuitive to tell someone that entering into action to get to a goal (using methods as a means to an end) negates your innate perfection that dzogchen points towards. The natural state is completely uncontrived.

Taking karma or merit to be something like "sin" in western religion is a grave misunderstanding in my eyes. And attaching to a belief that you die and are reborn again gives credence to the idea that you're this separate individual agent existing in time, and that you are a subject to objective happenings and cause and effect. Experience (which is what dzogchen is based on) communicates none of these notions, only beliefs and ideas which have been accepted and taken as truths do. So this is what Longchenpa was saying at the end of that excerpt i posted... "Constantly deconstructing, investigating keenly" none of these presuppositions hold any water, and seeing this opens the door to remaining in the natural state effortlessly, because it's effortless by nature. It's here now, it shines in it's fullness but giving power to dualities constructed in mind produces a subtle diminution of awareness. It creates a wall which isn't there, and then instead of saying "look, this wall isn't real" these implements which reify the wall are kept alive and it seemingly obscures the unreality of it all.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 15th, 2011 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
So again my inquiry into how karma, merit and transmigration truly apply in dzogchen stands.

Pema Rigdzin said:
It's so simple: Knowing the natural state is nirvana. Not knowing it is samsara. Whenever one is not in the knowledge (rigpa) of the natural state , samsara - including karma; emotional & physical ups and downs; the cycle of birth, death, and rebirth - is one's experience. It very obviously doesn't matter an iota that none of it is truly existent.

It's kind of silly that this conversation has to be had over and over among people who are not awakened and clearly know that their suffering and ripening of karma haven't disappeared just because Dzogchen theory makes eminent sense.

krodha wrote:
I wouldn't know about conversations like this being held over and over, suffering is due to being bound to your karma, which is action seeking a result in time. I can't call dzogchen a theory, due to the fact it has real empirical application beyond theory and belief. I'm simply saying by believing you are not perfect from the beginning, and have to seek this "state" you are bound by your own effort. It creates an impossible task and you become your own worst enemy. It's like walking out your front door and setting on a journey to find the planet earth, when it's underneath your feet the whole time.

One of the cornerstones of this teaching is seeing that things aren't as we're conditioned to take them to be. But these presuppositions such as karma, merit and one who is born over and over only solidify the notion that we are what we're originally conditioned to think we are. I don't know if this makes any sense but i'm trying.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 6:21 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Well that's good because it surely is blah blah blah!

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 4:12 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:

heart said:
If you don't understand mind (sem), which is what is under the spell of cause and effect, how can you possibly understand rigpa? In the natural state, there is no karma because the natural state is free from mind (sem), this is what Longchenpa is talking about. Of course if you are under the illusion that you are in the natural state most of the time, like some other in this forum, none of this will make any sense for you.

/magnus

krodha wrote:
You must have missed where i said the inquiry was rhetorical, i wasn't asking for myself, but i appreciate the response! I understand about as far as one intellectually can, but the intellect only goes so far.

But to critique your statement...

The would be 'understander' of mind (sem), is the mind (sem) itself, which is again a projection of itself into time(cause and effect) and time has no reality apart from thoughts/memories which constitute said mind (sem). So how can mind be "understood" at all? The mind (sem) as an entity has no reality. And time(cause and effect) equally has no reality. The seeming arising of consecutive thought/events gives birth to a false notion of time which creates the illusion of a substratum that endures as a subject in relation to objective experience. But the notion of time is a projection of that same present thought(appearing as memory/anticipation) and therefore negates the reality of an enduring subjective substratum(self) and complementary objective experience(world). Further, this negates the illusion of any dualities which support the seeming existence of distance and/or spatial relations(founded on the same misconception of a reference point). Thus the projected trifecta of experience(knower, knowing, known) is equally empty of inherent reality and innate 'experiential' assimilation of this truth collapses the unreal into a state of pure innate 'being' (which is itself empty). What "is" appears timelessly void of distinction, dimension or proliferation. I know full well what Longchenpa is talking about, but being that the natural state IS what is, the mirage called myself(or others) which is nothing more than the "natural state" in it's self-liberated suchness (being perverted through these empty projections) has no authority to make any such claim. And because that is the case; none of you (nor I) will ever be in the natural state most of the time... because no attribute listed in this sentence has any reality apart from conventional language.

So again my inquiry into how karma, merit and transmigration truly apply in dzogchen stands.

And i only mean the inquiry in a productive and innocent manner to spark friendly conversation! I value all opinions and points of view

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 11:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
krodha wrote:
Aside from helping with ascending conduct in a sense, how does the notion of karma(in a cosmic retribution sense), merit(in a positive/negative schematic attached to an individual) and rebirth(in a cycle of physical births/deaths) apply to dzogchen? I mean this question rhetorically but i'd also like to hear what people have to say.

Seems to only obscure and delay any assimilation in my eyes. I've never understood (aside from helping with ascending conduct) the presence of these notions in dzogchen. Your nature is primordially pure and perfect from beginningless time, which is what dzogchen points towards. And when embodied and applied to experience is undeniably true. Yet these notions from the other yanas linger and spill over into the view of many who post on here(which is perfectly fine in the context of a lot of the discussions on here). It seems to only veil this expedited and direct path which is dzogchen. It's all well and good either way, to each their own, but i guess i'm just surprised how much these aspects of the teachings take precedent here.

Ideas of rebirth, karma, merit etc.. are spoken of as if they can apply in this teaching which naturally points to a state of perfection prior to dualistic notions. These things need to be attached to an individual which doesn't exist on the absolute platform. They have their purpose and part but if they're taken as concrete "laws" applying to someone aspiring to become something in time, the dzogchen is obscured from that point of reference and the relative state forever prevails(which actually isn't even true but seems to be the case relatively and in the context of the view which reigns supreme).

"The actual essence, pristine gnosis,
cannot be improved upon, so virtue is profitless,
and it cannot be impaired, so vice is harmless;
in it's absence of karma there is no ripening of pleasure or pain;
in it's absence of judgement, no preference for samsara or nirvana;
in it's absence of articulation, it has no dimension;
in it's absence of past and future, rebirth is an empty notion;
who is there to transmigrate? And how to wander?
What is karma and how can it mature?
Contemplate the reality that is like the clear sky!

Constantly deconstructing, investigating keenly,
not even the slightest substance can be found;
and in the undivided moment of nondual perception
we abide in the natural state of perfection."

- Longchenpa

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching
Content:

samdrup said:
To be honest, I never have so I don't know!...but I would do Tsok (ganapuja) to repair Samaya.

mint said:
Oh, the way you said it, it sounded as if the empowerment came with some caveats. I wouldn't want you to break your samaya and be eaten by a guardian.

krodha wrote:
You can just do chod and get eaten by a guardian, you'd be a minty fresh treat for the black troma. Mint: the appetizer, main course and dessert. She's hungry

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
I've always been taught to not take it lightly...

Kilaya said:
Not taking it lightly is one thing, but fearing protectors as if they were some hostile beings may not be the right attitude. Of course, we respect them and we don't try to use them for selfish goals or harmful acts against others, but apart from that I don't see why invoking them for the sake of our spiritual development would be dangerous or wrong.

krodha wrote:
Yes i'd say it's definitely not the right attitude to fear anything in these teachings. Aside from the schematic of a practitioner-deity relationship it's also good to keep in mind that these guardians are not separate from us at base. But are merely aspects of our true nature which transcends these seeming dualities reinforced by our conditioning. They are meant for aid, inspiration, strength, courage and on some levels may not be anything other than archetypal in nature and implements to fortify our own intention and certainty we project into our practice and path.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 3:25 AM
Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching
Content:
mint said:
So, there's no guardians who can aid the beginning student of Dzogchen? or, it's useless?

or, it's too harmful?

asunthatneversets said:
I was told not to mess with Ekajati, Rahula or Dorje Legpa by yourself unless you're a well assimilated practitioner. That calling on them in a group setting like a ganapuja or something is cool but by yourself is not a good idea. I've also been told that if you want to call upon wrathful protectors such as those i mentioned to help you in practice you WILL attain your goal, be it realization or whatever... but you'll lose touch with everyone in your life who isn't a dharma practitioner.

mint said:
Why is it not a good idea? What ill effects have been noted of calling upon these guardians by one's self? If you've received the empowerment, isn't that technically a license to call upon the guardian yidams when going solo?

krodha wrote:
I couldn't even say why it isn't a good idea, i'm merely regurgitating what someone else has told me when it comes to the rules and regulations of deity yoga. So take my statements with a grain of salt and based on what others have said on here i'll probably re-evaluate my own notions of it as well. The only thing i can say is that my source has been a dharma practitioner for 50 years and he's highly knowledgeable, well-traveled and well-informed on most things when it comes to anu/atiyoga. But that doesn't validate what's said... and it may very well be a case of different traditions having different beliefs and opinions which may contrast each other like someone said above. Stick to what your sangha practices (which sounds like it's the same community i belong to, ChNN knows whats right).

I'd say if you want to go with a guardian to aid practice in the beginning (or at any time) use Padmasambhava(Guru Rinpoche). But really if you just dedicate the merit ('om dhare dhare bhandare svaha jaya...' etc..) at the end of practice, and be sure to keep the intention in mind that you're doing practice for the benefit of all sentient beings you're golden.

Author: krodha
Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2011 at 2:56 AM
Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching
Content:
krodha wrote:
Yeah i'm just parroting what i've been told. I attach no weight or validity to any of those ideas they could be completely unfounded for all i know. I'm actually not one to adhere to any of the dogmatic aspects of these teachings... it is funny to see myself mirroring notions like that which have been planted into me subconsciously by those i've come into contact with. For some reason those who attend the ling i go to sometimes really do put the guardians i mentioned up on a pedestal, in the sense that one shouldn't perform said practices unless they're at a certain level (which is counter-intuitive to dzogchen altogether). But namdrol is right be careful about who is saying what on here, i am a

student of ChNN but that doesn't mean i'm exempt from propagating statements which are rumors being paraded as some kind of truth.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 12:03 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
catmoon said:
Isn't forced liberation a contradiction in terms?

Virgo said:
Really, it actually manifests for them due to their merit. Because of my practice any one who comes into contact with me will be liberated. It is a simple fact. This is not because of me, but because of the blessings of the Dharma. I have never created an ounce of any good. And any ounce of goodness that may have been created by me was done completely on accident.

If you say certain mantras etc., then anyone who touches you, hears you, sees you, etc., makes a strong connection to the Dharma.

Kevin

krodha wrote:
Anyone who comes into contact with you will be liberated? What makes you say that? (Aside from the blessings of the dharma reason you mentioned). I'm not attempting to negate your statement i'm just curious about how one would come to such a conclusion. A strong conclusion at that by stating its "a simple fact". Just curious! I guess the statement depends on your definition of 'liberation' (again aside from one free of negative forces/suffering and who knows all phenomena) as well.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 7:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchenpa by Accident?
Content:
krodha wrote:
And if they're interested you'll know it. Because they'll pursue the conversation and want to know about it. If they don't care and seem uninterested you'll most likely never create a connection, but the seed will be planted at least, even subconsciously. It's best to never push it upon anyone, for a lot of people that will automatically turn them off to it. And that goes for anything not just dharma.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 13th, 2011 at 7:01 AM
Title: Re: Guardians of the Teaching

Content:
krodha wrote:
I was told not to mess with Ekajati, Rahula or Dorje Legpa by yourself unless you're a well assimilated practitioner. That calling on them in a group setting like a ganapuja or something is cool but by yourself is not a good idea. I've also been told that if you want to call upon wrathful protectors such as those i mentioned to help you in practice you WILL attain your goal, be it realization or whatever... but you'll lose touch with everyone in your life who isn't a dharma practitioner. I have a rahula statue in my room.. and a huge thangka with only those 3, Ekajati, Rahula and Dorje Legpa on it. I favor the wrathful beings by personal preference.. but don't do practices to invoke them unless i'm in a group setting.

And yes traditionally you're supposed to receive those certain transmissions to do their mantras and practices. Supposedly doing the practices without the transmissions will deliver zero results and may hinder your progress. I've always been taught to not take it lightly... and if you aren't sure of something don't act on it until you are sure. It's one of those things you can choose to believe or not, but in either case know you're gambling if the cards aren't in your favor.

Author: krodha
Date: Saturday, December 10th, 2011 at 6:43 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist way to deal with fleas
Content:
krodha wrote:
He goes into the reasoning behind having to take action eventually in this interview, which is cut off unfortunately in this video. But... this thread made me remember this interview.

if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e = document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s = document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); } https://phpbbex.com/ [video]

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 8th, 2011 at 6:31 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
alpha said:
When it comes to doing the SMS the explanation of various practices contained in Precious Vase one has to do is very sparse and incomplete.

Ex. In the investigation on" How one is beguiled by Diverse secondary causes" there is only one paragraph of 6 or 7 lines .That's it...There is no more of how you should investigate and how you formulate in your head this investigation....
Or another example is Kumbaka....I honestly do not understand how you do it...

And these practices are among many others who seem vague and incomplete.

So the question is how one studies the P.V for the SMS when the information given is incomplete...?

Yeeeah.....How do you practice Kumbaka from a book??????

krodha wrote:
Because formulating an investigation in your head IS being beguiled. The practice is to remain relaxed and present, in this present moment... whatever arises you just let it be as it is... and go as it goes, and that includes thoughts. It does itself. "You" don't have to "do" anything.

All the practices are supports to help you do the main practice if you can't seem to. None of them are necessary. Be careful of the SMS too just because people can read and recite facts from the precious vase doesn't mean they KNOW the teaching. It's like reading and reciting baseball statistics, doesn't mean you know anything about the ins and outs of playing the game on the field.

Kumbaka isn't necessary either. It's a secondary practice. Like yantra yoga, like guru yoga, like any of it... they're all methods.

If you can see what you're being pointed to, and rest in that, it will do the work for you... all effort (though it may be needed on some levels) is ultimately misleading... and if you don't know when to let go of the practice.. or know what you're looking for in the practice. Then you're lost.

Someone told me something that helped me tremendously when i first started all this... and they said it even before i started. They said "never stray from the basic message... don't get caught up in the bullshit"

wise words.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 1:14 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Religious Pluralism
Content:

mint said:
Everything is a display of wisdom.

krodha wrote:
At some point, if you experience it yourself... you'll have to see that the state which dzogchen reveals is the same state which causes the few catholics(or persons of

whatever denominations) who experience it to say "i've seen god". And that state is prior to thoughts and concepts which would place it into a certain belief system. You have to 'believe' catholicism. What dzogchen points to requires no belief. The visualizations of Garab Dorje or Padmasambhava or what have you... dakinis and all the rest of it are all supportive practices (not to be reified as truly existing objective elements of experience like catholicism projects) which are implemented to take you to the culmination or reveal the state in its fullness. And the culmination or a small taste of it will knock your socks off. In that state the notion of you being an individual in relation to a belief system with rules and regulations will be seen for what they are, which are mere constructs in mind. As a subject relating to an object you partake in catholicism and abide by it's teachings, you identify with concepts, ideas, thoughts, notions which construct your experience to be a certain way. But if dzogchen is applied earnestly and correctly, it will annihilate the concreteness of these subject/object dichotomies... and as others were saying in this thread, the concepts, ideas, thoughts, notions (which ARE catholicism) will be ornaments of that state.. they'll BE that state... timeless, unborn, undying. And yes you'd still be free to partake in catholicism (or any activity for that matter... worship satan.. whatever) you'd be swimming in yourself... and even that is a misleading notion. I'm not sure if you grasp the monumental degree of this teaching but until it's experienced it will remain on the level with catholicism as a nice idea.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 11:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Paul...thanks for the reply

Alpha...I wasnt suggesting rules/limitations. Just giving people a base of information on Dzogchen so they could have a little knowledge on how to go about following this Path. I believe that it is through doing some of the foundational practices that one is able to see more clearly just what ones limitations are and thereby deal with them. That has been my limited experience thus far.

krodha wrote:
All depends on the person and how intensely they identify with habitual patterns. It's only conditioning that creates the appearance of a path... information in those books which might serve to remove obstacles for one person, could be the very same info which misleads another. And practices which help one person can become a trap for another if they fixate on the practice... there's a very thin line to walk with reading texts and practicing.

Author: krodha
Date: Tuesday, December 6th, 2011 at 4:20 AM
Title: Anyone have info on these Garab Dorje texts?
Content:

krodha wrote:
I know most are familiar with Garab Dorje's three statements that strike the essence but I was curious to read these other texts attributed to him (according to wikipedia). I asked a friend/mentor who is very knowledgeable about dzogchen and he said the 3 statements are all that's important... which is true in a sense, but i'd still like to read these texts. I did some research online and came up with nothing so i figured i'd ask on here... figured someone would know! Where can i find the following texts?

- 'Cutting Through The Three Times' (Tibetan: དུས་གསུམ་ཆིག་ཚོད, Wylie: dus gsum chig chod)

- 'Overwhelming the Six Modes of Consciousness with Splendour' (Tibetan: ཚོགས་དྲུག་ཟིལ་གནོན, Wylie: tshogs drug zil gnon)

- 'Natural Freedom That Underlies Characteristics' (Tibetan: མཚན་མ་རང་གྲོལ, Wylie: mtshan ma rang grol)

- 'Direct Encounter with the Three Kayas' (Tibetan: སྐུ་གསུམ་ཐུག་ཕྲད, Wylie: sku gsum thug phrad)

- 'Vajra Fortress' (Tibetan: རྡོ་རྗེ་མཁར་རྫོང, Wylie: rdo rje mkhar rdzong)

- 'Deep Immersion in Awareness' (Tibetan: རིག་པ་སྤྱི་བླུགས, Wylie: rig pa spyi blugs)

I'm already familiar with 'The Golden Letters' and i know ChNN has a Garab Dorje book available... they seem to only cover the 3 statements though... which is profound and appropriate in the context of someone new to the teachings... or someone applying the teachings in the direct and stripped down experiential manner they should be. At the same time I'm sure these other writings are just as profound and insightful and i love reading these early influential and traditional texts... Mañjuśrīmitra's Bodhicittabhavana is one of my favorites so I can only imagine these are just as good... any help would be much appreciated!

Thanks!

Author: krodha
Date: Sunday, December 4th, 2011 at 8:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
mint said:
What is the difference between these two books, aside from price?

http://www.shangshungstore.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=104 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

https://www.amazon.com/Cycle-Day-Night-Primordial-Essential/dp/0882680404/ref=sr_1_4?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1322956981&sr=1-4 " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

krodha wrote:
They very well might be exactly the same... i have the one from the amazon link, and that's actually an older version of it. That book has been rereleased with a newer cover since then and some updates to the text i believe. That version in the shang shung store might just be the most recent press of it. Educated guess on my part but it is speculative since i don't have the version in the shang shung link.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 1st, 2011 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: About 5 years trying to practice ChNN's teachings...
Content:

padma norbu said:
Anyway, it's been about 5 years now. I thought I would be a lot further along. I also found some entries from a retreat with Jim Valby where I made the note "150 hrs x 2000 mantras/hour = you begin to get some idea what Tun is all about." HA. I have never done this much Tun in my life.

I'm really, really sucking ass at this stuff. Just thought I would share.

krodha wrote:
Sounds like you have a preconceived notion of "where" you're supposed to be.. and end up for that matter. Or "what" you're supposed to be by being further along this path. You very well might be acting as your own worst enemy in this. You seem to be identifying with ideas or stories of others experiences and gauging/comparing yourself to these notions. These methods being prescribed for people aren't the best methods for everyone... i mean honestly, no mantra is going to help you in embodying what it is that dzogchen points to. All efforts to create a result are actually reifying your apparent predicament. Dzogchen is so subtle it's easily missed and overlooked... by identifying with a conceptual path or goal you've already seemingly obscured it. It's all a subtle shift in perception... which actually radically shifts experience. But the experience is always THIS experience right now. Don't look for a result in time... be here now, and inquire into the nature of what these elements of experience such as time, space, objects etc actually are... instead of doing mantras and practices maybe try looking at the one doing these practices. What does it mean to be awake, aware, present. Forget all presuppositions you have about yourself.. that you're "such and such" a person in relation to a world and universe you live in etc... that you aren't already that.. you're already pristine, luminous, spaceless, naturally occurring timeless awareness. Investigate empirically why it is that you don't feel that in your experience... and why you don't know it to be true. Identification with thought is the main culprit... it paints a false story and gives birth to everything.

Author: krodha
Date: Thursday, December 1st, 2011 at 6:39 AM
Title: Re: Is receiving transmission via webcast a farce?
Content:
Food_Eatah said:
What is the difference between a "transmission" and watching a teaching?

krodha wrote:
Transmission is a direct experiential introduction to the nature of your mind... watching or listening to a teaching is understanding an intellectual description of whatever the teaching is on. There's different types of transmission (and some are symbolic using the intellect) the type norbu uses is a physical method that shows you the nature of your mind. That doesn't mean one will "get it" or understand what it's pointing to every time, depends on the capacity of the practitioner. Some see it right away the first time.. some need a few transmissions to assimilate it... and for some other routes like symbolic and intellectual understanding is better. No way is wrong or right, just depends on the person... like in every day learning some people like to "see" a graph or have instructions written out to understand something and some can just listen. Doesn't matter really... all roads lead to rome.